WAAMH
Western Australian Association
for Mental Health

WAAMH

Western Australian Association
for Mental Health

NDIS Thin Markets Project

Submission to the April 2019 Discussion Paper

Western Australian Association for Mental Health

Western Australian Association for Mental Health (WAAMH)

P: (08) 6246 3000
W: www.waamh.org.au
E: cmckinney@waamh.org.au

WAAMH

Western Australian Association
for Mental Health

WAAMH
Western Australian Association for Mental Health

Introduction

The National Disability Insurance Scheme (NDIS) is a valuable social reform that will provide access to lifelong support for many people with psychosocial disability that have long sought support that is available, responsive and person-centred. There are however significant challenges in the NDIS for people with psychosocial disability, which will need to be overcome for the reform to improve participant outcomes and deliver its promise of shared value for both individuals and our society.

The NDIS aims to enhance choice and control for people with disability and support their independence and social and economic participation through access to lifelong support. Fundamental to the NDIS model is the tenet that building strong, viable markets of disability services will create the opportunity for people with disability to have access to a choice of innovative, quality services enabling the objectives of the NDIS to be achieved.

About WAAMH

The Western Australian Association for Mental Health (WAAMH) is the peak body for the community mental health sector in Western Australia and exists to champion mental wellbeing, recovery and citizenship. WAAMH recognises a continuum of supports are essential to the promotion, protection and restoration of mental wellbeing. WAAMH promotes, advocates for and further develops this network of supports. WAAMH's membership comprises community managed organisations providing mental health services, programs or supports and people and families with lived experience of mental health issues and suicide, with whom WAAMH engages in genuine partnership. WAAMH also engages a wise network of collaborative relationships at a state and national level.

About this submission

This submission focuses on the development of robust markets for people with psychosocial disability. It is informed by WAAMH's NDIS Sector Reference Group, comprehensive ongoing engagement with members and psychosocial stakeholders including consumer and carer representative organisations, and WAAMH's March 2019 consultation to inform the WA Market Review.

We request that our submission to the WA Market Review is accepted as part of this submission. It forms Appendix 1.

Additional feedback was sought and received from WAAMH members and other stakeholders to the specific questions in Thin Markets Project Discussion Paper (discussion paper).

Many of the issues highlighted in this submission are described in the enclosed case study of KEEDAC/ Kaata-Koorliny Aboriginal Corporation.

Problem definition: thin markets in the context of the NDIS

a) Thin market definitions, key characteristics, market segments

The thin market definition outlined in the discussion paper is a good starting point.

However, the document feels very remote to local context in Western Australia and the reality of WA's rural and remote challenges with vast travel distances, higher cost of living and significantly higher wages in some areas especially mining regions. There is also a lack of infrastructure such as public transport and very limited to no mainstream service availability.

These impact on participant support needs and the ability of providers to recruit suitable staff – higher wages simply must be paid, and even accommodation provided. While local staff can be recruited and trained, the limitations of the NDIS pricing model is very significantly prohibitive. These issues are described in detail in WAAMH's submission to the WA Market Review (see Appendix 1).

Within current pricing frameworks - notwithstanding the recent increases - establishment costs to set up in new regional areas are too high with unpredictable and at times very low current or likely numbers of participants. Psychosocial providers already report pricing is too low to reliably maintain quality in metropolitan and inner regional areas, in particular for people with very complex needs.

Markets may also be thin in relation to cultural needs and cultural security. For the NDIS to reach its potential, all participants should have a choice in the market – for some people it will be critical that this means addressing cultural safety and security,. Yet in some areas (including densely populated areas) it may be difficult to get these services.

In particular, Aboriginal communities in regional and remote areas represent a thin market. WAAMH has received reports from multiple stakeholders that a standard NDIS funding approach will result in the non-availability of services to Aboriginal communities in regional/remote areas.

In most cases reasonable and necessary supports for CaLD, Indigenous and LGBTQI particpants (although the cultural context will change for the latter) means access to services that provide clear understanding of their cultural needs and inclusion for people of their respective communities. This includes access to carers of similar cultural background or language groups.

Similarly, if participants are seeking contemporary or innovative approaches or services (for example peer support- through a 100% peer led organisation, or a safe space/housing that was therapeutic and peer led), providers are not able to offer that in WA at the moment. Another thin market could be considered accommodation support that included housing.

b) key causes, challenges and/or barriers that produce thin markets

In Western Australia the limited availability of clinical (mainstream) mental health supports directly impacts on providers decisions to enter certain markets due to the absolute criticality of both clinical supports and NDIS support to meet participants needs. Providers report many cases of a lack of clinical support, compromising the safety of participant and staff. This is a persistent challenge, particularly outside metropolitan areas where access to clinical mental health services is significantly lower [1].

WA providers have reported to WAAMH this directly impacts their decision to not enter rural and remote markets.

Some providers - who are a provider of choice for people with very complex needs and justice interface - are taking the decision to more often 'say no' to supporting some participants with psychosocial disability who have exceptionally complex needs. This is particularly the case for people who have extreme challenges with wellbeing and are often violence and aggressive and may be interfacing with the justice system.

While this is technically outside NDIS supports, the reality is that participants with complex needs are a cohort for whom a thin market is emerging, and we are seeing little real shift in WA to increase community justice and forensic mental health services to respond to the needs of these participants. State government has modelled the demand for increased community mental health support and forensic services, and the policy frameworks are in place setting out the need, but the investment is not being realised and this remains a persistent challenge.

Transport and travel payments is a major feasibility issue in rural and remote WA – it is reported by providers as one of the major factors in their decision not to enter rural and remote psychosocial provision.

c) potential impacts of thin markets for NDIS participants

---

[1] WAAMH Submission: Accessibility and quality of mental health services in rural and remote Australia Senate Inquiry https://waamh.org.au/assets/documents/systemic-advocacy/waamh-submission-rural--remote-mh-senate-inquiry-2018.pdf

Currently participants in many WA regions experience no choice at all, or only one provider is available. This comprises the tenet of the NDIS regarding choice and control and healthy competition.

WAAMH has received reports that the lack of clinical supports for people with exceptionally complex needs and justice system behaviours directly impacts on providers ability to offer quality supports - compromising participant, worker and community safety. This is an emerging thin market.

Culturally secure access processes and reasonable and necessary supports is neglected in CaLD communities from the initial access and eligibility stage through to planning and then service delivery. WAAMH members and stakeholders report that this results in under-representation by these groups in the numbers of people successfully accessing the NDIS, and significant underfunding of participant plans as these cohort members are unable to provide the appropriate response or evidence to gain the supports required.

This has resultant impacts on market settings. If demand for culturally appropriate services is relatively low, this directly impacts the ability of smaller or niche organisations with expertise in supporting people of diversity to enter NDIS as providers and be sustainable. In a block funding environment, the sustainability of smaller or niche organisations can already be tenuous, however viability pressures are amplified in the individualised funding environment and a competitive market approach.

Additionally, relatively low participant numbers or plan build results in lower incentives for more general providers to build, enhance and sustain their cultural responsiveness and support innovation for people with diverse cultural needs (including LGBTIQ+).

As a result, it becomes very difficult for CaLD, Aboriginal and LGBTIQ+ clients to exercise choice and control, as their ability to access good support and information is so much more limited.

Greater detail about the impacts for diverse groups is set out in the Keedac case study at the end of this submission.

Recommendations:

- Local context is strongly acknowledged in the definitions and drivers of thin markets and the development of potential solutions.
- Cultural security is considered a critical factor in determining whether a market is thin, and market intervention is required
- Market intervention strategies are required to enhance development of and access to innovative, contemporary services.

- How far a worker has to travel be considered a key local context factor in planning and pricing decisions. This should be determined on a more flexible case by case approach rather than a fixed price approach accounting for where the participant lives and what it would take to get services to them.
- Core supports should be fully flexible. Restricting people who are paid mobility allowance or transport directly is putting increased pressure on individuals, families and providers to make transport affordable to individuals whose goals are directly linked to requiring support to get to places.

Where and when the government should take a different approach to NDIS delivery

Regions and cohorts affected by thin markets are set out in section 1 of this submission.

Key indicators which signal when responses to thin markets are required include:

- No providers, including for specific cohorts
- no new active providers into regional areas
- lack of choice
- withdrawal of providers
- reports of quality concerns
- reports of inappropriate or culturally insecure support options

It is essential that assessments of these issues focus on active providers, not registered providers as some, perhaps many, will not be active.

Thin markets should be prioritised in:

- Regional and remote areas of Western Australia
- For participants with psychosocial disability, especially those with very complex needs
- Participants with culturally diverse backgrounds including Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, people from Culturally and Linguistically Diverse backgrounds, and LGBTIQ+ people.

Recommendations:

- WAAMH recognises that it is still early in the implementation of the NDIS, and welcomes this discussion paper, however despite the early stage of implementation we strongly recommend that early corrective action be a priority in the thin market contexts described in this paper.

How government should address thin markets

WAAMH supports the introduction of "direct commissioning of services" approach in the discussion paper, in regions that are established to have no supports such as remote towns and Aboriginal communities.

While WAAMH broadly supports the NDIS approach to enable participant choice and control, we also argue that niche and specialist service providers are a critical part of the service landscape, including in the NDIS. For some cohorts, these are currently their service of choice – or the only service they will access.

Yet it is these services most likely to experience viability pressures and withdraw. WAAMH has received numerous reports of small, local, or specialist service experiencing extreme challenges in the NDIS environment. See the Keedac case study at the end of this submission for a more detailed description of the issues.

The direct commissioning of services must ensure an equal playing field for smaller or specialist providers – this is not normally evident in competitive tendering processes. The service provider chosen must strongly and capably demonstrate their local knowledge and experience with the specific communities and the people that live there.

WAAMH also supports the notion of community led partnerships – analysing what are the strengths of the community, its needs, assessment of who the people with NDIS packages are and what they are looking for, and then developing solutions to respond to those needs.

Some of the trade-offs inherent in these different approaches are discussed in the Keedac case study at the end of this submission.

WAAMH further recommends the introduction of increased flexibility and out of policy decisions, so that local and economic context can be taken into account when developing packages. For example, wages costs in certain regions, transport costs.

One example of an out of policy decision (from previous state funded disability services in WA) was allowing the employment of family members in some extenuating remote situations e.g. a cousin might provide support in a small Aboriginal community.

WAAMH recommends exploration of remote workforce programs and the bundling of packages to respond to the needs of families that may have multiple service system packages, such as aged care, child with disability and adult with psychosocial plan. Some families might seek to choose a family package that allows them to determine their needs; this might include having one worker across different programs. In a remote community this would be even more important. Bundling would require allowing more out of policy flexibility in those situations.

One stakeholder has suggested that to overcome cultural security support challenges, in a way that is irrespective of cost of service delivery or other impacts, is to add a specialist service delivery registration group into the registration process. Rather like the Rainbow accreditation, this would allow providers to apply for and provide evidence of specialist service delivery for certain cohorts such as CaLD, Indigenous, LGBTQI+ or people psychosocial disability. This does not mean an automatic referral to these service providers but does allow participants an easier way to recognise the specialisation of the service.

Recommendations:

- Introduce increased flexibility and an out of policy decisions framework and process, so that local and economic context can be taken into account when developing packages.
- Introduce higher pricing in Western Australian remote areas based on analysis of the local context, rather than a blunt tool such as the Monash Model which does not accurately reflect the local context – see WAAMHs submission to the WA Market Review Submission for more information.
- Introduce direct community of services – provided that genuinely culturally secure services are contracted.
- Explore community led partnerships.
- Explore the development of remote workforce programs.
- Explore the bundling of services across programs.
- Further recommendations are set out in section 1 of this submission, and in WAAMH's WA Market Review submission (Appendix 1)

Case Study: KEEDAC/Kaata-Koorliny Aboriginal Corporation

Prepared by Keedac.

Keedac is an Aboriginal Corporation based in the rural town of Narrogin in the west Australia, Wheatbelt region. Narrogin is 192 kilometres southeast of Perth, with a population of 4,219 (2011 census).

Keedac operates in a 100km radius area and is the only Aboriginal specific service in that region.

Narrogin has been reported by other non-Aboriginal providers as a non-viable market, with WAAMH receiving reports of providers entering and later withdrawing from that market.

Thin market challenges

- Geographic isolation: Keedac in Narrogin is the only provider servicing Aboriginal communities for a region covering 100 km radius. The physical distance and travel time results in considerably higher costs for service delivery that are not reflected in standard NDIS schedule charges.
- Vulnerable clients
  Some clients have complex or higher needs, including isolation, complex disability needs and self-support challenges. These clients require highly qualified and competent staff. Keedac continues to train and recruit staff with deep experience and needs to maintain a base load of such staff, whether the number of clients is small or large.

  Such vulnerable clients are subject to episodic as well as ongoing permanent needs, calling for highly qualified peer support to be available at short notice at times, or to have time to visit clients on a regular basis. The travel times and distances involved place a premium on the time of highly qualified staff.
- Higher operating costs
  In regional/remote areas, the issues of low client numbers, combined with highly dispersed clients, results in far higher per-client costs that are not reflected in the NDIS schedule.
  For example, the experience of Keedac is that a base load level of experienced staff needs to be maintained, sufficient to ensure that peer support is available to clients, regardless of whether client demand is high or low. Because we only maintain a small number of peer support workers, and care for a small number of clients, as compared with highly populated areas,

we do not have the flexibility to expand or contract on numbers of peer support workers.

- In addition, to provide proper and necessary support and management of peer support workers, additional fixed costs in terms of an office base, management staff, compliance staff, vehicles, training, OSH, needs to be maintained. In a large organisation, these fixed costs can be shared over a larger number of peer support workers, but in a small organisation, the required NDIS standards still have to be met. Management supervision has to be provided, regardless of the number of peer support workers.

  As a result, the experience of Keedac, and Providers in similar regions, is that the cost per client is considerably above that in higher populated areas and beyond the provision in the NDIS schedule.

- Workforce
  Regional/remote communities face difficulties in recruiting and retaining suitably qualified staff, and in providing ongoing training and learning opportunities. It is the experience of Keedac that few workers are willing to move from other areas to Narrogin to work. There is the related issue that local Aboriginal tribes prefer to deal with someone from their own tribal area or nearby which can cause issues in assimilating someone from another location.
  The preferred action by Keedac has been to encourage training for local peer support workers. Some of this can be done online, but Keedac also funds attendance at supplementary courses in Perth or elsewhere, to attain industry qualifications.
  As a result, training costs are higher for Providers in regional/remote areas than for Providers in metropolitan areas.

- Temporary supply gaps during transition
  Support from Allied Health Services and similar during transition can be limited in regional/remote areas. In the case of the Narrogin region serviced by Keedac, we understand, from the NDIS, that it may be well into 2020 before our clients are transitioned to NDIS.

  Meanwhile, our existing services under PHaMs are to be replaced by funding from WAPHA under Psychosocial+ but we are awaiting advice on the quantum of funding, which may be considerably lower.

  Keedac has clients which need servicing, without any break, but Keedac sees a risk of having to withdraw some or all services for a period, due to lack of funding sufficient to pay for existing staffing provisions. If this eventuates, there is no other suitable Provider in the region which would cause severe problems for our clients and throw the service load onto whatever Allied Health Services, hospital and GP services, are willing to step into the breach.

The particular concern of Keedac, in servicing a regional/remote market, is that this is a thin market, where the level of funding received from NDIS will not be sufficient to maintain services.

The problem is the NDIS payment model, where payment is made on a per-case basis, individual payment for each service delivered. This would be workable if we could ensure that peer support staff are fully engaged in providing fee-paying services for all of their work hours, and if they did not have additional travel time and costs.

The market is too small and remote to enable us to scale operations to match demand whilst meeting governance requirements. However, to provide the level of service required by NDIS in this regional area, Keedac has to maintain a level of suitably qualified and trained staff as a fixed cost, while the service revenue is variable, and insufficient to cover those fixed costs.

Keedac operates in a thin market. Under the NDIS model as currently specified, there is a real risk that Keedac, and other similar Aboriginal community providers, cannot offer the services of a Provider and remain viable. In such a circumstance, which is likely, Keedac may have to cease operating as a Provider, which would leave the regional Aboriginal community with no service support alternatives.

Thin Market Responses

This calls for an alternative commissioning model, as set out in figure 4 of the report.

Figure 4 itemises intervention levels from limited government involvement, to substantial government involvement, in four tranches, being:

- Market facilitation
- Market deepening
- Regulation, and
- Alternative commissioning models

In regional/remote areas, for services to Aboriginal communities, we are a long way from the market facilitation model.

Even the regulation model does not address what is needed for Aboriginal corporations such as Keedac to be a Provider. The regulation model provides for an increase in charges of 25% for regional markets such as ours, which does not even come close to reflecting the costs of provision in such a thin market.

It is the view of Keedac that one of the alternative commissioning models needs to apply, for servicing Aboriginal communities in regional/remote areas.

Figure 4 lists alternative commissioning models as:

- Government provision of services
- Direct commissioning of services
- Community led partnerships

We understand the intent of the NDIS program, being to provide services on a per-service individualised funding model, rather than block funding of staffing and support. However, this model simply does not apply for the service of Aboriginal communities in regional/remote areas, due to the thin market issues described above.

Based on figure 4, Keedac considers the possibilities for the continuation of services to NDIS clients would be:

- Government provision of services
  In this model, Keedac ceases to provide services. The government opens offices in Narrogin and similar locations, takes on the peer support staff currently employed by Keedac and others, and provides services directly to Aboriginal clients.

  This is likely to be the most expensive approach for the government, but provides a high level of control and governance.

- Direct commissioning of services
  As set out in the report, this involves directly contracting a Provider to provide services. In our case, this would mean contracting Keedac, on a block grant basis, to provide services. The fee-per-service charges would either return directly to government or be used to offset the block grant.

  Keedac believes this to be the optimal approach, which builds on the experience and knowledge of regional/remote Providers, while limiting the overheads of management by the government.

- Community led partnerships
  According to figure 4, this involves providing seed funding for a community led partnership.
  This could be relevant in regions where a new Provider is to be set up, especially if other community funds, such as from WAPHA, or local shires, can be contributed. But, in our view, the ongoing supply constraints of a thin market are not addressed by this model. Sooner or later, the issue of fixed costs exceeding variable revenue have to be addressed.

In summary, Keedac is of the view that the provision of services to Aboriginal communities in regional/remote areas meets the criteria of a thin market.

While actual supply/demand circumstances will vary with each location and provider, we recommend that the government considers the solution to be the provision of block grants to cover service costs, under the "direct commissioning of services" model, to be the most appropriate. Such commissioning can be on a case-by-case basis.

Keedac considers that the challenges to future funding for NDIS services to Aboriginal communities in regional/remote areas needs urgent resolution.

We don't yet know what ongoing funding will be, and the risk of withdrawing services through insufficient funding is only months away.

WAAMH
Western Australian Association for Mental Health

Appendix 1

Western Australian Association for Mental Health

WA Market Review Submission

April 2019

Contents

Introduction 3
About WAAMH 3
About this submission 3
Problem definition: thin markets in the context of the NDIS 4
Where and when the government should take a different approach to NDIS delivery 7
How government should address thin markets 8
Case Study: KEEDAC/Kaata-Koorliny Aboriginal Corporation 10
Appendix 1 WA Market Review Submission 15

1. Introduction

The National Disability Insurance Scheme (NDIS) is a valuable social reform that will provide access to lifelong support for many people with psychosocial disability that have long sought support that is available, responsive and person-centred. There are however significant challenges in the NDIS for people with psychosocial disability, which will need to be overcome for the reform to improve participant outcomes and deliver it's promise of shared value for both individuals and our society.

The NDIS aims to enhance choice and control for people with disability and support their independence and social and economic participation through access to lifelong support. Fundamental to the NDIS model is the tenet that building strong, viable markets of disability services will create the opportunity for people with disability to have access to a choice of innovative, quality services enabling the objectives of the NDIS to be achieved.

In this context, disability service providers have a central role in the success of the NDIS. The Western Australian Association for Mental Health (WAAMH) thus welcomes the opportunity to contribute the collective views and experiences of Western Australian providers, consumers, and family members to the WA Market Review.

This submission focuses on the development of robust markets for people with psychosocial disability. It is informed by WAAMH's NDIS Sector Reference Group, comprehensive ongoing engagement with members and psychosocial stakeholders including consumer and carer representative organisations, and WAAMH's WA Market Review round table event held with David Cullen, Chief Economist to the NDIS, on Tuesday 26 March 2019.

This submission is framed around the 3 overarching questions of the review:

1. The state of the markets for disability goods and services in Western Australia including labour costs, services delivery costs in Western Australian and in remote areas, provider availability and competition, efficiency, and benchmarks from other related sectors
2. Whether the existing NDIS support catalogue, price controls and associated rules support sustainable efficient delivery of quality supports, appropriate for Western Australia and can accommodate service delivery models and innovative supports
3. Whether any material differences in the costs of delivering services in Western Australia compared to other jurisdictions will be sustained or temporary.

2. Significant reform in a context of state delays

Transition to a market led service delivery model is complex for service providers, consumers and family members with significant business model development, innovation and change required. Administrative burden has increased as providers straddle additional systems (particularly in WA due to NDIS implementation delays) and now need to acquit against each line item in the participant plan, rather than acquittal against participant outcomes set out in their plan.

The change requires innovative purposeful leadership, creativity, staff capacity and cash reserves. WA stakeholders report varying levels of difficulty with this change. Some are confident and capable, with the cash reserves to invest in the change processes required.

Others struggle to resource the change and respond creatively and effectively enough to remain confident and effective.

As such, WAAMH welcomes the previously and recently announced transition assistance for providers, including the Temporary Transformation Payment announced in March.

WA is experiencing additional complexity and delayed market development due to the history of the NDIS in this state. This continues to severely impact on support availability and consumer choice for people with psychosocial disability.

Providers have reported business decisions based on insufficient capacity and resources to straddle 2 new trials whilst managing the change to individualised services and the existing systems they were operating in. For some this led to a 'wait and see' approach with no NDIS market entry. For those providers that did enter the market, the majority entered just one trial in their primary service region/s. Those providers working in the WANDIS trial sites are now undergoing a second change process to move into the NDIS.

Despite participants with psychosocial disability comprising the second highest number of adult participants in WA and a significant proportion of new entrants to the scheme, Department for Communities (previously Disability Services Commission) has primarily focused on agency processes and transition support for those people with disability and providers previously within its remit. WAAMH notes little specific engagement in the well-identified challenges for psychosocial disability set out, for example, in the Joint Standing Committee report on NDIS services for people with psychosocial disabilities.

Additionally, stakeholders report little transparent engagement in this complex area by WA's mental health government stakeholders which have taken no publicly known systemic steps to support provider transition. WAAMH strongly supports the psychiatric hostel projects which have seen high government engagement but notes that until recently mapping of potential participants was limited to a small set of state funded programs and the mental health interface has not been systemically addressed. However, it should be noted that the engagement of the Mental Health Commission in the NDIS transition appears to be increasing.

Recommendation:

- State and federal transition support initiatives specifically prioritise market entry and sustainability for psychosocial providers to ensure that the large cohort of people with psychosocial disability entering the scheme have access to a choice of quality supports.

3. Pricing

Current capped price settings are hampering market development and growth; stakeholders indicate that this may particularly affect psychosocial service development due to the complexity of needs that many participants with psychosocial disability have, coupled with a frequently-inadequate response of other service systems.

Providers continue to repeatedly raise concerns about the viability and sustainability of doing business in the NDIS, with hourly rates are too low to enable the provision of a quality

services by suitably skilled staff. Providers also report that travel pricing rules are too restrictive and not reflective of WA's geography and population density.

Recent business decisions reported to WAAMH by WA providers include:

- Large psychosocial providers opting to provide only support coordination as it is considered viable but withdrawing from providing core supports;
- Large mental health and broader community sector organisations that have a small to medium psychosocial support component of their organisation considering whether to withdraw from NDIS provision completely;
- Small psychosocial / mental health providers delaying entry to the NDIS whilst monitoring the scheme and provider viability; and
- Disability providers new to psychosocial disability entering regional markets and then withdrawing in areas including the South West, Wheatbelt and Kimberley due to a combination of the price, inexperience in mental health and unforeseen complex needs of participants.

Additionally, providers report:

- Topping up NDIS pricing with reserves, which is commonplace but not sustainable;
- Not being concerned about competition but rather a lack of participant choice, with few new providers entering psychosocial markets including in metropolitan areas but even more so in regional and remote areas; and
- Concerns about quality, safety and experience for some disability providers not previously in the mental health space that now provide psychosocial supports, alongside concerns that mental health providers must comply with both disability service standards and the National Mental Health Standards, but disability organisations offering psychosocial support need only comply with the former.

3.1 Feedback on New Pricing Announcement

WAAMH welcomes the NDIA's recent announcements about price increases. Due to the recency of this announcement we have been able to secure some provider feedback with the broad view of the psychosocial support sector is that more still needs to be done. Significant concerns remain across the sector about the viability of the prices and impact on service quality, particularly in rural and remote WA.

There was a diversity of provider views offered about the announcements including:

- 'Both the attendant care price rise and the Temporary Transformation Payment will be significant and will mean that we can sustain NDIS services into the future'.
- 'More needs to be done to provide sustained pricing increases and realistic settings for rural and remote WA in the long-term'
- 'The new prices will not improve our appetite to move into regional, rural or remote areas as it does not address the cost of travel between participants'
- 'We already provide services in some major regional centres in the south west and great southern, but these price increases would not be enough to encourage us to provide remote or rural services' (beyond those areas).
- 'The suggested changes will possibly delay the exit from delivering NDIS services in Metro areas in the immediate future rather than lead us to expand our services into rural and remote areas'.

- 'Agree the price rise and temporary payment will help with quality and provider sustainability in metro, but this will not be sufficient for rural/remote market entry given transport costs. Additionally, significant start-up costs have an impact on a casualised workforce as without standard hours these costs take a significant time to recover'.

Feedback on recent pricing announcement from large metropolitan service provider, Ruah Community Services:

> *"The price rise is most welcome; however part of the increase is temporary and neither address the primary challenge associated with NDIS, the utilisation rate of 90%. It is challenging to provide staff with training and professional supervision within this utilisation rate and we believe these are essential for a quality service.*
>
> *A 5.6% increase in base is not sufficient to enable operationally break even services. When combined with the 7.5% Temporary Transformation Payment we are able to provide a service which breaks even on operational costs, however does not make any contribution towards corporate or management costs (including buildings, assets, risk and quality, IT). NDIS services generate no surplus to contribute to the organisation's risk reserves, indeed if NDIS was our only revenue stream, the organisation would not be viable. As the Temporary Transformation Payment reduces, our NDIS services would return to loss making.*
>
> *With the base increase and the Temporary Transformation Payment we are only able to get operational costs to break even by reducing or ceasing:*

- *Training*
- *Supervision*
- *Paying for staff travel*
- *Paying for technology for staff*

> *We feel this is of significant concern as:*

- *It stifles development of the workforce*
- *It threatens quality*
- *It reduces choice. By removing organisation's capacity to develop staff, all organisations become the same.*
- *It pushes the financial pressures of the NDIS down onto the lowest paid staff in the industry. Frontline staff take on the onus of paying for travel, their own equipment and development. This makes it less appealing to work in the sector and is a workforce risk when demand is increasing.*

WAAMH notes previous recommendations and calls of both independent inquiries and advocacy organisations for an independent pricing body. Given the significant budget for individualised support of $22 billion into the future and the complexities of the NDIA's responsibilities, we support the establishment of an independent body to assess and determine pricing. This body should make its assumptions and determinations for pricing decisions clear and transparent so that providers and participants are all able to offer and access supports in ways that maximise value for all parties.

Recommendations:

- Government establishes an independent pricing body for the NDIS.

Recommendations for rural and remote provider travel are made in section 5 of this submission and for Workforce in section 8.

4. Consumer choice and quality

WA stakeholders have significant concerns about the limited choice of quality psychosocial supports available for participants in this state, especially but not limited to rural, remote and very remote areas. Where choice does exist, there are concerns about the quality of some psychosocial supports. Many consumers report that the quality of services they receive under the NDIS is lower than that of the community based mental health supports they have previously accessed.

WA mental health providers are at varying stages of their NDIS journey. While some have an established NDIS business model, are successfully growing their NDIS business and feel comfortable about quality, this primarily applies to providers in metropolitan areas. Other providers, while having an established business model and experience, have significant ongoing concerns about the impacts of NDIS pricing on the quality and sustainability of services they offer and whether they will continue as an NDIS Provider under current settings. Even confident providers report that the balance between quality and cost is a “daily angst”.

A range of quality, market stewardship and pricing changes are required to improve quality and choice as the NDIS is progressively implemented, with a number of recommendations made elsewhere in this submission.

5. Rural and Remote Market Gaps

WA stakeholders hold deep concerns about the market gaps affecting consumer choice across rural, regional and remote Western Australia. While some of this may be exacerbated by delayed introduction of the scheme, primarily the issues are permanent and relate to inappropriate pricing for the conditions in this state. Large swathes of remote and very remote areas, significant distances between regional centres, and a spare population severely impact on provider viability and thus service availability.

The spread of the population and the likely numbers of participants providers may be engaged to support is a significant concern for viable business models for providers working on or considering entering these remote markets e.g. the Wheatbelt has spread of small populations across many small towns. few services and infrastructure; by comparison Queensland is more densely populated. A decision not to enter regional markets is reported by both passionate NDIS providers working effectively in metropolitan areas, and those more hesitant about the viability of the scheme for their organisations.

As a result, some places have no, one or few psychosocial providers actively offering supports. Areas of concern include the Pilbara, Wheatbelt, Goldfields, Mid West and Kimberley with concerns both for the availability of choice in regional centres, and even more critically for rural towns and remote areas. Some communities have seen providers newly

enter that market only to leave. This has included relatively close communities including Northam which is only 95mk from Perth amongst others, as well as places with high lifestyle appeal including the South West and Broome in the Kimberley.

Recent reports include:

- The Monash Model classification is inappropriate for the realities of service provision in regional, remote and very remote in Western Australia. For example, Kalgoorlie is classed as MMM3 because of its reasonably large population and thus does not attract a remote loading, despite the fact it is a remote location in terms of distance from major services and infrastructure, and has higher living costs, limited infrastructure, limited housing;
- In comparison, Busselton has the same classification but is an attractive lifestyle option for a new workforce and is 2.5 hours drive to Perth compared to 7 hours for Kalgoorlie;
- The low prices particularly affect workforce attraction and retention in the context of a casualised workforce and a mining economy: the social and community sector has struggled for years to staff some of these locations;
- Feedback from Providers in areas like the South West is that casual workers frequently leave for significantly higher paid seasonal work, leaving people with disability without support at these times;
- The price does not sufficiently factor in travel needs with 45 minutes insufficient when a round trip of several hours or even days is more realistic. This is the case even in many rural locations that are comparatively populated compared to remote areas, such as parts of the South West;
- The greater travel time that is paid for therapy providers compared to other support providers entrenches the relative disadvantage of lower paid workers compared to allied health professionals;
- Innovative scheduling and rostering arrangements being reported by metropolitan psychosocial providers to manage staff time and travel costs are insufficient to manage regional travel arrangements;
- Participant travel often does not reflect the reality of the rural or remote location, often compounded by limited responsiveness of mainstream agencies. For example, one participant has the capacity to catch a bus so was refused funding for travel, even though there is no bus;
- Many providers have reported that, based on their viability assessments, entering regional markets is not viable, particularly if they do not already have a footprint in that location and need to start from scratch;
- Within current pricing settings and with a limited population of potential participants providers exploring entering regional and remote markets report that they do not have sufficient capacity and reserves to establish a new service including developing local knowledge and networks and 'upskilling' clinicians, allied health, GPs etc.

Recent business decisions by providers not to enter rural and remote markets:

- Medium sized metropolitan based mental health and psychosocial support provider rapidly expanding its NDIS services in metro has decided not to enter any regional,

rural or remote markets at all as the price and travel rules do not support viable operations.

- Large mental health and psychosocial support provider with services in metro and many regional towns is expanding its NDIS supports in metro, but will not offer NDIS services beyond major regional centres with significant populations in the South West and Great Southern regions.
- Medium sized mental health and psychosocial support provider that provides metro and regional services in Kimberley and Pilbara has assessed viability and determined that Broome and Karratha are viable, but Carnarvon is not due to a combination of population size, pricing and establishment costs.
- Established mental health service provider operating in both regional and metropolitan locations has decided to offer NDIS supports in metropolitan areas, but cannot offer psychosocial supports in remote areas, even where they already operate other services.

WAAMH welcomes the remote strategies being implemented to encourage Aboriginal Community Controlled Organisations into NDIS service provision, as an important way to offer choice and control and work to increase engagement by Aboriginal peoples. WAAMH however notes that to date this initiative only applies to the Kimberley. Providers considering entering regional and remote markets require more information about the remote strategies being implemented in WA, their intended outcome and likely timeframe. NDIA plans to enact the Market Enablement Framework should be undertaken through close working with people with disability and psychosocial providers.

Additionally, psychosocial and state-based specific data is also required for market viability assessments as outlined in section 10, Market Stewardship, of this submission.

Recommendations:

- The NDIA reclassifies remote loading for rural and remote areas in WA to reflect the realities of rural and remote service delivery costs.
- The NDIS allows provider travel payments for the travel time it takes to respond to participants' reasonable and necessary needs, including in-home supports, that enable equitable achievement of participant outcomes, rather than applying the current 45-minute travel rule.
- The NDIA urgently extend current initiatives to develop Providers in remote areas across all remote Western Australia, including through the Market Enablement Framework, extension of ACCO arrangements, and close engagement of the psychosocial sector in these developments.

Specific recommendations about workforce issues are made in section 8 of this submission.

6. Complex and fluctuating needs

The fluctuating support needs of people with psychosocial disability has long been recognised, with the Joint Standing Committee recommending the introduction of an approach to build flexibility in plans, including allowing minor adjustments to be made without need for a full plan review.

Additionally, people with psychosocial disability that are eligible for the NDIS are likely to be affected by a range of multiple co-occurring challenges in their lives and need supports that can skillfully and capably respond to their needs (often termed complexity). Issues may include poverty and unemployment, homelessness, involvement in the criminal justice system and/or forensic mental health services, complex physical health problems and others. Many will also have other co-occurring disabilities. The need for quality clinical support and interface is essential for many.

The pricing cap as one part of the regulated market settings results in challenges for providers to offer flexible, personalised and innovative services that respond to people's needs, hopes and ambitions.

Examples of the impact on quality and safety offered by providers include:

- Insufficient support coordination to engage clinical mental health supports, post imprisonment corrective services and community reintegration, housing and employment;
- Inability to respond to the support needs of a participant, as the NDIS would not support staff safety requirements through approving a second staff member to attend home visits, even when supporting a participant with a forensic history living in a rural, sparsely populated area.

Recommendations

- A review of support payments for people with multiples co-occurring challenges and complex support needs including forensic history and justice engagement.

Other recommendations to improve quality of plan build and responsiveness of supports are outlined in section 7 of this submission.

7. Support Catalogue and Support Flexibility

While the Issues Paper asks whether the support catalogue (amongst other factors) supports sustainable delivery of disability supports, it is almost silent on the support catalogue itself and contains no engagement with current support descriptors and rules. However, providers frequently report that some aspects of the support catalogue, and the assumptions made in initial modelling about the proportions of core and capacity building supports, are a mismatch with the needs of people with psychosocial disability.

Inflexible supports are also cited by participants, family members and providers as a significant issue. Examples of the impact of inflexible supports offered by providers, participants and family members include:

- Capacity building supports being tied to a particular purpose rather than flexible;
- The 'splitting' of core supports, capacity building and support coordination in NDIS pricing and support types, compared to previous programs that offered psychosocial support that included all 3 elements, with capacity building and support coordination (sometimes called case management) helping to underpin the effectiveness of core supports; and

- Insufficient flexibility built into support type descriptors to enable provider innovation and creativity when responding to the person.

7.1 Problems with plan build limit achievement of NDIS objectives

These issues are heightened by inconsistent quality at the planning stages. There appears to be a divergence between the insurance-based ethos and design of the NDIS and the average plan contents in psychosocial disability. This is evidenced by frequent reports of inconsistent plan build for participants with psychosocial disability with reports of significant range in what is deemed reasonable and necessary for people with similar functional capacity and support needs.

Providers also report a frequent imbalance in plan contents with stakeholders reporting that plan contents are heavy on core support but light on capacity building and support coordination. This is both not in keeping with recovery oriented psychosocial supports and limits the potential of the scheme to achieve its person centred and insurance objectives. The latter principles should encourage a greater focus on investment in capacity building and recovery in the context of psychosocial disability, to both improve outcomes and consequently reduce long-term reliance on the NDIS. *This is a major way in which we could create value for participants and society*.

Specifically, in WA we are aware of dozens of reports of insufficient support coordination in psychosocial plans, especially WA NDIS transfer plans. This is concerning in the context of national data, which indicates that only 50% of psychosocial packages are being spent, as support coordination is often required to enable people with psychosocial disability to access, use and navigate supports. If the support balance is not right, the NDIS will be unable to achieve its objectives in a holistic sense – employment, family, community connection.

The inconsistency in plan build not only affects the potential of the NDIS to achieve its outcomes for people, it also limits the ability of providers to make predictions about the quantum of support that people might choose to access from their agency, impacting on market viability assessments.

7.21 Support types

Recent work by Mental Health Australia, [Optimising Support for Psychosocial Disability](), was funded by the National Mental Health Commission and involved several mental health providers. It sought to describe typical support packages for people with psychosocial disability that would optimise their outcomes and help realise the objectives of the scheme. It made proposals to amend aspects of the NDIS Price Guide to recognise the distinctive characteristics of psychosocial support services including introducing new items and amendments to existing items. The Report recommended strong up-front investment in a Phase 1 to establish a foundation of support, followed by a balanced suite of investments at a later time to encourage social and economic participation.

While some stakeholders support introducing into the Support Catalogue additional support types for people with psychosocial disability, the majority of WA psychosocial stakeholders instead seek greater flexibility, so that providers can be creative and innovative and best enable the development of people's capacity and offer relational approaches that are family

aware and support people in the context of their lives – which we often talk about as 'complexity'.

The NDIS is founded on person centred principles through individual planning; for many participants with psychosocial disability there is a need to respond to greater variability in supports needs – to ramp up and ease down supports as needed. However, providers report a compromised responsiveness to people's needs due to a combination of a perceived inflexibility in pricing, alongside often inconsistent plan quality that often approves insufficient hours for the person's needs. A mechanism is needed to enable that level of variability to be accommodated and responded to. Plan reviews lack responsiveness and timeliness as a means of responding to variability.

NDIS could benefit from an 'out of policy' committee to support flexible funding decisions based on extenuating circumstances. This is needed for rapid and effective responses when a person is in crisis, to cover services/support that are not included in the plan or support catalogue and are difficult to access. This type of mechanism worked well in WA state government Disability Service Commission in their individualised funding streams.

> *Example:*
>
> *MIFWA has experienced some NDIS participants whose situations are extremely complex. For example a woman who experiences significant challenges in making good life choices and is unwilling to engage in any support other than what is provided by her mother in periods of crisis. This NDIS participant had a significant plan that other than coordination and support to the primary carer (her mother) was unwilling to engage in support. At times the participants choices and actions left her and her mother at significant personal risk and afraid for their safety. Several times her mother and the participant requested financial support to cover a bus fare to get out of town (attending extended family in regional WA) to be safe from retaliation from others in the community. MIFWA paid the person's bus fare however this could not be paid out of the plan. Essentially this participant had high resources however required a much more creative solution to try and impact on her life and situations.*

Where people's situations are complex, allocation of behavioural support, psychology and even complex coordination may not be enough to break through the situational challenges. An out of policy committee would allow for creative solutions and tailored approaches to progress people towards the principles the scheme seeks to achieve.

Recommendations:

- Implement consistent access to sufficient levels of capacity building and support coordination for people with psychosocial disability to enhance the potential of the scheme to achieve its person centred and insurance objectives, as a major way to create value for participants and society.
- Ensure effective psychosocial planning processes enable more consistent plans responsive to reasonable and necessary supports and balanced across support coordination, core and capacity building supports.
- Develop a mechanism outside plan reviews to enable the required level of variability to be accommodated and responded to, with appropriate safeguards created to

ensure quality and value. This could take the form of flexible funding to respond to fluctuating needs or crises.

- Introduce an 'out of policy' decision process to support flexible funding decisions based on extenuating circumstances.
- Specify greater flexibility within the support types to enable creative, innovative responses to people's needs, including more flexible capacity building supports
- Explore removing the separation between core and capacity building supports to enable more responsiveness to people's needs including variability in support needs
- Publicly report on average plan build for people with psychosocial disability on a national and jurisdictional basis.

8. Workforce

While the NDIS workforce needs are vast and the ability to scale up a pressing concern across the NDIS and the nation, it appears that psychosocial providers may be experiencing additional challenges due to the nuances and complexity of providing quality supports to people with psychosocial disability, many of whom have multiple unmet and co-occurring needs and the need for clinical interface support.

Psychosocial providers uniformly report workforce attraction, development and retention as a very significant concern. Current pricing arrangements severely limit the attraction and initial and ongoing development of a new workforce equipped in psychosocial support. Prices also do not allow the retention of an existing workforce that is equipped to deliver mental health recovery supports with associated higher wages.

The delivery of a quality service is highly dependent on the competency and capability of the staff, and psychosocial providers have previously hired mental health support staff with higher qualifications (minimum Certificate IV in mental health as industry standard) with corresponding higher skills levels and award rates under block funded programs. One provider reported their 'concern that we are building a culture of underpayment'. In an individualised context, participants are able to choose their support worker; this has resulted in much greater casualisation of the workforce.

Several providers have reported it is as though they are running two organisations – one with higher qualifications, skills, experience and wages for staff in block funded or higher paid individualised mental health programs, and an NDIS workforce with lower wages, few qualifications, little development and casual contracts. The inequity between staff within organisations causes poor morale and further staffing losses.

Some providers have reported that staff burn out and turnover is high, and staff feel isolated. For other providers the challenges in providing for staff safety is extremely problematic, with inexperienced workers offering support to people with at times challenging behaviours and forensic mental health and/or justice system involvement.

The other major challenge is the utilisation rate which severely limits the ability to provide staff with the connection, training and professional supervision that are essential for a quality

service. Indications that the utilisation rate may be reduced from 95% to 90% as indicated by the NDIA at WAAMH's WA Market Review consultation is encouraging, however psychosocial providers remain significantly concerned that this will be insufficient to provide quality services. In comparison, one mental health and psychosocial provider reports a 75% utilisation rate for both state block funded programs and for their federally funded PHaMS service. At this rate they are able to comfortably deliver on contractual requirements whilst being in confident in quality.

Examples:

- Some providers report several instances of recruiting and skilling up general disability staff into psychosocial support positions, only to lose them to other programs within their organisation that offer higher wages and better conditions.
- One psychosocial provider has reported how it has implemented a new and innovative focus on organisational culture as the key and reports positive staff commitment to mission and stronger retention. However, this organisation also reports significant challenges in how to maximise the new opportunity to grow a peer workforce, whilst offering the additional supervision and support that many peer workers will need within NDIS pricing constraints.

Even more experienced and innovative providers still describe a "daily angst" of the balancing act between staff retention, conditions, safety and communications, with quality and price.

Recent statewide recruitment for around 170 Local Area Coordinators has exacerbated workforce pressures, with psychosocial support providers competing with LAC providers that can offer better conditions such as longevity of contract and more secure part or full-time positions.

Sector commentary about the recently released Workforce Strategy is that the strategy does not address the problems outlined in this paper such as the utilisation rate which limits capability development, and provides insufficient tangible action, in particular for specific cohorts and regional and remote areas to make significant headway. Added to this is the lack of coordinated cross government strategy to address the mental health, disability and community sector workforce, which results in concerns that the challenges will be difficult to resolve.

More comments about workforce issues are outlined in section 3, Pricing and section 5, Rural and Remote of this submission.

Recommendations:

- Independent review to determine an appropriate balance between utilisation rate, quality and value, comparing to benchmarks from previously funded disability and psychosocial support programs.
- The NDIA works much more closely with state government stakeholders to coordinate workforce development and growth strategies.

Pricing recommendations that will improve workforce attraction, retention and development are set out earlier in this submission.

9. Participant Engagement

WAAMH supports the recommendation of the Joint Standing Committee (JSC) that DSS and the NDIA develop plans for ensuring advocacy and assertive outreach services are delivered beyond transition to ensure people with psychosocial disability and those who are hard-to-reach can effectively engage with the NDIS. This requires a new process staffed by skilled workers with mental health expertise.

Recommendations:

- DSS and the NDIA implement the JSC Recommendation to develop plans for ensuring advocacy and assertive outreach services are delivered beyond transition to ensure people with psychosocial disability and those who are hard-to-reach can effectively engage with the NDIS

10. Market Stewardship

While some providers report that they know what they want to do and how but cannot support it financially, others report that capacity, expertise, reserves and infrastructure limit their entry into the scheme itself and especially into new regional and rural areas.

A key issue is that there is very limited psychosocial specific data publicly available. The data that is, is not granular enough to inform provider planning and entry into service provision in new areas, nor effective monitoring of different disability cohorts. For example, data required includes supply and demand data by location, jurisdictional comparisons for psychosocial such as what underlies the significantly disparate average package costs across jurisdictions, and the degree of psychosocial participant satisfaction as compared to the satisfaction of all participants.

This is especially concerning as people with psychosocial disability comprise the second largest group of participants over the age of 25 and are expected to comprise a significant proportion of people newly accessing disability support.

There is limited knowledge about the specific plans and strategies being implemented by the NDIA in its market stewardship role to address current and future market gaps and earlier more explicit communications are warranted. This should include the specific strategies being implemented in Western Australia, including information by cohort and by region.

While, as David Cullen NDIA Chief Economist queried at WAAMH's WA Market Review consultation, an important question is how much more sector development is required for organisations to embrace the changes required to sustain NDIS services, the reality is that there has been little sector-wide stewardship and development support to enable organisations to provide quality services that effectively grapple with the additional challenges and nuances of psychosocial support provision. WAAMH takes the view that this has contributed to the diversity in readiness of mental health providers seeking to enter the NDIS. It is also likely to continue to have a significant impact on the quality of psychosocial supports available, which are currently reported by many NDIS participants and their family members as of low quality. WAAMH has recommended in section 2 and section 11 that state

and federal transition support initiatives specifically prioritise market entry and sustainability for psychosocial providers to ensure that the large cohort of people with psychosocial disability entering the scheme have access to a choice of quality supports.

WAAMH supports the approach of the NDIA to develop Aboriginal Community Controlled Organisations (ACCOs) as NDIS Providers in the Kimberley, which may require expansion to other regions. WAAMH also notes that only some ACCOs are experienced in providing mental health, social and emotional wellbeing and/or psychosocial supports. The latter has already been recognised as needing specific skills and capabilities within the NDIS, and ACCOs and other providers seeking to support Aboriginal peoples will experience the added challenge of bridging cultural security and NDIS rules and expectations. As such, to enable good outcomes for all NDIS participants through ACCO providers, psychosocial capacity building is an important area for comprehensive sector development.

Recommendations:

- More comprehensive data that enable jurisdictional and regional comparison is made publicly available about plan build and participant satisfaction for psychosocial disability. This should be available in less frequent process such as market position statements, as well as NDIA quarterly reports.
- The NDIA comprehensively engages with NDIS participants, mental health consumers and family members, WA psychosocial providers and ACCO's in market and sector development activities to rural and remote Western Australia.
- Market development opportunities for ACCOs incorporate activities to strengthen psychosocial capability.

11. Longevity of the issues

While it is recognised that many of the issues described in this paper affect the NDIS across Australia, there are some factors exacerbated by the West Australian context. The workforce costs for rural, remote and very remote delivery are considered as intractable, have been an issue for many years in other service settings and will be unresolved without a comprehensive cross government approach (see section 8). Provider transition support, such as grant funding incentives to establish in new regions, is an example of a transitory costs that would support the development of consumer choice in regional and remote areas.

While generalist provider support to develop new business models is widely available, the challenges in developing a new workforce that understands and is responsive to the needs of people with a psychosocial disability who are eligible for the NDIS and have complex needs is under-acknowledged and sector wide transition support, for both business model and workforce development that accounts for the unique nature of providing psychosocial disability support, is required. While Department of Communities and federal departments have funded individual mental health organisations with sector capacity building grants, there has been no system and sector-wide transition activity for psychosocial disability, which is severely limiting the availability of choice for people with psychosocial disability, particularly outside metropolitan areas.

Recommendations:

- Psychosocial disability transition and regional market development be a focus for future state and Commonwealth sector development grants and initiatives. This should include psychosocial capacity building for Aboriginal Community Controlled Organisations.

Contact

Submission prepared by Chelsea McKinney, Systemic Advocacy Manager

E: cmckinney@waamh.org.au

T: 08 6246 3000