Issues and proposed changes associated with the Assistive Technology and Home Modifications (AT-HM) List under Support at Home

October 2026

Purpose and scope of this document

Assistive Technology Suppliers Australia (ATSA) has prepared this document to support the review of the July 2026 Assistive Technology and Home Modifications (AT-HM) List under Support at Home. It identifies gaps, inconsistencies and unclear requirements that may prevent older Australians from accessing supports that meet their assessed needs. It proposes targeted amendments to the List, with consequential changes to supporting guidance where needed.

These proposals complement our 2026 Sector Roadmap on Improving Access to Assistive Technology under Support at Home, which addresses broader improvements to the AT-HM Scheme.

Please direct any enquiries about this document to Lauren Henley, ATSA's Director of Policy and Advocacy at lauren.henley@atsa.org.au.

How we informed this document

Our initial draft identified 14 issues. It drew on feedback from older Australians, assistive technology suppliers and providers about their experiences with the AT-HM Scheme since Support at Home commenced.

On 22 September 2026, we circulated the draft to participants who attended our AT-HM round table in July 2026 and subsequently contributed to the development of our sector roadmap. It was also circulated to members of the National Assistive Technology Alliance (NATA).

The draft provided a basis for gathering further input on missing products or categories and problems with the List's entries, prescription requirements, wording and classifications. Contributors were also asked whether the issues were accurately described and the proposed changes were appropriate.

We finalised the document by:

- Considering all feedback received
- Refining the issues and proposed changes
- Adding matters that were not covered in the initial draft, and
- Separating topics requiring distinct responses.

This version sets out 28 distinct issues and proposed changes for the Department's consideration.

General access and use of the List

1. There is no clear pathway for equivalent or unlisted products

Problem

The List limits AT-HM funding to listed products, equipment and home modifications. Two situations need clearer treatment:

- A product fits an existing category but is not individually named. Providers may be uncertain whether a newer or equivalent product is covered by an included or conditionally included entry.
- A product falls outside existing coverage. The List does not set out an exceptional-access pathway where no listed option can meet the person's assessed need.

An older person may therefore be unable to obtain a suitable product because existing coverage is not recognised or because the necessary product is genuinely unlisted.

Proposed change

Amend the List's eligibility statement to:

- Clarify that a product need not be individually named where it falls within an included or conditionally included entry. The entry's conditions and professional-input requirements should still apply.
- Confirm that this clarification does not override an express exclusion.
- Establish an exceptional-access pathway for genuinely unlisted products where no listed option can meet an assessed need. The proposed product must meet AT-HM purposes, be safe and suitable, and provide value for money.
- Specify which express exclusions, if any, can be reconsidered through that pathway and the conditions that apply.
- Require evidence proportionate to risk and complexity, accepting relevant existing assessments and trial results where they remain current.

Use exceptional-access requests to identify recurring coverage gaps for future List amendments.

2. The “Currently funded by others” section does not address gaps in access

Problem

The List excludes many product groups because another Support at Home service stream or government program is expected to fund them. It does not, however, consistently identify the alternate program or explain what happens when the person cannot obtain suitable support through this pathway.

In practice, an older person may be unable to access another program because of:

- Different eligibility rules
- Limited product coverage
- Long wait times that prevent access at the point of need
- No suitable professional service nearby

A product may be funded on paper but remain unavailable in practice. This fragmentation can leave people without critical support.

Proposed change

Revise the heading and eligibility provisions for the “Currently funded by others” section. Make clear that expected coverage under another service stream or program does not necessarily mean the person will be able to obtain suitable support for their assessed need.

Review every product group in this section and:

- Identify the expected Support at Home service stream or other funding program and explain how to access it.
- Test whether the person can actually obtain a timely, suitable and accessible product and the professional services needed to use it.
- Provide a conditional AT-HM pathway where the item meets AT-HM purposes and the other program cannot meet the assessed need.
- Accept proportionate evidence of ineligibility, a product or service gap, or a delay that creates an unacceptable risk to functioning or safety. Do not require an unsuccessful application to another program where its published rules clearly establish the gap.
- Identify who is responsible for helping the person access the alternative or conditional pathway.

3. Prescription and professional advice requirements are unclear

Problem

The List describes the AT prescription categories as a guide, but some categories specify required prescription or evidence. It is unclear how this introductory wording relates to those requirements and providers’ obligations to seek appropriate professional input.

Other sources of uncertainty include:

- The List does not clearly explain what professional advice involves or how it differs from a prescription.
- Broad product rows can apply one category to standard items and to customised, complex or high-risk products.

- The level of professional input needed for different products is not consistently explained.

This can lead to inconsistent decisions, unnecessary assessment requirements or insufficient professional input for safe use.

Proposed change

Amend the category legend, product rows and accompanying guidance to:

- Clearly distinguish recommended advice or prescription from mandatory prescription or evidence requirements. Revise the introductory “guide” wording so it is consistent with these distinctions.
- Explain when no prescription is normally needed and when providers must arrange professional input.
- Define "professional advice", "prescription" and "supporting evidence". Specify the documentation needed for each.
- Identify suitable professional qualifications and relevant scope of practice, including specialist assistive technology expertise where required.
- Match requirements to the product’s risk, complexity and customisation, and the person’s assessed needs. Split broad product rows where different requirements are needed.
- Distinguish standard products and suitable like-for-like replacements from customised, complex or high-risk solutions. Explain when existing assessments or prescriptions remain sufficient and when a new assessment or prescription is needed.
- Support individual clinical judgement about the professional input needed for safe and effective use, within the clarified requirements.
- Align eligible professional services and claiming instructions with the professional input required.

Before finalising amendments, the Department should consult the allied health sector, including relevant professional associations and practitioners with specialist assistive technology expertise. This consultation should help ensure the requirements are clinically appropriate and practical to implement.

4. Product entries do not clearly link to associated service requirements

Problem

The List refers to prescription and wraparound services, but relevant product entries do not consistently identify or link to the services needed to deliver a safe and effective solution. For example, customised equipment may require specialist measurement and fitting, while home modifications may require professional planning and installation oversight. Supporting guidance contains provisions for these services, but their relationship to particular List entries is not always clear. This can make it difficult for providers to identify the associated service requirements when interpreting a product entry.

Proposed change

Add brief associated-service notes or references to relevant List entries. These should:

- Identify services particularly relevant to the product or home modification, including assessment and trials, specialist measurement and fitting, preparation of necessary reports or drawings, liaison with builders or suppliers, installation oversight, user training and follow-up, where required.
- Direct readers to the existing guidance explaining those services and their eligibility requirements.
- Ensure the product description, professional-input category and associated-service references provide consistent information.

5. Technical errors and unexplained ISO terms create uncertainty

Problem

The List relies heavily on specialised terminology from ISO 9999:2022. Although some entries include examples, unfamiliar terms are not consistently explained. This makes it difficult to recognise products within broad categories.

Technical and wording problems include:

- Powered stair-climbing transporters are labelled ISO 09 54 under “Currently funded by others”. That is the sexual-activity category; the motorised-vehicle classification needs correction.
- The Beds and bed equipment row prints “118 12 28” for rails for self-lifting, with an extra digit in the code.
- “Spectacle hearing airs” should read “Spectacle hearing aids”.
- “Play Adaptative products for social interaction” needs a clear, correctly worded function label.

These problems make it harder to determine which products are included, conditionally included or excluded.

Proposed change

Undertake a complete technical and plain-language review of the List. The review should:

- Check every heading, product description and ISO code against ISO 9999:2022.
- Correct the identified spelling and formatting errors. Verify and publish the correct ISO classification for the transporter and motorised-vehicle entries, checking descriptions and code alignment.
- Clearly explain boundaries where related products appear in different sections.
- Add a glossary, plain-language descriptions and contemporary practical examples for unfamiliar terms.
- Use examples consistently across the List so interpretations are consistent between clinicians, providers and regions.

6. Digital devices and accessories are too narrowly covered

Problem

The conditional inclusion covers portable computers and personal digital assistants. Access depends on prescribed software or applications and the older person having no capacity to buy.

Smartphones and tablets are not explicitly named in that entry. Desktop computers, operating software, browser software and computer/network accessories appear under “Out of scope”. Some communication software is included under separate functional categories.

Mainstream devices can provide effective accessibility through built-in features. Requiring separately prescribed software can exclude a suitable, lower-cost solution. The additional affordability test can also prevent access despite an assessed accessibility need.

Proposed change

Broaden the conditional inclusion to name a suitable desktop or portable computer, tablet or smartphone that meets an assessed accessibility, communication, cognitive or safety need. Select the lowest-cost option that delivers the required function, taking account of compatibility, reliability and the services needed for safe use.

The revised entry should:

- Recognise built-in accessibility features and avoid requiring a separate app where it is unnecessary.
- Cover necessary accessibility apps, software and accessories, including braille-display connectivity accessories.
- Give practical examples of apps for accessible reading, communication and navigation.
- Remove the additional inability-to-purchase condition. Base eligibility on assessed functional need, suitability and value for money, consistent with choosing an effective AT solution.
- Revise the related desktop-computer, software, accessory and communication exclusions so they do not override this conditional inclusion.
- Cover essential operating software and connections needed for the eligible AT function. Specify coverage of one-off purchases and licences, and of any necessary ongoing licence or connectivity costs.

A mainstream product should not be excluded solely because it also has ordinary uses. Continue to exclude costs that relate only to ordinary personal use.

7. Stakeholders need a clear process for reporting List issues and tracking changes

Problem

Stakeholder feedback identified a need for a clearer published process for reporting errors, unclear wording, missing products and practical access problems.

When concerns are handled through individual correspondence, other stakeholders may be unable to see whether the same issue has been raised, whether it is being reviewed or how it has been resolved.

Proposed change

Establish an accessible reporting and review process available to older people, carers, clinicians, providers and suppliers. The process should:

- Accept reports of coding errors, unclear wording, inconsistent classifications, missing products and practical access problems, with supporting examples where available.
- Acknowledge each report and provide a reference number.
- Identify the responsible Departmental team and publish expected response and review timeframes.
- Maintain an accessible public issues register showing a summary of each issue, its review status and the outcome, without personal or confidential information.
- Review reported issues periodically and publish the outcomes, including reasons where no amendment is made.
- Address urgent errors promptly where they affect safe access.

Publish a separate accessible change register recording:

- The date and version of each amendment.
- The entries changed and the nature of the change.
- The reason for the amendment and the related issue reference, where applicable.

Link the two registers so stakeholders can follow a reported concern through to its outcome. Update the List and related guidance together, and ensure all published formats reflect the same amendments.

Mobility and physical function

8. Gaps in orthoses, prostheses and essential components prevent access to needs-based support

Problem

The List names many upper-limb orthoses but only foot orthoses for the lower limb. The gaps include:

- Other lower-limb, spinal, cranial and abdominal orthoses, which are not clearly listed.
- Limb prostheses and their essential components, which are missing.

Replacement parts, consumables and adjustments can preserve safe use and delay a full replacement. Their coverage needs to be explicit.

Proposed change

Include the full range of eligible orthoses and prostheses within ISO 9999 Class 06, subject to assessed functional need and appropriate clinical requirements. The review should cover:

- Spinal, cranial and abdominal orthoses, upper-limb orthoses and the full range of lower-limb orthoses, using the appropriate Class 06 classifications.
- Functional neuromuscular stimulators and hybrid orthoses, upper-limb and lower-limb prostheses, and other prostheses where they meet scheme purposes. Verify the relevant ISO codes through the technical review in issue 5.

Explicitly cover the components and continued-use support needed for eligible products:

- Sockets, liners, interfaces, joints, feet, knees and suspension systems.
- Other essential components, replacement parts and necessary consumables.
- Repairs, modifications and adjustments required for continued safe use.

Link these entries to the associated services in issue 4. Also:

- Clearly identify when a certified orthotist/prosthetist is required, particularly for custom-made, customised, high-risk or complex products.
- Confirm that service and funding arrangements enable access to these professionals.

Apply the actual-access test in issue 2 where another funding program is expected to provide these products or specialist services.

9. Therapeutic footwear is not clearly distinguished from ordinary footwear

Problem

The List includes “shoes and boots” and foot orthoses. It does not clearly distinguish ordinary footwear from custom-made, modified or medical-grade footwear needed to address an assessed functional or clinical need.

Shoes and boots are labelled “Low risk (recommended)”. That broad label does not distinguish standard footwear from complex prescribed footwear.

Proposed change

Identify prescribed custom-made, modified and medical-grade footwear as distinct entries under “Clothes and shoes”. Clarify coverage within the existing shoes-and-boots entry, and add an appropriate entry if a genuine gap remains. Verify the ISO codes and assign prescription categories appropriate to the product’s risk and complexity. Distinguish eligible therapeutic footwear from ordinary shoes and boots.

10. The term “secondary mobility products” remains undefined, creating uncertainty about additional mobility devices

Problem

The List treats “secondary mobility products” as usual household or discretionary expenses but does not define the term. It separately excludes several mobility products, including:

- Cycles and cycle adaptations.
- Stair-climbing manual wheelchairs.
- Transportation chairs.
- Unpowered scooters.

An additional device may be needed because the person's primary device cannot meet an assessed functional need in every environment. The wording can make an existing device a reason to refuse another necessary solution.

Proposed change

Define secondary mobility and distinguish an additional product for convenience or recreation from an alternative product needed for an assessed function.

The revised provisions should:

- Provide conditional access where the primary device cannot meet that need.
- Require evidence of suitability, safe use, the intended environment and value for money.
- Confirm that an existing device should not automatically prevent access.
- Reconcile the relevant mobility exclusions with this provision.

11. Cycle exclusions can prevent access to adapted cycles and trikes needed for mobility

Problem

The List excludes cycles and cycle adaptations, although some cycle-related wheelchair accessories are included.

An older person with disability or age-related functional decline may need an adapted or purpose-built cycle or trike to meet an assessed mobility need. Specialised features or adaptations may be necessary because a standard cycle cannot accommodate their access needs or be used safely and effectively. The current exclusion can therefore prevent access to a suitable mobility solution.

One supplier reported that a trike was refused following three trials and support from an occupational therapist, with the List cited as the reason.

Proposed change

Revise the cycle exclusions to allow conditional access to disability-related cycle adaptations and adapted or purpose-built cycles and trikes, including electric pedal-assist models, where they meet an assessed mobility need.

The revised provisions should:

- Assess the product against the person's mobility need, intended use and goals, as documented in their support plan.
- Consider suitability and safe use in the intended environment, supported by relevant assessments and trial results.
- Apply professional assessment requirements proportionate to the product's risk and complexity and the person's needs.
- Confirm that having another mobility device does not automatically prevent access where the cycle or trike meets a distinct assessed need.
- Distinguish equipment needed for disability-related mobility from an ordinary purchase for fitness or recreation. Additional exercise or recreational benefits should not, by themselves, prevent access where the product meets an assessed mobility need.

12. Exclusions for equipment relating to movement, strength and balance do not address gaps in access

Problem

The List excludes equipment for movement, strength and balance training under “Currently funded by others”. This category includes hand-exercise devices, gait-training equipment and standing frames.

A person with disability may need specialised or adapted equipment to undertake activities that maintain or improve their physical functioning. Standard equipment may not meet their access needs or allow safe and effective use. The List does not identify the alternative funding program for this category or explain how a person can access necessary equipment when that program cannot meet their assessed need.

Proposed change

Review the exclusion for movement, strength and balance equipment. The revised provisions should:

- Identify the expected funding program or service stream and the relevant eligibility conditions.
- Provide conditional AT-HM access where equipment meets an assessed need for maintaining or improving physical functioning and another program cannot meet that need.
- Recognise specialised or adapted equipment needed to meet disability-related access needs, including where standard equipment cannot be used safely or effectively.
- Specify professional assessment and safe-use requirements proportionate to the equipment’s risk and complexity and the person’s assessed needs.
- Distinguish equipment needed for an assessed AT function from purchases made solely for general fitness or recreation.

13. Sport and recreation exclusions can prevent access to specialised equipment that facilitates participation

Problem

The List takes an inconsistent approach to assistive technology for sport and recreation. For example:

- Products for games and social interaction are included.
- Hunting, fishing and camping equipment is conditionally included for cultural practices.
- AT relating to sport and recreation is treated as a usual household or discretionary expense, and the sports category is excluded.

The List does not explain why equipment supporting participation in some recreational activities can be funded, while equipment meeting a comparable disability-related need in sport or other recreational activities is excluded.

An older person with disability or age-related functional decline may need specialised equipment or adaptations to participate safely and effectively in either type of activity. These differences in coverage can make eligibility depend on the activity involved, rather

than a consistent assessment of the person's functional or access need and how the equipment addresses it.

Proposed change

Revise the relevant exclusions to allow conditional access to specialised sport and recreation equipment and disability-related adaptations that meet an assessed participation need.

The revised provisions should:

- Require an assessed need to be documented in the person's support plan and explain how the equipment supports functioning or manages disability or age-related functional decline.
- Recognise that specialised or adapted equipment may be necessary where standard equipment cannot meet the person's access needs or be used safely and effectively.
- Cover the necessary adaptation or additional disability-related cost where it can be separated from an ordinary purchase.
- Allow a complete adapted or purpose-built product where it is necessary to deliver the assessed assistive technology function.
- Distinguish eligible equipment and adaptations from ordinary sport and recreation purchases without a disability-related function or access need.

Vision and information access

14. Exclusions and descriptions relating to vision products make access unclear

Problem

The List includes image-enlarging systems, tactile displays and text-to-speech technology. However, some descriptions and exclusions make it difficult to identify which accessibility products are covered. For example:

- Broad product names do not clearly identify video magnifiers, refreshable braille displays or tactile graphics displays.
- Closed-circuit television systems are excluded, but some low-vision video magnifiers are also known as closed-circuit televisions. This could cause an included magnifier to be treated as excluded.
- Audible displays are excluded, without clearly explaining how this exclusion applies to devices that provide spoken information for someone who cannot access a visual display.
- Coverage of smart glasses used for reading, identifying objects or describing surroundings also needs clarification.

These uncertainties can lead to different decisions about products that serve the same assessed access need.

Proposed change

Clarify the relevant inclusions and exclusions so providers can readily identify eligible products. The revised entries should:

- Use current product names and practical examples, including desktop and portable video magnifiers, refreshable braille displays and tactile graphics displays.
- Confirm that the closed-circuit television exclusion does not apply to eligible low-vision video magnifiers.
- Clarify coverage of devices that provide spoken information for an assessed access need. Amend the audible-display exclusion where necessary to permit that coverage.
- Explain whether, and under what conditions, smart glasses can be funded for assessed information-access needs.
- Distinguish eligible accessibility functions from ordinary audio and video uses.

Where a product is already covered, clarify the existing entry. Where a coverage gap remains, add an appropriate inclusion or conditional inclusion.

15. Braille embossers, tactile diagram tools and accessible labelling systems are not clearly covered

Problem

The List includes manual braille writing equipment, portable braille note-taking devices and braille training products. Related tools are not consistently named, including braille embossers, tactile diagram tools and accessible labelling systems.

Marking materials and tools are also included, but their use for accessible labelling is not explained. The broad printer exclusion can also be interpreted as excluding a braille embosser, even though it provides disability-specific access to written information. These descriptions make coverage of reading and writing tools difficult to recognise.

Proposed change

Retain existing braille note-taker coverage and add clear contemporary examples under the relevant reading, writing, drawing and marking entries, including:

- Braille note-takers
- Braille embossers
- Tactile diagram tools
- Accessible labelling systems

Clarify coverage within existing categories and add any missing disability-specific product entry.

Revise the printer exclusion so it does not prevent funding for a braille embosser required to meet an assessed information-access need.

16. Guide-cane entries do not clearly identify cane types and replacement tips

Problem

Guide canes and accessories are included, but the entries do not clearly identify long-cane variants or replacement-tip types, such as rolling tips.

Coverage of electronic canes also needs clarification because electronic orientation products are currently excluded.

These uncertainties can prevent access to a suitable cane or essential replacement tip where its coverage is not recognised.

Proposed change

Clarify the guide-cane and accessory entries to:

- Name long-cane variants and common replacement-tip types, including rolling tips.
- Confirm coverage of compatible replacement tips needed for continued safe use, taking account of the person's needs and intended environment.
- Explain how the electronic-orientation exclusion applies to electronic canes, including their classification and applicable assessment requirements.

17. Electronic navigation exclusions do not distinguish individual tools from venue infrastructure

Problem

Tactile and visual orientation materials are included, but electronic orientation and acoustic navigation products are excluded. These broad exclusions apply to the product groups without a separate pathway for the devices and apps an individual uses. They are not currently limited to venue-installed infrastructure.

Proposed change

Revise the electronic-orientation and acoustic-navigation exclusions to distinguish public or venue-installed infrastructure from devices and apps used by an individual.

Provide conditional AT-HM access to an individual's device or app where it meets an assessed mobility or safety need.

Add clear examples of individual tools, including:

- Wearable devices that guide the person through vibration or other touch-based signals.
- Apps that provide accessible directions within buildings.
- Devices or apps that receive information from a navigation system in a building or public place and present it in a form the person can use.

Clarify that conditional access covers only the device or app used by the individual. Public or venue-installed navigation infrastructure should remain excluded.

Communication and hearing

18. Speech-generating communication devices are not clearly distinguished from excluded voice and speech products

Problem

Some older people need a device or app that speaks messages they type or select because they cannot rely on speech to communicate. These speech-generating devices are a form of augmentative and alternative communication (AAC).

The List includes “dialogue units” and face-to-face communication software. Personal voice amplifiers are also included. However, “voice generators” and “speech flow devices” are excluded under “Currently funded by others”.

The List does not clearly explain these terms or distinguish their functions. In particular, “voice generators” could be interpreted as including speech-generating communication devices. This creates a risk that a needs-based communication device will be treated as excluded, simply because it produces speech.

Proposed change

Clarify the included communication entries and excluded voice and speech entries. The revised provisions should:

- Explicitly identify covered speech-generating AAC devices and software within the relevant communication inclusions.
- Explain “dialogue units”, “voice generators” and “speech flow devices” in plain language, using practical examples to distinguish their functions.
- Confirm that an eligible communication device should not be excluded solely because it produces speech. Resolve any overlapping descriptions that could cause this interpretation.
- Identify the expected funding program for voice and speech products that remain excluded as funded elsewhere. Clarify conditional AT-HM access where that program cannot meet an assessed need within a specified timeframe.

19. Essential components and replacements for communication devices are not clearly covered

Problem

The List includes switches, keyboards, communication accessories and positioning systems. These entries do not clearly identify all components needed to use augmentative and alternative communication equipment, such as keyguards, mounts, chargers, power supplies and replacement batteries.

The scheme guidelines recognise components integral to a listed product when purchased with it. Coverage is less clear when a necessary component is purchased separately later.

Without these components, an eligible communication device may not provide a complete or usable solution over time.

Proposed change

Clarify component coverage within the relevant communication, operating-control and positioning entries. Add any missing coverage needed for an eligible communication device, including:

- Access components and keyguards.
- Mounts.
- Power supplies, chargers and replacement batteries.

Explicitly address necessary components purchased separately later, including replacements. Confirm that these can be considered without requiring purchase of a new communication device.

20. Hearing support entries do not clearly distinguish AT-HM coverage from Hearing Services Program coverage

Problem

Hearing aids and amplifiers are excluded as currently funded elsewhere. Conditional inclusions already cover some sound-transmission systems and hearing accessories when the Hearing Services Program does not cover them.

Examples such as remote microphones, loop systems and television listening systems are not named. Similar products can therefore be classified differently. The separate exclusion of microphones and other audio equipment also needs to be reconciled with conditional hearing-accessory coverage.

Proposed change

Expand the hearing examples under conditional inclusions and clarify the funding arrangements. The revised entries should:

- Name remote microphones, loop and television listening systems, and other necessary transmission or accessory systems.
- Clearly explain the boundary with the Hearing Services Program.
- Retain the existing conditional pathway for uncovered support.
- Clarify that a remote microphone or other eligible hearing accessory is considered under the hearing conditional inclusion, with appropriate evidence, despite generic audio-equipment exclusions.

Daily living and personal care

21. Daily living entries do not clearly explain when everyday products are considered to be eligible

Problem

The List includes everyday products such as clothes and shoes, eating and drinking aids, toothbrushes and cleaning equipment. Its general eligibility statement requires products to support functioning or manage disability or age-related functional decline. However, the

daily living entries do not consistently illustrate how these products can meet that requirement. This can leave providers uncertain about when a standard or adapted product is needed to address an assessed functional need and when it is an ordinary personal purchase.

Some existing coverage is also difficult to recognise. For example, tube-squeezing devices are included, but toothpaste squeezers are not named as a practical application of that entry.

Proposed change

Clarify how the existing eligibility requirements apply to standard and adapted products within the daily living entries.

Add practical examples that explain the functional need addressed, including:

- Clothing with suitable fastenings that enable a person with reduced dexterity to dress.
- Eating and drinking aids that enable a person with limited grip or coordination to use utensils or cups.
- Toothpaste squeezers, under the existing tube-squeezing entry, that enable a person with reduced hand strength to dispense toothpaste.
- Adapted cleaning equipment that enables a person with limited grip, reach or mobility to undertake household tasks.

Use these examples to explain existing coverage and distinguish purchases needed for an assessed assistive technology function from purchases made solely for ordinary personal use.

22. Medication aid inclusions and exclusions leave product coverage unclear

Problem

The List includes products for administering non-liquid medicines but excludes “other assistive products for administering medicines” under “Currently funded by others”. It does not clearly explain which medication aids fall within each entry.

An older person may need equipment to organise, access, measure or apply medicines because of disability or age-related functional decline. The descriptions do not clearly identify accessible medicine organisers, electronic dispensers or aids for eye drops, liquid medicines and medicinal creams or lotions.

Pharmacy packing services organise medicines into doses, but do not necessarily provide the equipment someone needs to access or administer them. Treating these services as an alternative to medication aids can therefore leave an assessed need unmet.

Proposed change

Clarify the medication-aid entries and amend the exclusions where necessary to address gaps. The revised provisions should:

- Name accessible medicine organisers and electronic dispensers, explaining their coverage within the non-liquid medicine entry.
- Include aids needed to administer eye drops, oral liquid or suspension medicines, and medicinal creams or lotions because of disability or age-related functional decline.

- Clearly distinguish assistive equipment from medicines themselves and pharmacy packing services. Separately identify the funding arrangements for injection and infusion equipment.
- Identify the expected alternative funding program for medication aids that remain excluded as funded elsewhere.
- Provide conditional AT-HM access where another program cannot supply a suitable, accessible product that meets an assessed need.

23. Exclusion of cooking and timer-switches make coverage of cooking aids and safety controls unclear

Problem

The List includes food-preparation aids. It also includes home modifications such as gas safety valves, equipment to prevent burns and accidental fires, and mechanical or electronic controls. However, assistive products for cooking and frying, cooking units, refrigerators and freezers are excluded. Timer switches are also excluded.

The entries do not clearly explain how these exclusions apply to cooking aids, appliance adaptations or safety controls needed because of disability or age-related functional decline. For example, a timer-based control that switches off a cooking appliance may meet an assessed safety need. It is unclear whether it is covered by a safety or control inclusion, or excluded as a timer switch.

This can lead to inconsistent decisions about equipment needed to prepare food safely and independently.

Proposed change

Clarify existing cooking-aid and safety-control coverage and amend exclusions where necessary to address gaps. The revised provisions should:

- Identify eligible food-preparation and cooking aids, using practical examples such as adapted utensils and stabilising aids.
- Clarify coverage of accessible appliance controls and automatic safety shut-off devices, including timer-based controls.
- Ensure exclusions do not override existing coverage. Provide conditional access where a genuine gap prevents access to equipment needed for an assessed assistive technology function.
- Cover the necessary adaptation or additional disability-related cost where it can be separated from an ordinary appliance purchase.
- Allow consideration of a complete product where it is necessary to deliver the assessed function.
- Distinguish eligible cooking aids, adaptations and safety controls from ordinary household appliance purchases.

Home access and safety

24. Coverage of vision-related home modifications is unclear, with tactile floor and stair materials excluded

Problem

General lights, floor coverings and non-slip floor or stair materials are included as home modifications. Tactile and visual orientation materials are also included as AT.

However, tactile materials for floors and stairs are expressly excluded under “Out of scope”. That exclusion needs to be addressed for assessed tactile home-navigation adaptations.

Other vision-accessibility examples are not clearly named, including:

- Tactile ground surface indicators.
- High-contrast edging.
- Tactile signage.
- Lighting adaptations for low vision.

These boundaries and descriptions can lead to inconsistent decisions about changes needed for safe navigation at home.

Proposed change

Reconcile the exclusion and relevant AT and home-modification entries. The revised provisions should:

- Revise the tactile-materials exclusion to permit assessed disability-related tactile adaptations needed for safe navigation at home.
- Name tactile ground surface indicators, high-contrast edging, tactile signage and low-vision lighting adaptations under the relevant categories.
- Identify what is already included and provide an appropriate inclusion or conditional inclusion for any remaining coverage gap.
- Explain when a solution is AT or a home modification, including the applicable prescription and installation requirements.
- Distinguish assessed functional or safety adaptations from ordinary decoration, maintenance or home improvement.

25. Removable rails need clearer classification and prescription requirements

Problem

Removable grab rails and handgrips appear under both AT and home modifications. The AT entry is labelled “Prescribed (recommended)”, while the home-modification entry is labelled “Prescribed (required)”.

The List does not clearly explain which entry applies to a particular product or installation. This creates uncertainty about the prescription and other professional input required.

Proposed change

Review the overlapping entries and clarify the distinction between removable rails and handgrips supplied as AT and those supplied as home modifications. The revised entries should:

- Explain when each classification applies, taking account of the product's function and how it is fitted and used.
- Specify the applicable assessment, prescription and safe-installation requirements.
- Explain how removability affects classification and professional requirements, while retaining the input needed for safe and effective use.
- Provide practical examples illustrating the different classifications.
- Identify how providers can seek clarification where the appropriate entry remains unclear.

26. Door-entry cameras and intercoms lack conditional access for assessed needs

Problem

The List expressly excludes intercoms and entry phones under Distant communication, as well as closed-circuit television systems under audiovisual equipment. Door openers, locks and some electronic controls are included as home modifications.

A person with limited mobility may need a door-entry camera or intercom to identify and communicate with visitors, or use entry controls, safely and independently. The existing exclusions do not provide a conditional pathway for this assessed access need.

Proposed change

Add a conditional inclusion for door-entry camera and intercom solutions that meet an assessed mobility, communication or safety need. The revised entry should:

- Clarify whether the solution is AT, a home modification or a combination.
- Cover necessary controls and installation.
- Distinguish disability-related access from ordinary household security.
- Revise both the closed-circuit television exclusion and the intercom/entry-phone exclusion so they do not override this conditional pathway.

27. Safety and emergency entries do not clearly identify accessible alarms and hazard detectors

Problem

The List includes signalling devices, personal and environmental emergency alarm systems, and some home safety equipment. It does not clearly name accessibility features needed by people who cannot use a standard device.

Broad descriptions can leave assessors and providers uncertain about eligible accessible alarms and hazard detectors.

Proposed change

Add clear examples under signalling, alarming and localisation, including:

- Smoke and carbon monoxide alarms with alerts suited to the person's access needs.
- Flashing or strobe-light alerts, vibration alerts—including bed or pillow shakers—and spoken warnings where needed.
- Hazard detectors that provide alerts in a form the person can perceive and understand, including audible, visual or vibration alerts.

For these entries:

- Identify the functional need and required accessibility feature.
- Distinguish the additional disability-related support from an ordinary household purchase.
- Clarify coverage of any components needed for the system to work.
- Reconcile the audible-display exclusion with accessible alarm and hazard-alert functions so essential speech output is not misclassified.

28. Equipment classified as home modifications needs clearer maintenance coverage

Problem

The List includes stairlifts, lifting platforms and bidets as home modifications. These products may require servicing, maintenance, repairs and replacement parts throughout their use to remain safe and functional.

The scheme's repairs and maintenance provisions expressly refer to assistive technology. Their application to equipment classified in the List as home modifications is less clear. This creates uncertainty about whether necessary maintenance of included equipment is able to be funded.

Proposed change

Review the classification and maintenance coverage of equipment listed as home modifications. Amend the relevant entries or eligibility notes to:

- Confirm coverage of necessary servicing, maintenance, safety checks, repairs and replacement parts where the equipment continues to meet an assessed need.
- Ensure this coverage is clear whether the equipment is classified as AT or a home modification.
- Review classifications against the product's function, installation and risks, and reclassify products where appropriate.
- Distinguish maintenance of eligible disability-related equipment from ordinary repairs and maintenance of the dwelling.