

LETTER OF RESIGNATION

Re: Cessation of Unfunded, Unrostered, Unratio'd On-call Care Services

23 September 2026

To: The Hon Mark Butler MP – Minister for Health, Disability and Ageing, and the NDIS
Senator the Hon Jenny McAllister – Minister for the NDIS

I am writing to formally resign from my position as Primary Carer. The scope creep to Case Manager, Night Owl, Advocate, Interpreter of Jargon, Budget Ninja, Accidental Therapist, and Chief Search-and-Rescue Officer (Missing Continence Aids) is unsustainable. As you know, I have held this role for 20 years, unpaid, unbriefed and unratio'd. I submit that no exit interview is required, as you already hold several years of my feedback on file.

Notwithstanding my impending departure, I've had a chance to read (and re-read) your 22 September (yesterday) release on funding changes and safeguards, and I want to say: I admire the confidence. It takes a certain flair to reduce a vulnerable disabled person's community participation budget and call the document that explains it a 'safeguard'. I submit that's not policy writing, that's branding. Please pass my compliments to whoever workshopped that pearler in the marketing department (or whichever AI drafted it for them). The audacity deserves its own support category, though I wonder whether you'd file it under flexible Core funding, or lock it away in restrictive Capacity Building?

I note the new plan variation pathway is available to "high support needs participants" who meet a certain (suspiciously precise) funding threshold of \$215,030. I also note it applies only to those receiving 24-hour funded support at a shared ratio of at least 1:3. I'd like to flag, for the record, that I've been providing support at a ratio of 1:1 for two decades, unpaid. As I am a reasonable person (and by all accounts for the last 20 years have been necessary), I am not requesting backpay (although I remain open to the possibility). It appears, however, that in providing care unpaid, I have inadvertently done my loved one a disservice — undermining the very funding and protections your safeguard document is meant to guarantee them. I am still ruminating on the observation that "other parts of the plan will not be impacted" and remain, notably, uncomfortable.

I was especially moved by the worked examples you provided. On face value, I'm sure they're lovely people — albeit imaginary, and still luckier than most actual disabled people in the NDIS.

Correct me if I've misunderstood (note: I've added a little context under poetic license to assist my understanding). Daniel had his community participation budget halved. He lodged the plan variation request on day 88 (of a 90-day window). Daniel is high needs and does not have any Support Coordination funding left in the current instalment, so his plan nominee/carers had to write the s47a on their own (more free labour, more mental load) whilst, I'm assuming, the carer was concurrently caring for Daniel in the hours where his funding had been cut (the reason for the s47a — ironic much?). Marching on, the NDIA took 21 days to assess the s47a (I reckon they're going to be busy with these, so they've allowed them the maximum timeframe you mentioned), then — oh my gosh — another 21 days for a decision. Phew, what a marathon. Ultimately, after 130 days (a squeak over 4 months) on reduced funding (with no reduction in need), Daniel's plan was handed back to him with funding for a third of what he lost. The add back was calculated by how many hours Daniel would now be spending at home at a

lower support ratio than when he was in the community (I see what you did there). Is this another bit of genius marketing spin, where you lock away disabled people in their houses with less support ratio/oversight and call it a Safeguard? This sounds like Uber surge pricing, but in reverse: is the hypothesis that the less Daniel can do, the cheaper he becomes to support. Am I wrong?

I can't quite wrap my head around the example of Amina, who, it appears, was assessed, found 'eligible-adjacent' (you can borrow that new term if you like — you're going to need it), and yet declined for a s47a, because the math said she was both essentially "not enough" and "fine" at the same time — impressive multitasking from a spreadsheet with a marketing degree. That algorithm's really earning its subscription fee this week.

Now back to my original reason for writing to you today. As enticing as the offer is for me to continue in my present role and expand on the scope (yet again), I respectfully decline.

Thus, I tender my resignation with a reasonable 7 calendar days' notice, effective 1 October 2026, to align with the change date you've proposed, and so we don't get into a kerfuffle. I appreciate this notice period may be problematic; however, I don't recall a notice period being specified in your assumed agreement for my voluntary, unpaid, informal care — so I've self-assessed that 7 days represents value for money (for you): effective (for me), albeit not beneficial to my loved one. I trust the Department will find this easy to absorb, given how comfortably it has already absorbed the difference between "reasonable and necessary" and "reasonable and necessary, within a budget."

I won't be available for handover. There isn't one. That was rather the point of me in this role. I thank you for the opportunity over the last 20 years — it's taught me a great deal, mostly about spreadsheets, support ratios, and the outer limits of my own patience.

With the composure of someone who has read the Intensive Pathway Safeguard document more times than the person who wrote it (or whoever proofread what the AI drafted),

sincerely,

A Carer

This letter is satire, written by a carer, and reflects one carer's experience. Names in the examples are illustrative.