

## CONSULTATION QUESTIONS

### Question 1

What aspects of the current ILF worked well and what elements did not work so well?

#### Comments

Since its introduction in the 1980s ILF has had a very important role in supporting its recipients to lead an independent life. It was a forerunner to direct payments (DP) and has been important in fostering a culture of choice and control within social care for people with a disability.

The introduction of direct payments through local authorities meant that ILF and DP recipients had to work with two different systems, with different regulations, and potential for confusion. The increasing restrictions on eligibility within the ILF have created inequalities. For example, it is age restrictive, has significant geographical variation in take up and there are different levels of funding depending on when the recipient applied for ILF. With the closure of the Fund there is now a generation of people that will not receive this opportunity.

### Question 2

Should the money that becomes available after existing ILF recipients no longer need it be used in the same way for others in the future? If so, why? If not, how else might the money be used?

#### Comments

Based on information from ILF about the rate of attrition it could be assumed that the funding that will become available could be rather small and would not be sufficient to utilise in the same way. Given this, and the inequity of the current system of distribution it is proposed that available funds could be used for community initiatives, as part of preventative support.

### Question 3

If the available resource is simply that which is transferred from the Treasury, how would you like to see it used if it was not to be a continuation of the existing approach?

#### Comments

A local partnership with a co-productive approach would be in the best position to identify opportunities that would make best use of the funding and to support transformational change in services.

### Question 4

What innovative ways might there be for increasing the overall amount of money in the pot?

#### Comments

It is a struggle to respond with a new solution at this time of increasing financial restraint. The partnership approach, however, would be the most effective way of sharing experiences and skills. SDS offers the opportunity to think more holistically about the way care and support services are provided. There is a need to consider how rights to independent living continue to be promoted in a joined up way particularly in relation to the newly developing integrated arrangements with the NHS.

### Question 5

With any available resource, where is the most effective area to target resources which can have the biggest impact on an individual's ability to live more independently?

#### Comments

As in question 2 we query whether the amount of funding that will be available will be sufficient to make an impact. It would be useful to receive more information on this to help us respond. Should this funding be of sufficient amount we would support the suggestions within the consultation document of supporting people through transition – for example to adulthood, to older age, and of short term support toward independence. In particular it should support new approaches including community capacity building, the development and sustaining of social networks, and support to empower people through a co-productive approach.

### Question 6

Once funding has been devolved to the Scottish Government, which option do you think will be most appropriate for Scotland?

#### Comments

We would support Option 1 ie the local authority administration of arrangements. We choose this option on the understanding that 'current recipients should not have their existing funding taken away unless their personal circumstances change and they become ineligible'. Although the consultation paper makes it clear that this is the Scottish Government's view the paper is ambiguous about whether this would apply under option 1.

The funding should also be ring fenced to ensure this continuing protection.

Although this will create some additional work for local authorities it still clearly seems the most cost effective in relation to administration, and the most streamlined of all the options. Most ILF users are already receiving social work support, social work are already involved in ILF reviews, and since 1993 social work funding is an eligibility requirement of ILF provision. Local authorities have experience in income maximisation and have the structures and experience, via direct payments, to make payments to individuals. There is the opportunity to resolve some of the confusion (see question 1) of having two funding sources.

There are some other aspects of the consultation paper where clarity would

be welcome. It would be useful to know what the eligibility criteria would be and the impact of Welfare Reform on ILF recipients, for example, the change from DLA

### **Question 7**

To assist with our partial Equality Impact Assessment in relation to the future development of a sustainable Fund to support disabled people in Scotland to live independently, please describe any equality issues (in relation to age, disability, sex, sexual orientation, gender re-assignment, race, religion or belief, pregnancy and maternity and marriage and civil partnership) that you feel may arise and suggest ways in which these could be addressed.

#### **Comments**

There is current discrimination within ILF in relation to age. The Fund has a range of eligibility criteria so that people have a range of levels of Fund, whilst others are excluded. People with very high support needs cannot access the Fund, nor people within care homes and hospital.

The protection afforded to people post April 2015 will not address these inequalities, although the gradual release of funding may do this over time.