



Campaign snapshot:

Housing and Living Supports

May 2026

The NDIS Quality and Safeguards Commission (NDIS Commission) recently undertook a targeted compliance campaign focused on enhancing regulation of NDIS providers delivering both specialist disability accommodation (SDA) and supported independent living (SIL) supports.

Background

In 2023, the Australian Government provided additional funding for the NDIS Commission to establish a time-limited team to strengthen regulation of the SDA sector. We established the Housing and Living Supports (H&LS) team in April 2024. It operated until 30 June 2025, undertaking a campaign focused on NDIS participants receiving 24-hour, 7 days a week (24/7) living supports in shared accommodation settings.

This campaign delivered on the NDIS Commission's objective to carry out

targeted campaigns that build connections with the sector and gather insights to strengthen the quality of support and respond to emerging risk.

Why this matters

- Recent reviews and inquiries have found that many NDIS participants in shared supported living arrangements (housing and living supports) continue to experience little or no choice about where they live, who supports them and who they live with.
- The NDIS Commission has a role to ensure the rights of NDIS participants using housing and living supports are upheld and that they are able exercise choice and control over their services.
- There is a need to strengthen regulation of the SDA sector to ensure quality service provision and safeguarding of participants.
- It is important to understand the impacts (intended and unintended)

on participants and the sector of options for the separation of SIL and SDA (more information may be found on the [NDIS Commission website](#)).

under the National Disability Insurance Scheme Act 2013 Act – to review the quality and accuracy of service agreements, arrangements with SIL supports, and conflict of interest.

Who was involved

- 243 provider meetings across Australia, including rural and remote locations
- 416 compliance inspections at provider service delivery locations (dwellings) across Australia, including rural and remote locations
- Discussions with 661 NDIS participants (or their decision-makers on their behalf)
- Place-based campaigns occurred in Queensland (Cairns, Cherbourg, Torres Strait Islands and Toowoomba), Victoria (Ballarat and Bendigo) and New South Wales (Dubbo-Orange).

What we looked at

The campaign involved 3 main components:

- Participant (and/or authorised representatives) engagement via site visits and phone calls to gain insight into participants' experiences with SIL and SDA supports.
- Provider meetings (virtual and face to face) – to understand how SIL/ SDA providers operate, and to provide feedback on engagement activities.
- Documentation reviews via issuing a request for information (s56 notice)

Key findings

We took compliance action when visits and inspections identified providers in breach of their legislated obligations. Regulatory activities included 3 infringement notices (totalling \$56,340), 8 compliance notices and 10 corrective action requests.

Information gathered throughout the campaign has fed directly into the consultation undertaken by the NDIS Commission regarding NDIS Practice Standards, new standards for SIL and the separation of SIL and SDA. A summary has been included in the consultation report [Next steps regulation for in-home and housing supports consultation summary](#).

Issues

- Where a participant receives all supports, including accommodation, SIL, community-based supports and support coordination through one provider, choice is sometimes limited to the options presented by that provider. However, some participants and their families described the benefits of what they considered a streamlined approach, particularly in relation to communication and oversight for complex support requirements.

- Current regulatory requirements expect providers to meet minimum standards for conflict-of-interest disclosure and management, that is that conflicts are disclosed and managed. However, the rules do not specifically require providers to demonstrate how they actively support participant choice beyond their own, or linked, entities' services.
 - Many NDIS participants express a strong preference to receive housing and living supports from providers who share their cultural background. This helps participants with improved understanding, trust and emotional security. These relationships build deeper connection, more responsive care and a sense of safety. This is especially important for participants from culturally and linguistically diverse communities or First Nations backgrounds.
 - Where the SDA provider is not the owner, reasonable modifications to improve the functionality and practical use of the accommodation is limited to the owner's willingness to make the modifications. This can result in kitchens, bathrooms and exit or entry areas that lack accessibility features. On the other hand, where the SDA provider owns the property, prompt modifications occur to accommodation (such as ramps, hoists, storage solutions or kitchen/bathroom layout) to improve the environment for participants and supports delivery.
- providers is the primary driver of satisfaction with home and living supports. When all parties share a clear, current understanding of individual support requirements, participants typically report more positive experiences. Conversely, lack of clear understanding often leads to challenges in support, regardless of the accommodation type or provider arrangements.
- Education and support are essential in promoting best practice and providing clear guidance to providers. Engagement across the sector consistently highlighted provider need and demand for accessible, practical resources to navigate the system.
 - Group living arrangements affect participant choice and control. Typically, in an SDA dwelling where more than one participant lives, the first participant in the home has their choice of SIL provider. When participants enter an established household, there is an expectation that SIL supports in place for other housemates will be accepted by the entering participant for practical reasons.
 - Choice and control in thin markets – in regional, remote and very remote areas – is affected by the number of NDIS providers delivering supports in the area.
 - Providers who manage SDA properties on behalf of an investor have stated that investors' decision making can be profit-focused and not participant-centric. Providers are concerned a separation of SDA and SIL would lead to a more dominant investor-model market.
 - Where a participant does not have SDA funding, there is a practice of providers renting properties and subletting to

Themes

- The quality of relationships between participants, their families, workers and

participants below market rate. Participants are then placed in a house with a rooming/boarding agreement. These 'closed SIL' arrangements are not NDIS funded and therefore the NDIS Commission has limited oversight. This arrangement does not promote participant autonomy and can be difficult for the participant to extract themselves without significant cost. The Commission heard that in most remote, regional and metropolitan locations the rental market is difficult and unaffordable for low-income earners. For participants who receive a disability support pension, a closed SIL setting is potentially the only way to access housing opportunities.

Next steps



The insights gathered during the campaign will inform regulatory reform.



The NDIS Commission is releasing resources to help SDA providers understand the difference between provision of reasonable transition supports and the offer of inducements that breach the NDIS Code of Conduct and NDIS Practice Standards.

www.ndiscommission.gov.au



/NDISCommission



/ndiscommission