

# **DRAFT RULES FOR DIRECT PAYMENTS**

(Easy read summary) comments from Edinburgh  
Advocating Together (EAT)

## **Question 1.**

On page 3 saying that “Some people may not have to pay towards their support is not clear enough, a better explanation of who does and does not have to pay right at the start of the document would have been more helpful

On page 4 the words are very unclear and the whole section is very complicated. Saying that the council will have to take money off someone’s payment is confusing, just saying that the payment would be lower or less would be clearer.

On page 4 more information is needed when it says “the local council....a bit at a time”.

## **Question 2.**

On page 6 Members wished to say that it is important to them that the rules do pay attention to the problems that could happen if a member of family knows you too well and takes advantage or might feel they can make you do things their way.

On page 6 members are glad to see it said clearly that “the person and the family member

agree...” some people might be able or wish to use advocacy to make sure both parties agree.

One member had a positive experience of employing a family member through ILF funding previously. The pressure that family members could create over holidays or sickness is a worry and members are glad that there are rules in place to keep people safe.

One member recognised that having her Mum work for her would not be good in her situation as her Mum does lots for her already and the person needs freedom from her family.

#### On page 7

The last point made here – “There are other reasons why the council thinks...” members feel they would want reassurance that cost would not be one of these reasons.

### **Question 3.**

Members would have found it useful to have it clarified if the the sentence after the third bullet point – “It also includes someone.....used the money properly” means that someone in this situation will never get the chance again, are you banned forever?

Members felt strongly that someone having an order which says they must use or attend one certain type of support could still benefit from the choice that a direct payment would allow them.

There might be different places or providers that could supply the support specified in the order or the person may need a range of supports and a direct payment would allow them to have some choice in where they get that support.

Members said that having a court order should not always mean that you cannot use a direct payment, each case would be individual

Members know people who have very restricted lives but if a court order says someone has to do certain things BUT these things can be done using different providers then the person should have that choice.

It could also be that someone had some of their support specified but the more everyday aspects of their support would be an area that allowed for the choice a direct payment would allow.

#### **Question 4.**

Members can understand that someone using drugs or alcohol might use a direct payment to buy these substances instead of to pay for support.

Members wondered how long someone would have to be “clean” to get a Direct Payment or

would having had substance issues mean that you never got one?

Members said that if someone is being abused at home and their abuser has control of their money the situation may mean that a direct payment might be the best thing for them so why not give it?

A direct payment might be something which lets someone feel safe and allows them to move on in life.

**Question 5.**

This is a little difficult to understand but members agreed it is important to make sure that someone's care is not paid for twice.

**Question 6.**

Yes all the rules should be clear.

**Question 7.**

Although there has been some effort to make this information accessible and easy to read almost everyone with a Learning Disability would need support to understand the document and respond to it.

It is useful and clear the way that family member is defined on page 8.

It would have been most helpful to have an explanation of “eligible” right at the start. Where it says “The council must tell the person in writing and in any other format that the person needs” it should also say to allow the person to understand.