

**Reasons for Decision:**

**Order # AP1617-0137**

The appellant appealed that the appellant's request for six cans of <text removed> pediatric nutritional supplement per day was denied. Since the appellant filed the appeal, the Employment and Income Assistance Program has approved two bottles per day. Therefore the basis of appeal was amended at the hearing to be that the amount of pediatric nutritional supplement was insufficient.

The appellant has a child with <medical condition removed> whose sole source of food is pediatric supplement in the vanilla flavour. The appellant indicated that the child refuses to eat anything else and the appellant has tried every combination of texture/flavour the appellant can think of to get the child to consume anything else. The appellant stated that if the child cannot have this food product the child will literally go hungry for days. On average the child will consume six bottles a day, although can have as many as ten. The cost of the item is <amount removed> so over the course of a month the appellant spends <amount removed> on this item. The appellant's entire basic needs budget is <amount removed> so the amount available for food for the appellant and the child, as well as clothing and personal needs is only <amount removed>.

The representative from the Disability Health Support Unit indicated that the pediatric nutritional supplement is not designed to be the sole source of food for a child. The DHSU had concerns that six cans per day would be providing three times the daily recommended levels of iron intake. THE DHSU representative did some research with the company that manufactures the product, and some dieticians and the family's own doctor, and none of them would indicate that they believed consuming six cans of this product a day would be safe for a child. The Department agreed to authorize funds for the purchase of two bottles of the supplement per day. The appellant has been referred to the feeding clinic at <text removed>. The representative indicated that this clinic has staff who are experts in assisting children who have challenging food intake problems. It was estimated that there would be a 2 to 3 month wait for this service. They stated that the appellant could still choose to provide six cans of the pediatric supplement per day, but would have to use the basic needs money to do this.

After carefully considering the verbal and written information the Board has determined that the appellant has a legitimate need at the present time for funding to enable the appellant to purchase six cans of pediatric supplement per day. The Board has determined that the portion of the basic needs which is specific to the child's needs is only sufficient to purchase two cans per day, and therefore the appellant requires the additional funding in order to be able to purchase six cans. The DHSU representative presented some compelling information that this may not be safe for the child on a long term basis. The Board was convinced by the appellant however, that at this time,

it is the only option, and the appellant would continue to purchase the six cans a day, causing hardship to the appellant and the child. Therefore the Board is ordering that the program increase the amount provided for the purchase of the supplement to <amount removed> per month effective <dates removed>. Once the appellant has connected with the feeding clinic, then the appellant can work with the clinic to look for alternative solutions to meet the child's feeding needs.

## **DISCLAIMER**

These are electronic copies of the Reasons for Decision issued by the Social Services Appeal Board. These written reasons have been edited to protect the personal information of individuals by removing personal identifiers.