

ILF Working Group Final Report and Recommendations

Introduction and Background

1. This paper is the final report of the Independent Living Fund (ILF) Working Group containing its recommendations for Scottish Ministers on the policy to open up the ILF to new users, as agreed at its final meeting on 11 November 2016
2. As set out in the Remit and Terms of Reference (**ILFWG-09(2016) – As Agreed**), the ILF Working Group is a working group of co-production partners with an advisory remit, which convened to develop the policy options for opening the ILF to new users in Scotland, with new funding of £5 million committed from Scottish Government to do this.
3. The Working Group met from April to November 2016 with membership drawn from the key stakeholder interests including disabled people's organisations, local authorities, and representative bodies (including disability organisations and carers). The Group additionally included members who have direct knowledge and understanding of living with an impairment with high support needs, as a disabled person and as a carer. The full **membership** of the Group is included at **Annex A**.

4. The aim of the Working Group was to co-produce recommendations to advise Ministers on the policy to open the ILF to new users, including the eligibility criteria for new applications; and in doing so bear in mind that this policy should be affordable, within the available monies from Scottish Government (£5 million per year), and sustainable for the longer term.

Existing ILF and new ILF schemes

5. In March 2014, the UK Government announced the closure of the UK ILF from 30 June 2015, with funding for ILF support for disabled people passing to the devolved administrations and to local authorities in England. The Scottish Government committed to continuing those ILF payments to existing recipients, by establishing a new Scottish ILF and setting up a new body to administer this.

6. The existing £47.2 million ILF scheme was transferred to ILF Scotland from 1 July 2015. It currently supports more than 2,600⁽¹⁾ disabled people in Scotland, who have high support needs, to choose to live in their communities and live independent lives. ILF Scotland provides discretionary cash payments (on average £360 per week) to recipients to enable them to purchase care or support from an agency or pay wages of a privately employed personal assistant. The existing ILF scheme is an 'award for life', with payments continuing to be made to individual recipients, as long as they remain eligible.

⁽¹⁾2,649 Scottish recipients at 30 September 2016

7. At the same time as announcing the continuance of the existing ILF scheme for existing recipients in Scotland, the Scottish Government committed an additional £5 million a year of new money for new ILF awards. The £5 million available is a small sum, relative to the size of the current fund budget. Therefore, an early consideration for the Working Group was that reopening the ILF to new users on the same basis as the existing ILF scheme, was not a viable option (see paragraph 15 within the discussion below). The new ILF scheme, as considered by the Working Group, is therefore proposed as a distinct and separate fund to the existing ILF scheme. The shape and purpose of the new ILF scheme is the subject of the recommendations in this report.

Considerations

8. As part of the Working Group's first considerations, the Group produced and agreed a set of **Options Appraisal Parameters** for Opening the ILF to New Users. These Parameters are included at **Annex B**. The Parameters have been used by the Working Group to develop and appraise the policy options for the new ILF scheme. They acted as principles for the new policy against which the options were assessed to see how well they would deliver the desired outcome. This has assisted with the identification of the final recommendations within this paper.

9. The Group considered the policy options for the new ILF scheme, drawing on the emergent themes from the responses to the Scottish Government consultation 'on the future use of resources devolved following the UK Government's decision to close the ILF', held in 2013, together with the learning from various reviews and reports provided as

background to the work. This was then developed into a discussion paper for the ILF new scheme engagement events with disabled people, which in turn contributed to the formation of the Working Group's recommendations as set out in this report.

10. ILF Scotland organised and ran the series of ILF new scheme stakeholder co-production engagement events across Scotland to inform the Group's work. Eleven events were held, providing direct feedback from more than 270 disabled people, carers, organisations and wider interested stakeholders. Additionally a separate event was held in collaboration with Social Work Scotland, attended by local authority practitioners; and a formal written response was received from stakeholders in the Western Isles. The report from the stakeholder events has been published on the ILF Scotland website.

11. The Group's actions have included: thorough debate over the policy options for the new ILF scheme; consideration of the detailed feedback from the stakeholder events; noting of advice relating to the analytical information available; and consideration of advice from practitioners in relation to service mapping for the policy options that were tabled. All of this work was considered in the context of the Group's Parameters for the new scheme, and the results of these deliberations are the Working Group's final recommendations.

Next Steps

12. The Working Group's report and recommendations contain a high level identification of the considerations for a new ILF scheme. This is the start of a process which will require further exploration for the development and delivery of the new scheme in the short and longer term, in co-production with partners. Recommendations concerning the implementation of the new scheme are included within the discussion below.

Co-production Process

13. As stated above, the Working Group was the mechanism through which advice was developed in co-production, for the policy to open the ILF to new users. The co-production definitions, as tabled and discussed at the first Working Group meeting are included at **Annex C**. The members of the Group were the co-production partners who developed the recommendations contained within this report, working as equals, co-producing from the start and working together to achieve an outcome. Integral to the overall process were the stakeholder events, as described in paragraph 10.

14. The Group worked collaboratively through this inclusive and participatory co-productive approach, which was constantly modified in response to feedback from members. At the end of the process, members identified that the co-production approach had worked well and this was seen as a potentially helpful example of the model which might be useful to share more widely with colleagues across Scottish Government and elsewhere.

Discussion

Reopening the previous ILF scheme

15. The Working Group considers that reopening the existing ILF scheme to new users on the same basis of the criteria for the 'Group 2' ILF scheme (which closed in 2010) is not a viable option. This has been ruled out as an approach which is incompatible with the Parameters for opening the new fund, especially given the limitations of the £5 million of new funding available.

A broad and discretionary new ILF scheme that supports independent living outcomes

16. The Working Group's preference is that the new ILF scheme should be broad and discretionary, within the confines of clear eligibility criteria and is aimed at supporting independent living (see definitions of independent living included within **Annex B**). The new scheme should also be outcomes based and 'person-led'.

17. 'Person-led' means that, as well as the use of funding being tailored to and prioritising the specific needs of the individual (person-centred), the process itself also maximises the individual's choice and control. For example, this may mean providing access to information, additional support and advocacy to ensure that their voice is heard above those of other stakeholders such as professionals or carers. In essence, it means that they can exercise as much control as they are willing and able to assume over the entire process, including application, assessment, and implementation.

Recommendation 1

The new ILF scheme should be broad and discretionary, within the confines of clear eligibility criteria, is aimed at supporting independent living, is outcomes based, and is person-led.

Interaction with services provided by statutory agencies and other non-statutory organisations

18. The new ILF scheme should be additional and complementary to services provided by statutory agencies and other non-statutory organisations. It is not the role of the new scheme to replace existing statutory services, or substitute for delivery of their wider duties for provision of social care.

19. The Group notes that in many cases, cooperation with agencies such as local authorities might be crucial for providing a successful intervention via ILF support and ensuring that an individual has appropriate sustained support over the longer term. This would depend on how to deliver the best outcome for the individual. Where a partnership is necessary (i.e. in the best interests of the individual disabled person, as defined by them), then a partnership approach should be followed, with the agreement of the individual. Therefore, depending on the needs of the individual, a partnership approach involving relevant statutory agencies might be part of the overall provision of ILF support. However provision of ILF support in itself should not be dependent on the input of a statutory authority.

20. The aspiration for the application process for the new ILF scheme is that it should seek to establish whether the funding that is being sought would not otherwise be provided by a statutory authority or existing non-statutory organisation. The Working Group acknowledges, however, that there may be practical difficulties in ensuring this approach.

21. The new ILF scheme should have the flexibility to be reviewed and changed in the context of future changes impacting on the wider Scottish policy landscape; including the devolution of social security powers and health and social care integration.

Recommendation 2

The new ILF scheme should be additional and complementary to services provided by statutory agencies and other non-statutory organisations.

Recommendation 3

Dependent on the needs of the individual, a partnership approach, involving relevant statutory agencies might be part of the overall provision of ILF support. However, it is important to deliver the best possible outcome for the individual, and provision of support in itself should not be dependent on the input of a statutory authority.

Recommendation 4

The new ILF scheme should have the flexibility to be reviewed in the context of future changes impacting on the wider Scottish policy landscape.

Eligibility Criteria

22. Use of the new fund should be outcomes focused and based on individual needs, as defined by the individual, with provision of information, additional support and advocacy as required. The list of areas that could be supported by the fund should not be overly prescriptive, and the fund should be discretionary and flexible enough to tailor to individual needs and outcomes, within the confines of agreed eligibility criteria.

23. There should be age based eligibility criteria, set within the range of age 15 to state pension age. The actual age criteria that are applied should be relevant to the selection of the priority areas for phased implementation, discussed within paragraphs 40 to 43 below.

24. Access to the new ILF scheme should depend on there being evidence of disability or impairment. The Working Group acknowledges that receipt of the care component (at any rate) of Disability Living Allowance (DLA) or Personal Independence Payment (PIP) (or a future replacement Scottish benefit) may be considered as a means to verify evidence of disability. However this is not the only method of doing so, and other ways of doing this should be considered.

25. Existing levels of local authority support should not be a condition of eligibility for the new ILF scheme.

Recommendation 5

Use of the new fund should be outcomes focused and based on individual needs, as defined by the individual, with information, additional support and advocacy provided as required.

Recommendation 6

The list of areas that could be supported by the fund should not be overly prescriptive, and the fund should be discretionary and flexible enough to tailor to individual needs and outcomes, within the confines of agreed eligibility criteria.

Recommendation 7

There should be age based eligibility criteria for the new scheme. The actual age criteria that are applied should be relevant to the selection of the priority areas for phased implementation (outlined within paragraphs 40 to 43 below).

Recommendation 8

Access to the new ILF scheme should depend on there being evidence of disability or impairment. Receipt of the care component (at any rate) of Disability Living Allowance (DLA) or Personal Independence Payment (PIP) (or a future replacement Scottish benefit) may be considered as a means to verify evidence of disability. However this is not the only method of doing so, and other ways of doing this should be considered.

Recommendation 9

Local authority support should not be a condition of eligibility for the new ILF scheme.

Minimum and Maximum Awards

26. The new ILF scheme should not have a minimum level of award.

27. The new ILF scheme should have a maximum level of award, in order to allow as many people as possible to benefit from the fund.

Recommendation 10

The new ILF scheme should not have a minimum level of award.

Recommendation 11

The new ILF scheme should have a maximum level of award.

Reapplications

28. There should be the possibility of reapplications to the new ILF scheme. However new applications that meet the criteria for award should be prioritised (i.e. assuming that there are applications from individuals who present a similar level of need, it is the new applicant who should be prioritised).

Recommendation 12

There should be the possibility of reapplications to the new ILF scheme. However new applications that meet the criteria for award should be prioritised.

Constraints and Limitations for the new ILF scheme

29. The Working Group acknowledges the limitations of the £5 million per year available for the new ILF scheme, and therefore recognises that there is a need to prioritise support by narrowing the population that might be supported under the policy.

30. The Group notes that amongst all of the areas that might be supported by the new ILF scheme, there is potential for overlap with other services, particularly those delivered by statutory agencies.

31. The Group also notes that there are currently many unknowns in how a new ILF scheme might operate, due to an overall existing lack of data to indicate the numbers that might seek to access a new scheme. This is therefore a delivery risk for the long term financial sustainability of the new ILF scheme which will need to be managed and mitigated.

Time Limits

32. Due to the constraints of the available funding, outlined in paragraphs 29 to 31, including the need to ensure long term financial sustainability of the new ILF scheme, ILF awards should be time limited, with a defined end date that is linked to defined outcomes.

Recommendation 13

Awards under the new ILF scheme should be time limited, with a defined end date that is linked to defined outcomes.

Phased implementation of the new ILF scheme

33. Due to the constraints and limitations outlined in paragraphs 29 to 31, the Working Group recommends that the new ILF scheme should be implemented in a '**phased**' way.

34. The initial phasing for implementation should focus on a defined cohort, demographic or focus for the fund.

35. Phasing would also help to manage people's expectations for the new scheme.

36. Evaluation should be built into the approach from the start. The impact of the policy on supporting disabled people to achieve independent living should be measurable and the opportunity to learn and adjust is integral to the phased implementation approach.

37. The initial phase for implementation should be reviewed after a defined period, taking into account a range of factors such as take up, how the fund is being used in practice, and the outcomes that are achieved for the individuals concerned.

38. Future phasing for the new ILF scheme should depend on the learning from the initial phase. This would provide the opportunity to focus on enabling additional cohorts to access the scheme, or making adjustments to promote sustainability.

39. Future policy development for ILF should be done in co-production with disabled people and carers, and in partnership with relevant organisations and agencies.

Recommendation 14

The new ILF scheme should be implemented in a 'phased' way.

Recommendation 15

Evaluation should be built into the approach from the start.

Recommendation 16

The initial phase for implementation should be reviewed after a defined period. Future phasing for the new ILF scheme should depend on the learning from the initial phase.

Recommendation 17

Implementation and future policy development for ILF should be done in co-production with disabled people and carers, and in partnership with relevant organisations and agencies.

Phased implementation priorities

40. The Group have identified 4 priority areas for phased implementation of the new ILF scheme:

- Area 1 – To support discharge from residential, nursing or long stay hospital care back into the local community or local area
- Area 2 – To support the transitions from child to adult supports
- Area 3 – To support an individual to move out of the family home into an independent living setting
- Area 4 – To support a disabled adult who becomes a new parent, or to support with parenting

41. From this list, the Group considered Areas 2 and 3 to be the strongest candidates for the initial phases of the implementation of the new ILF scheme. The Group identify the need to target a single area for the first phase of implementation and agreed that this should focus on Area 2, supporting the transitions from child to adult supports. This selection was based on the factors outlined above, including a comparatively easily defined, relatively narrowly drawn cohort, sufficient existing data to be able to gauge possible take-up, and thus the comparative ease of being able to manage expectations and promote sustainability.

42. Although they were not able to identify this priority area for the first phase, the Group were also very supportive of Area 3, to support an individual to move out of their family home into an independent living setting. However, the Group noted that a further evidence base was needed both on the numbers that could be supported and the kinds of interventions which would be effective and sustainable. The Group therefore considered that further work should be done to gather such

evidence to establish a clearer idea of likely demand and potential use. The Group agreed that it would be desirable for this work to proceed in parallel with the implementation of Area 2, so that that this might enable Area 3 to be prioritised for the next implementation phase.

43. The Group additionally noted that if Area 2 is targeted for the first phase of implementation, that there may be some young disabled people who might seek to move out of their family home as part of the independent living outcomes for which they seek support. Provided they meet the eligibility criteria, those individuals could potentially apply for this support from an Area 2 focused ILF scheme. This might provide an opportunity to test the viability of a scheme that is able to support disabled people to move home, provided that this is tested within the boundaries of a scheme that supports child to adult transitions overall.

Recommendation 18

The 4 priority areas for phased implementation of the new ILF scheme should be:

- Area 1 – To support discharge from residential, nursing or long stay hospital care back into the local community or local area
- Area 2 – To support the transitions from child to adult supports
- Area 3 – To support an individual to move out of the family home into an independent living setting
- Area 4 – To support a disabled adult who becomes a new parent, or to support with parenting

Recommendation 19

From the list of priority areas, Areas 2 and 3 should be the focus of the initial phases of implementation of the new ILF scheme. The very first phase of implementation should focus on Area 2 – supporting the transitions from child to adult supports.

Recommendation 20

Further work should be done to gather evidence regarding the potential implementation of Area 3 – supporting an individual to move out of their family home into an independent living setting – with a view to identifying whether this area should be the subject of the next implementation phase.

Communication of the outputs from the ILF Working Group

44. The Working Group's report should be made publically available in a range of accessible formats and communicated to those who have contributed to the Group's work, including the attendees who participated in the ILF Scotland run engagement events.

Recommendation 21

The Working Group's report should be made publically available in a range of accessible formats and communicated to those who have contributed to the Group's work, including the attendees who participated in the ILF Scotland run engagement events.

Summary of Recommendations

A broad and discretionary ILF scheme that supports independent living outcomes

- **Recommendation 1** – The new ILF scheme should be broad and discretionary, within the confines of clear eligibility criteria, is aimed at supporting independent living, is outcomes based, and is person-led.

Interaction with services provided by statutory agencies and other non-statutory organisations

- **Recommendation 2** – The new ILF scheme should be additional and complementary to services provided by statutory agencies and other non-statutory organisations.
- **Recommendation 3** – Dependent on the needs of the individual, a partnership approach, involving relevant statutory agencies might be part of the overall provision of ILF support. However, it is important to deliver the best possible outcome for the individual, and provision of support in itself should not be dependent on the input of a statutory authority.
- **Recommendation 4** – The new ILF scheme should have the flexibility to be reviewed in the context of future changes impacting on the wider Scottish policy landscape.

Eligibility Criteria

- **Recommendation 5** – Use of the new fund should be outcomes focused and based on individual needs, as defined by the individual, with information, additional support and advocacy provided as required.
- **Recommendation 6** – The list of areas that could be supported by the fund should not be overly prescriptive, and the fund should be discretionary and flexible enough to tailor to individual needs and outcomes, within the confines of agreed eligibility criteria.
- **Recommendation 7** – There should be age based eligibility criteria for the new scheme. The actual age criteria that are applied should be relevant to the selection of the priority areas for phased implementation (outlined within paragraphs 39 to 42 below).
- **Recommendation 8** – Access to the new ILF scheme should depend on there being evidence of disability or impairment. Receipt of the care component (at any rate) of Disability Living Allowance (DLA) or Personal Independence Payment (PIP) (or a future replacement Scottish benefit) may be considered as a means to verify evidence of disability. However this is not the only method of doing so, and other ways of doing this should be considered.

- **Recommendation 9** – Local authority support should not be a condition of eligibility for the new ILF scheme.

Minimum and Maximum Awards

- **Recommendation 10** – The new ILF scheme should not have a minimum level of award.
- **Recommendation 11** – The new ILF scheme should have a maximum level of award.

Reapplications

- **Recommendation 12** – There should be the possibility of reapplications to the new ILF scheme. However new applications that meet the criteria for award should be prioritised.

Time limits

- **Recommendation 13** – Awards under the new ILF scheme should be time limited, with a defined end date that is linked to defined outcomes.

Phased implementation of the new ILF scheme

- **Recommendation 14** – The new ILF scheme should be implemented in a 'phased' way.

- **Recommendation 15** – Evaluation should be built into the approach from the start.
- **Recommendation 16** – The initial phase for implementation should be reviewed after a defined period. Future phasing for the new ILF scheme should depend on the learning from the initial phase.
- **Recommendation 17** – Implementation and future policy development for ILF should be done in co-production with disabled people and carers, and in partnership with relevant organisations and agencies.

Phased implementation priorities

- **Recommendation 18** – The 4 priority areas for phased implementation of the new ILF scheme should be:
 - Area 1 – To support discharge from residential, nursing or long stay hospital care back into the local community or local area
 - Area 2 – To support the transitions from child to adult supports
 - Area 3 – To support an individual to move out of the family home into an independent living setting
 - Area 4 – To support a disabled adult who becomes a new parent, or to support with parenting

- **Recommendation 19** – From the list of priority areas, Areas 2 and 3 should be the focus of the initial phases of implementation of the new ILF scheme. The very first phase of implementation should focus on Area 2 – supporting the transitions from child to adult supports.
- **Recommendation 20** – Further work should be done to gather evidence regarding the potential implementation of Area 3 – supporting an individual to move out of their family home into an independent living setting – with a view to identifying whether this area should be the subject of the next implementation phase.

Communication of the outputs from the ILF Working Group

- **Recommendation 21** – The Working Group’s report should be made publically available in a range of accessible formats and communicated to those who have contributed to the Group’s work, including the attendees who participated in the ILF Scotland run engagement events.

Annex A

Membership of the ILF Working Group

Name	Organisation	Representing	Nominated alternate
Dr Maureen Bruce (Co-chair) (until 23 August meeting)	Scottish Government	Scottish Government	
Jamie MacDougall (Co-chair) (from 30 September meeting)	Scottish Government	Scottish Government	
Peter Scott (Co-chair)	ILF Scotland	ILF Scotland	
Susan Douglas-Scott	ILF Scotland	ILF Scotland	
Margaret Simpson MBE	Scottish Borders Social Enterprise Chamber	Disabled people and ILF recipients (individual)	
Jenny Miller	PAMIS	Voluntary sector – representing people with profound and multiple learning disability and their families	
Christine Farquhar	Upward Mobility	Carers and ILF recipients (individual)	
Garrick Smyth	COSLA	Local Government	
Layla Theiner	Disability Agenda Scotland	Voluntary sector – representing people with disabilities	

Name	Organisation	Representing	Nominated alternate
Chris Creegan	Scottish Commission for Learning Disability	Voluntary sector – representing people with learning disabilities	
Etienne d'Aboville	Glasgow Centre for Inclusive Living	Disabled People's Organisations	
Lucinda Godfrey	Dundee Carers Centre	Voluntary sector – representing carers	Meg Marr
Hope Craig	Trainee Solicitor	Disabled people (individual)	
Dr Sally Witcher OBE	Inclusion Scotland	Disabled People's Organisations	
Susan Grasekamp (until 1 July meeting)	Scottish Disability Equality Forum	Disabled People's Organisations	Morven Brooks
Morven Brooks (from 23 August meeting)	Scottish Disability Equality Forum	Disabled People's Organisations	
Ian Fricker	Self Directed Support Scotland and Disabled Person's Housing Service (Fife)	Disabled People's Organisations	
John Obrien	Partners for Inclusion	Voluntary sector – support organisation	
Margaret Petherbridge	Social Work Scotland	Social Work Profession in Local Authorities	Dina Scott

Annex B

Options Appraisal Parameters for Opening the ILF to New Users – As Agreed

Parameters

1. The policy advances disabled people's **Human Rights** and is based on the **social model** of disability (see definitions below).
2. The purpose of the policy is to support **independent living** (see definition below).
3. The policy should be person centred and outcomes based.
4. The policy should prioritise support for those with greatest need, as determined by the criteria.
5. The policy has transparent rules of eligibility and the application process is proportionate and easy to access.
6. The new policy enables equity of access within its defined criteria.
7. Awards under the policy are portable across Scotland.
8. The policy is capable of being viewed as making a positive contribution to independent living by disabled people and their carers.
9. The policy complements the existing Scottish policy landscape, for example Self-directed Support, Health-Social Care integration and devolution of welfare powers to the Scottish Parliament.
10. The policy provides additional resource which does not substitute for an existing service provision, care or source of funding.
11. The policy is able to be delivered over the longer term, from the committed funding of £5 million per year.

12. The policy should support independent living for sufficient numbers of disabled people to warrant the existence and administration of a distinct funding scheme.
13. The impact of the policy on supporting disabled people to achieve independent living should be measurable.
14. The policy can be delivered within the existing infrastructure and to the project timescales, and is cost effective to administer.

Definitions

Social Model of Disability

The individual/medical model of disability sees disability as an inevitable consequence of impairment. By contrast, within a **social model**, disability is seen as the disadvantage that people with impairments experience when they encounter avoidable physical, organisational, institutional or attitudinal barriers to independent living. This is the definition of the social model that will be used for the purposes of the Working Group's considerations.

Independent Living

Independent Living in Scotland (ILiS) definition

Independent living means all disabled people having the same freedom, choice, dignity and control as other citizens at home, at work and in the community. It does not necessarily mean living by yourself or fending for yourself. It means rights to practical assistance and support to participate in society and live an ordinary life².

Disability Research on Independent Living & Learning (DRILL) definition of Independent Living

All disabled people having the same choice, control, dignity and freedom as any other citizen to achieve their goals at home, in education, at work, and as members of the community. This does not necessarily mean disabled people doing things for themselves but it does mean

² Independent Living – A Shared Vision joint statement signed by the Scottish Government, COSLA, and the Independent Living in Scotland (ILiS) Steering Group 2009.

having the right to practical assistance based on their choices and aspirations

15 Rights for Independent Living

For the purposes of the Working Group's considerations, **independent living** is defined by the '15 Rights for Independent Living' as set out by Glasgow Disability Alliance in its *Manifesto for Action: an independent living strategy for Glasgow* (2013):

1. A decent income, including state benefits for those unable to work.
2. Accessible and adapted housing.
3. Personal assistance.
4. Accessible and readily available information.
5. Communication support.
6. Advocacy and working towards self advocacy.
7. Technical aids, equipment and technology.
8. Inclusive education and lifelong learning.
9. Equal opportunities for employment and training for work.
10. Accessible and inclusive healthcare provision.
11. Peer support including from disabled people and their organisations.
12. Full access to our environment.
13. Fully accessible and affordable transport.
14. Full social, civic and judicial participation.
15. Legal Rights and legal advice.

UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD)

The right to independent living is established in Article 19 of the UNCRPD:

Article 19 - Living independently and being included in the community

States Parties to this Convention recognize the equal right of all persons with disabilities to live in the community, with choices equal to others, and shall take effective and appropriate measures to facilitate full enjoyment by persons with disabilities of this right and their full inclusion and participation in the community, including by ensuring that:

- a. Persons with disabilities have the opportunity to choose their place of residence and where and with whom they live on an equal basis with others and are not obliged to live in a particular living arrangement;
- b. Persons with disabilities have access to a range of in-home, residential and other community support services, including personal assistance necessary to support living and inclusion in the community, and to prevent isolation or segregation from the community;
- c. Community services and facilities for the general population are available on an equal basis to persons with disabilities and are responsive to their needs.

Annex C

Definitions of Co-Production

What is co-production?

The definition of co-production we intend to use for the ILF Working Group work is:

“Understanding that people have skills, capabilities, knowledge and experience to contribute unleashes huge potential for co-producing better outcomes across public services.

“Co-production redefines the relationship between public service professionals and their clients, from dependency to mutuality and reciprocity. Citizen leadership is also based on these values.”

Source: Scottish Government: Self-Directed support: A National Strategy for Scotland (2010)

There are lots of definitions of co-production, but they usually talk about:

Working in partnership: the people responsible for developing or delivering something (for example, a service) work with the people who will eventually use it or be affected by it. They share their knowledge, skills and resources. They share responsibility for making the process and the end result successful.

Working as equals: the people working together in co-production (the 'co-production partners') are different. They do not have the same powers to act or limitations to what they can do. They have different knowledge, skills and resources. But they are all recognised to be equally important. In that way they are equal partners.

Co-producing from the start: people must work together from the very start. This means before important decisions are taken when as much as possible can still be influenced and changed.

Working together to achieve an outcome: at the start the partners agree what end result (or outcome) they all want to see. Then they work together to achieve it.

Source: Independent Living in Scotland Co-Production Toolkit (2012)

Rewards and risks

Rewards:	What could stop rewards from happening?
A better outcome for all	A better outcome for all will be hard to achieve if the partners don't really agree on the outcome they want to see. They each pull in different directions. They compete with each other rather than work together as partners.
Sharing knowledge leads to new, creative ideas	New, creative ideas will not happen if partners have a fixed idea of what would work. They are not willing to think about new ideas that might work. They don't really listen to each other or respect each other's ideas.
Better relationships between partners	Relationships will not get better if partners make wrong assumptions about each other. They behave in ways which increase distrust rather than build trust.

Source: Independent Living in Scotland Co-Production Toolkit (2012)