

OFFICIAL: SENSITIVE



PROC-4807: Disability Expert Advice Report

Version: 2

Date: May 2025

The contents of this document are OFFICIAL: SENSITIVE

OFFICIAL: SENSITIVE

Contents

PROC-4807: Disability Expert Advice Report	1
Summary of Disability Expert Advice	3
Introduction	5
Approach	5
Tenders	6
Tender 2: University of Melbourne	7

OFFICIAL: SENSITIVE

OFFICIAL: SENSITIVE

Summary of Disability Expert Advice

Requirement		Tender 2: Melbourne University	
Ages		Suitable for ages 16+ and all adult NDIS participants.	
Disability groups		Potential to address many disability groups' needs but requires further development for psychosocial disabilities.	
Culturally appropriate		Recommendation for culturally sensitive assessors and training. Concerns about power dynamic that could be exacerbated by assessment length.	
Recognises diversity LGBTIQASB+		Concerns about optional inclusions in training. Mandatory inclusion recommended.	
Trauma informed		Aims to minimise distress with strength-based focus and allows alternative sources of information.	
Available in English		Available in English	

OFFICIAL: SENSITIVE

OFFICIAL: SENSITIVE

Requirement		Tender 2: Melbourne University	
Information from appropriate sources		Collects information from appropriate sources but the performance-based aspect is unclear.	
Contexts relevant to the NDIS		Recognised that the tool could be administered in multiple contexts and environments relevant to the NDIS.	
Assessor accreditation and training		Support for experienced AHP with trauma informed approaches. Disability knowledge and experience important.	
Additional materials		Important to match an assessor with appropriate experience to the needs, disability type of the participant.	
Other operational support		Supports frequency and intensity scoring scales but raised concerns about translating identified support needs into funding.	

OFFICIAL: SENSITIVE

Introduction

Further to the Evaluation Plan for the Support Needs Assessment Tool (PROC-4807), the Evaluation Committee has sought advice from the Disability Expert Advice Panel in reference to requirements within components one (under “Suitable for NDIS Cohorts” and “Supports a Positive Participant Experience”) and two of the tender. The advisors were also asked to answer, “What would you like the Evaluation Panel to investigate in more detail to understand which tools provide a good participant experience?” for each tender.

The Disability Expert Advice Panel was formed from responses to an Expressions of Interest request sent to Disability Representative Carer Organisations on Friday 7th March 2025. Submissions were reviewed with reference to the following criteria:

1. A person with disability
2. Relevant knowledge of the needs and experiences of people with disability
3. Demonstrated experience working in a collaborative and consultative manner with diverse stakeholders

Panel member selection was reviewed to ensure diversity of age, geographical location, disability type and knowledge content areas.

Approach

The following process has been undertaken to collect, collate and confirm information from the Disability Expert Advice Panel:

- 23 April 2025: Introductory meeting, overview of tools and evaluation criteria
- 24 April 2025: De-identified tender information provided to the panel.
- 28 April 2025: Workshop to discuss the tender responses and draft advice.
- 30 April 2025: A review/consensus meeting on the draft report content.
- 5 May 2025: Individual workshop with a person with intellectual disability was held.
- 5 May 2025: First report version sent to the Evaluation Committee.
- 7 May 2025: De-identified tender information provided to the panel
- 12 May: Panel reconvened to consider Tender 3 and draft advice. An individual workshop with a person with intellectual disability was also held.
- 14 May: Individual consensus meeting with person with intellectual disability
- 15 May: A review/consensus meeting on the draft report content.
- 15 May: Updated report sent to the Evaluation Committee

OFFICIAL: SENSITIVE

OFFICIAL: SENSITIVE

Tenders

OFFICIAL: SENSITIVE

OFFICIAL: SENSITIVE

Tender 2: University of Melbourne

s45 - material disclosed in confidence, s47C - deliberative processes, s47G - business information



OFFICIAL: SENSITIVE

OFFICIAL: SENSITIVE



Expert advice to support evaluation of the component one technical requirements

Version: 1

Date: May 2025

The contents of this document are OFFICIAL: SENSITIVE

[ndis.gov.au](https://www.ndis.gov.au)

OFFICIAL: SENSITIVE

OFFICIAL: SENSITIVE

Contents

Expert advice to support evaluation of the component one technical requirements	1
Contents	2
1. Overview of component 1 requirements	3
1.1 Be suitable for NDIS purposes:	3
1.2 Be suitable for NDIS cohorts:	5
1.3 Support a positive participant experience:	6
1.4 Suitable for NDIS business requirements:	7
2. University of Melbourne	8
2.1 Suitable for NDIS purposes	8
2.1 Suitable for NDIS Cohorts	12
2.2 Supports a positive participant experience	15
2.3 Suitable for NDIS business requirements	16

OFFICIAL: SENSITIVE

OFFICIAL: SENSITIVE

1. Overview of component 1 requirements

The following table was included in the Request for Tender Package provided to tenderers. It provides an overview of the four component 1 requirements, and the types of indicators/evidence that would be expected in a submission.

Requirements

The assessment tool(s) should meet the set of requirements outlined under the following four headings. The assessment tool(s) should:

1.1 Be suitable for NDIS purposes:

Requirement	Indicators/Evidence
1. The tool(s) primarily assess disability support needs The tool(s) primarily assesses the concept 'support needs' and does not primarily assess other concepts such as functioning, severity of impairment, quality of life, or non-disability support needs (e.g. carer support needs, or supports only related to other areas of need such as health or housing).	- Measures attributes of disability-related support needs of people with disability (rather than concepts such as function, impairment or quality of life), and - Measures attributes of support needs such as type, frequency, and intensity, and - Scales should be ordinal or continuous and have at least three levels.
2. The tool(s) assess need in relation to NDIS supports The list of disability-related supports funded by the NDIS is available on the NDIS website . The support needs assessment tool should assess the pertinence of these supports to the person with disability.	Scales or domains demonstrate the coverage of relevant support type(s).
3. The tool(s) assess needs across a broad range of support need areas The solution assesses needs across a range of life areas in which a person may have disability-related supports. For example, it assesses needs across the activity and participation areas described in the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF), including	Domain structure and content demonstrate coverage of each support need area.

OFFICIAL: SENSITIVE

OFFICIAL: SENSITIVE

Requirement	Indicators/Evidence
disability-related health needs and behavioural support needs).	
4. The tool(s) are appropriately structured The structure of the tool(s), including the domains and associated items is well-validated, supported by a strong theoretical/conceptual basis with empirical evidence.	• Description of relevant and contemporary theoretical underpinning of the structure of the tool(s), and/or • Studies exploring the structural validity and/or internal consistency of the tool(s) found satisfactory results (as defined by recognised standards for the interpretation of psychometric results) in relevant cohorts.
5. The outputs of the tool(s) support appropriate budgeting decisions in respect to NDIS Supports The data derived from the assessment tool(s) include scores for each domain and/or support need area in sufficient detail to inform the budgetary requirements of the participant.	• Outputs are provided for each domain of the tool(s) (i.e. does not only provide one overall score).
6. The tool(s) are consistent with a contemporary model of disability Conceptually founded or consistent with a model of disability such as the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF), Canadian Occupational Performance Model, or the Disability Creation Process Model.	• Evidence of the use of relevant models in the development of the tool(s), and/or • Satisfactory description of how the tool(s) are consistent with one or more contemporary model of disability.
7. The tool(s) are able to produce consistent outputs Demonstrated sufficient reliability (including inter-rater, inter-respondent, test-retest and intra-rater reliability).	• Research studies to assess the tool(s)' reliability found satisfactory results (as defined by recognised standards for the interpretation of psychometric results) in relevant cohorts.
8. Evidence of tool(s)' ability to predict support needs Evidence to indicate the assessment tool can accurately predict support needs, as demonstrated through its practical	• Research studies which statistically explored the tool(s)' predictive validity found satisfactory results (as defined by recognised standards for the interpretation of psychometric results) in relevant cohorts, and/or

OFFICIAL: SENSITIVE

Requirement	Indicators/Evidence
application in another relevant context and/or statistical evidence within a research context.	Previous examples which demonstrate the tool(s)' ability to be used to predict support needs in another relevant context.

1.2 Be suitable for NDIS cohorts:

1. The tool(s) are appropriate for relevant ages The solution has been developed for, or successfully tested with, people with disability aged 16+ to reflect the range of age cohorts accessing the NDIS.	- Appropriateness for relevant ages demonstrated through the Initial design or subsequent revisions of the tool(s) (e.g. consideration of domains, questions, response options), and/or - Appropriateness for relevant ages demonstrated through subsequent testing of the tool(s) (e.g. satisfactory results or feedback).
2. The tool(s) are appropriate for disability groups relevant to the NDIS The solution has been developed for, or tested with, people with disabilities relevant to the NDIS's participant cohorts. These include people with neurodevelopmental conditions, physical disability, neurological conditions, degenerative conditions, and psychosocial disability.	- Appropriate for (tested or developed with) disability groups accessing the NDIS, and/or - Demonstrated ability to tailor the assessment for different disability groups (e.g. semi-structured interview).
3. The tool(s) can be administered in a culturally appropriate way Tool's content and administration requirements includes and supports sensitivity and respect towards cultural differences, including any practices, translations, and representations are suitable for a diverse range of participants, including Australian First Nations Peoples. This includes a demonstrated awareness of how various ethnic, racial, and linguistic groups differ from one another and recognising the significance of their cultural elements.	- Does not contain concepts, practices or language that are culturally insensitive or inappropriate, and/or - Tested and validated with a range of cultural groups (including Australian First Nations Peoples), and/or - Multiple language versions available.

OFFICIAL: SENSITIVE

4. The tool(s) can be administered in a way that recognises the diversity of members of the LGBTIQASB+ Communities The tool(s) account for the diversity of relationships (including family structures, such as chosen family) and uses gender-conscious language (as defined here: <u>Inclusive Language Playbook: Writing for LGBTQ+ Communities</u>) that recognises the diversity of gender.	Does not contain concepts, practices or language that do not recognise the diversity of members of LGBTIQASB+ Communities.
5. The tool(s) can be delivered in a way that is trauma informed Able to be administered in a trauma-informed way (either through inherent properties that are trauma-informed, or a lack of inappropriate properties).	Does not contain concepts, practices or language that are inconsistent with trauma informed practice.
6. The tool(s) are available in English The tool(s) are available in English, with minimal colloquialisms or terminology that would be unfamiliar to an Australian audience.	English version available (may have been validated in another language and no significant changes have been made).

1.3 Support a positive participant experience:

1. The tool(s) collect information from appropriate sources The tool(s) allows, but not require, self-reporting by the participant. It should also include the ability for information to be incorporated from multiple sources (e.g. carers, information from treating professionals).	- Description of sources of information able to be used by the tool(s) as described in the administration manual/instructions, and/or - Appropriate information sources demonstrated through initial design or subsequent testing.
2. The tool(s) can be administered in contexts relevant to the NDIS	Description of contexts suitable for administering the tool(s) as described in the administration manual/instructions, and/or

OFFICIAL: SENSITIVE

The tool(s) is able to be administered in a range of environments (e.g. NDIS offices, the participant's home etc.), and allows, but does not require, in-person assessment (e.g. permits assessments via video call).	Appropriate administration contexts demonstrated through initial design or subsequent testing.
--	---

1.4 Suitable for NDIS business requirements:

1. Assessor workforce The tool(s) are able to be administered by a multi-skilled workforce with differing levels of professional qualification and disability experience.	• Description of requirements for assessor skills, training or qualifications as described in the administration manual/instructions, and/or • Appropriate assessor skills, training, or qualifications demonstrated through subsequent testing.
2. Administration time required The average time taken to administer the tool(s) is reasonable, in that it enables collection of sufficient information to understand a participant's holistic disability support needs.	• Description of expected face to face administration time as described in the administration manual/instructions, and/or • Description of expected preparation, scoring and report writing time as described in the administration manual/instructions, and/or • Evidence of administration time in research studies or other similar cohorts.
3. The solution utilises questionnaire or interview information collection methods The tool(s) should use questionnaire or interview information collection methods, rather than relying on performance-based methods. Ability to administer the tool(s) using semi-structured interview methods is beneficial.	• Description of appropriate information collection methods as described in the administration manual/instructions, and/or. • Appropriate information collection methods as demonstrated in subsequent testing.

Number	Project Risk Owner	Project Risk Manager	Project Risk Name	Project Risk Description	Project Risk Type	Project Risk Status	Causes	Impacts	Current Consequence Rating	Current Likelihood Rating	Current Risk rating	Current Risk Rating Rationale	Control Name	Control Description	Control Owner	Control Manager	Status
Risk number	Surname, First	Surname, First	I.e. One line summary title	I.e. Detailed description	Selected Risk Type	Selected status	I.e. List each Cause as a bullet point	I.e. List each Impact as a bullet point	Selected	Selected Likelihood	Based on the	Rationale for the Current Risk Rating, including	I.e. One line	I.e. Detailed description	Responsible for the	Responsible for day to day	Selected status
R.1 Assessment tool and budget model procurement delays PUR-607477			s47F - personal privacy The process for procuring assessment tools takes longer than anticipated. This would impact a range of dependent workstreams and delay the rollout of new framework planning.	The Agency may receive insufficient or low quality responses from the market for the procurement of support needs assessment tools. This would result in delays to selecting needs assessment tools for new framework planning. Selection of needs assessment tools is a critical dependency for a range of other work, including development of budget model and finalisation of legal framework.	Project Risk	Active	• Timeline of the project means suppliers are unaware of the tender and a small number of bids are received • Few suppliers meeting the procurement requirements • Market response - Insufficient or low quality responses from the market for the procurement of support needs assessment tools • Challenges negotiating contracts with potential support needs assessment tool suppliers • Complexity of the contracts required • Difficulty agreeing licensing or price of contract • Insufficient data or privacy controls whether by the NDIA or the supplier • Procurement processes for assessment tool needs to occur within given timeframes because the budget model depends on outputs from assessment tools that will inform the budget modelling. • Caretaker period may impact the ability for the NDIA to agree a contract with a successful supplier	• Delay of the project to find a suitable supplier • If no tool is sourced, pause or end of project by government • Possible failure to moderate the cost growth of the NDIS in line with government targets • Delayed project delivery timelines • Potential data and privacy breaches • Agency reputational damage • Budget model is not fit for purpose due to insufficient time to develop, refine and test it. • Budgets do not correspond to participant support needs as part of new framework planning • Participant outcomes not met, dissatisfaction of disability community and their families	D - Major	Three - Possible	High	• Tangible impact on the business case and possible large budgetary impact. • Failure to find a tool would mean the NDIA having to create its own tool or begin a new procurement process, either way this would drastically reshape the timeline. • Legislative obligations (section 32K) require that there must be a support needs report the assessment tool and budget amounts need to be generated using outputs from the report. In the absence of the report a budget model cannot be created. • Significant delays to the Assessment tool procurement process could contribute to this risk being realised.	Communication and organisational process	• The evaluation service approach to market information included a detailed Statement of Requirements and clear information on how to respond to the RFP. • A communications plan to ensure the procurement reaches widespread audiences nationally and internationally • The responses will be evaluated according to the approved Evaluation Plan to ensure the most appropriate tools are selected. • Engagement with and support of the Procurement Branch to ensure tender and contract documents are appropriately reviewed and fit for purpose.	s47F - personal privacy		Draft
R.2 Assessment tool and budget model delays due to finalising legislative framework PUR-607478			Delays in finalisation and agreement of legislative instruments will delay the rollout of new framework planning	There may be delays in finalising legislation due to its complexity, OPC drafting timeframes and requirements, delays in agreement of rules with states and territories, DISB, OPC and states and territories processes may require seeing final drafting instructions or draft rules by a certain time that would impact the amount of time available to develop, test and refine the budget models, and therefore impact the quality of the solution.	Project Risk	Active	• Disagreements and delays in agreeing legislation with Government, agencies and States and Territories • Delays in drafting due to complexity of the legislation required • Whilst the majority of Rules required to be agreed with states and territories have a dispute resolution mechanism there are four which do not and if cannot be agreed this could prevent some aspects of new framework planning from progressing • Critical interdependencies	• Delay project timeline and criticism of the NDIA project • Tight timelines compromise development and quality of assessment tool method or budget method • The budget model is not fit for purpose due to insufficient time to develop, refine and test it. • Possible failure to moderate the cost growth of the NDIS in line with government targets • Pause or end of project by government	D - Major	Three - Possible	High	• Tangible impact on the business case and possible large budgetary impact. • Due to the number of interdependencies and tight timeframes delays in implementing legislation have the potential to delay other initiatives or projects. • If participant budgets grow by + 5% then negative impacts to scheme sustainability and implications for government overall. Dependency on external stakeholders could impact timelines that cause delays.	Alternative dispute method for fundamental Rules for initiative provided for in legislation	• Rules fundamental to new framework planning such as transition to new framework planning, stated supports, budget method, support need assessment tools, contents of needs assessment report and replacement need assessments are all transitional rules and therefore must be agreed by state and territories within 14 days or if agreement cannot be reached including by amendment can be sent to first ministers to agree within 14 days, if a majority of first ministers agree the Rule is registered			Draft
R.3 Budget model produced is inaccurate PUR-607480			The budget model is of poor quality	Absence of appropriately granular, abundant and accurate data to inform funding level design is a risk that may lead to budget models being of poorer quality than if there was robust data to build, refine and test the models on	Project Risk	Active	• Due to absence of sufficient quality and volume of data. • Dependency on clinical data from professional advice panel. • Alternatively, will be heavily reliant on scheme data which may be insufficient. • Delays caused by professional advice panel (PAP) procurement quality. • Timeline of the project means suppliers are unaware of the tender and a small number of bids are received. • Few suppliers meeting the procurement requirements. • Market response - Insufficient or low quality responses from the market. • Challenges negotiating contracts with potential suppliers.	• Budget models are not adequately able to articulate the appropriate budget for a participant. • Participant outcomes compromised • Scheme sustainability impacts • Budget models are not as supported by the academic, clinical and quantitative SME input as could be otherwise possible.	D - Major	Three - Possible	High	• Quality of data from Scheme may be insufficient and/or unavailable to provide quality budgeting models. Dependence on 3rd party clinical data from professional advisory panels (PAP)	Internal stakeholder consultation. Procurement process adherence for the PAP.	• Consulting internal stakeholders broadly. • Maintaining deadlines for the professional advice panel.			Draft
R.5 Assessment tool and/or the budget model is not accepted by the disability community PUR-607490			Stakeholder dissatisfaction with the assessment and/or budget process	The disability community may be dissatisfied with the assessment or budget approach and not positively engage with new framework planning	Both	Active	• Distrust of the NDIA, failure to meet expectations of co-design/consultation and/or fear of the speed of the reforms	• Pause or end of project by government • Timelines needing to be extended or project ended • Possible failure to moderate the cost growth of the NDIS in line with government targets	D - Major	Three - Possible	High	• Tangible impact on the business case and large budgetary impact. • Real risk of backlash if tool/budget method does not deliver what NDIA and government have promised or even if it is perceived to be introduced without appropriate consultation and support.	Communication and consultation strategy	• Requirements in the contract that ensure assessment have been appropriately validated and tested. • Inclusion of the voices of people with lived experience of disability through consultation and co-design of aspects of the needs assessment and budget			Draft

s22(1)(a)(ii) - irrelevant material

s22(1)(a)(ii) - irrelevant material