

CONSULTATION QUESTIONS

Question 1

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

Comments Moray Council recognises ILF monies are crucial in supporting people with high support needs, enhancing their quality of life and sustaining their wish and ability to live at home in the community as opposed to institutional care.

However, the changing eligibility criteria where local authority funding input has been raised twice since the original minimum threshold of £200.00, coupled with the condition new applicants are required to be in work for at least 16 hours per week introduced June 2010 made it difficult for individuals to secure ILF funding.

Individuals receiving ILF have different eligibility criteria with different levels of local authority funding.

ILF place restrictions on what funding can be used for which goes against the new Self Directed Support ethos of choice and control.

ILF and local authorities apply different charging policies.

ILF discriminates against people aged over 65 years who have the same care and support needs as people aged less than 65 years.

The geographical inequalities have meant a variation in take up in relation to needs resulting in conflicting success throughout Scotland.

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 Resources should be recycled to support other service users to remain at home in the community. Aligning with self directed support outcomes and using funding to support low level needs or reablement may prevent or defer intensive care needs. However, funding might be needed to sustain independent living for existing ILF users.

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 Whilst Moray Council supports the principle of protection for current ILF users to alleviate fear of financial loss and restricted support packages, however the issue of protection needs to be clarified, especially in relation to the "Direction from the Scottish Government". This would then inform how authorities utilise the funding.

Nonetheless, aligning with Self Directed Support outcomes and pooled budgets would ensure a more streamline approach towards meeting people's personal outcomes to they can remain living independently at home.

Question 4

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

Comments The Self Directed Support legislation supports co-production, pooling of budgets, community support and a person-centred approach to delivering personal outcomes. Support packages should demonstrate better value for money and optimally increase the money available in the overall pot. In addition see Q 5 – if funding is used for short term preventative and reablement work, funding can then be “recycled” back into the pot.

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 Short term preventative and reablement work to support individuals get over a period of crisis.

Question 6

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

Comments Option 1 is supported as current ILF users are already receiving support from Moray Council care services. Option 1 is fitting with the introduction of Self Directed Support and the Integration of Health and Social Care. This option will be the most cost effective as

- Moray Council already have the procedures/policies, experienced trained staff – social work, finance and administration staff. Moray Council has a growing number of direct payments and this will increase on the introduction of the Self Directed Support Act. Staff have experience of awarding and monitoring cash payments.
- For new cases, this gives scope and opportunity to rationalise eligibility criteria, charging policies etc.
- Protection of existing cases being offered to ILF users should be clear and highlighted this applies to all 4 Options and the monies released should be sufficient to deliver protection.

Further information would be required in relation to Options 2-4.

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 The issue of age discrimination prevails – people over 65 have similar needs that those under 65 years. However, the authority recognises the financial implications and resources required if ILF was extended to older people and recognises this is not being considered.

The current eligibility criteria and operational rules makes it difficult for people with high level support needs to secure ILF funding. For example they are aged 66 years or over, people in education or training or in some cases disabled people with a partner.

Having clear and streamlined eligibility criteria that is consistent to everyone would start to mitigate these issues.