

# CONSULTATION QUESTIONS

## Question 1

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

What parts of the current ILF worked well?

- ILF supported disabled people of all ages to exercise the same freedom, choice, dignity and control as other citizens at home, at work and in the community.
- As the ILF fund was administered by an Executive Non-Departmental Body of the Department for Work & Pensions (DWP), it had fairly low administration costs meaning that more money went directly to disabled people.
- ILF was a national source of money.
- ILF was paid directly to the individual.
- ILF had portability (when people moved, the money moved with them).
- ILF allocated social workers were more consistent than local authority allocated social workers throughout the process of initial interview, assessment and awarding/allocation of funding.
- ILF provided more flexibility and greater innovation than local authority, which is governed by strict rules and eligibility criteria, in the ways that it supported people to live independently.

What elements did not work so well?

- The cost of social work input before eligibility for ILF (£200 in 1993, £320 in 2008 and £340 in 2010).
- The cost of individual financial contributions for the cost of their package of care which totalled at least half of individuals' Disability Living Allowance care component.
- ILF funding being used to pay for local authority services.
- Group 1/Funding awarded for life meant that a number of people who applied after 1998 were not able to access funding to help them to live more independent lives.

## 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?

2.1 The SIAA would like to support the Scottish Government's intention that current recipients should not have their existing funding removed unless their personal circumstances change and they become ineligible. For those people who currently receive support from ILF, there must be adequate provision of funding in place to enable them to continue to receive the same level of support within any new system.

2.2 We would urge the Scottish Government to ensure that devolved funding equates to the current level of provision required by

Scottish recipients and believe that there will be a need for a bridging fund to meet additional administration costs until resource allocation can be streamlined. This devolved funding should be included in the social care budget so that it is not absorbed by other costs.

2.3 In Scotland, Self-directed Support will result in everyone being given an Individual Budget of some description which will be a minimum sum used to meet a set of identified and agreed social care outcomes. Additional funding streams such as *Access to Work* and *Disabled Students Allowance* will help with employment or education, but there will be gaps between these funds and what individuals want or need to meet a range of outcomes beyond those that can be met by local authorities. This will impact upon people being able to lead full, inclusive, independent lives.

2.4 The SIAA would support the establishment of a new fund set up to provide additional benefit to peoples' lives. This Fund would support personal, 'valued' outcomes such as maintaining or developing friendships or relationships which might not be supported through the local authority assessments either because the person fell outwith the eligibility criteria or local authorities were unable to provide the necessary resources. It is important that these 'valued' outcomes be considered as separate as they are likely to be different to the agreed social care outcomes.

2.5 We feel that assessment for the Fund would be done with the individual and carried out after a budget is agreed. Local authorities should not be able to consider this separate Scottish funding when calculating individual budgets.

2.6 Many individuals in receipt of ILF are increasingly apprehensive about the proposed devolved funding especially as they are already subject to changes occurring through Welfare Reform and the move towards a streamlined social care system. As the current economic climate makes these people increasingly vulnerable, it is essential that these individuals have access to Independent Advocacy for support through any transition and beyond in dealing with local authorities.

### 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?

3.1 ILF is one example of support that has contributed to disabled people being able to live independent lives and be active citizens. The SIAA would like to see the funds transferred to a new independent trust that continues to use it to support independent living initiatives.

3.2 As the Scottish Government will be working to ensure that any new fund is sustainable and has a positive impact upon peoples' lives, we would suggest the need to focus on sustainable outcomes, or outcomes which are likely to continue if funding ceases or is withdrawn. We feel that this can be done most effectively by adopting person centred approaches in agreeing, developing and reviewing outcomes with ongoing support through Independent Advocacy and natural networks.

#### Question 4

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

4.1 The SIAA believe that one way in which the money could be increased is by reallocating funding that individuals can access through initiatives such as *Healthy Living, Access to Work*, etc. If ILF is meant to enable people to live more meaningful, independent lives than these other funds could be harnessed to reduce the number of organisations providing support, prevent the duplication of support and focus more on sustainable outcomes.

#### 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?

5.1 In order to ensure equal access to funds, we suggest that resource allocation be done through a comprehensive independent assessment process which includes the individual and carers and independent advocates where applicable.

5.2 The SIAA feel strongly that any new fund should support those individuals who have the greatest need and that this should not be influenced by the need for longer term funding for individuals who may need ongoing support because of multiple complex needs.

5.3 We feel that resources should be allocated according to the period of time that this funding is likely to be needed for. This could be considered in terms of one off, short term, medium term or long term funding depending upon individual circumstances and outcomes.

#### Question 6

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

6.1 The SIAA believe that Option 4: A New Independent

Partnership and/or Trust would be the best as it offers the opportunity to co-produce a system with disabled people at the centre. We do not think that local authorities would be able to deliver a new fund consistently throughout Scotland, feel that the Scottish Government would be a costly option with the conflict of interest in setting strategic policy whilst fulfilling a delivery role and are not aware of any one Scottish Agency or Non-Departmental Public Body well placed enough in Scotland to ensure the desired consistency of approach.

6.2 This independent option would also be more appropriate if funding from alternative funds were to be transferred.

### 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.

7.1 In order to ensure that individuals are treated equally and fairly we believe that:

- All independent assessors are given training and understand what independent living is, are aware of equality issues and are committed to supporting individuals to attain sustainable, valued outcomes through person centred approaches.
- Individuals with communication difficulties and/or profound and multiple disabilities are not further marginalised because of the need for additional resources.
- Individuals are not disadvantaged by access criteria such as Personal Independence Payments or being in receipt of the higher rate of Disability Living Allowance.
- Individuals are able to have families and carers contribute to assessment, planning and review when it is agreed.
- Individuals should be signposted and have access to Independent Advocacy if there is an expressed desire or recommendation.
- That individuals have accessible information and simple process guidelines for registering concerns, lodging complaints or making appeals.