

Freedom of Information request 5197/2012

Received 31 December 2012
Published

Information request

On 31 December 2012 you asked:

*I asked the following questions and you gave the following replies.
I would like to clarify some issues please. I would very much like
this to be within 20 days. (follow on questions are below)*

Our Ref: VTR4594

- How many responses did you get to the ILF consultation.*
- How many Local Authorities responded?*
- How many said there was not enough information available to make a proper informed answer?*
- How many other organisations responded?*
- How many said there was not enough information to make an informed choice?*
- How many individual responses were there?*
- How many individual respondents said they disagreed with the proposed closure of ILF?*
- How many said there was not enough information to give an informed response?*

We have received around 2,000 responses. Duplicate submissions have meant that it is impossible to provide a definite figure.

We received 96 written responses from disabled people's and similar organisations, 78 from Local Authorities and 14 from other organisations. In addition, 88 representatives from 58 Local Authorities attended one of our consultation events.

401 ILF users, user representatives and support workers attended one of our consultation events. The remaining responses were submitted by individuals by post, email, online and by telephone.

The consultation on the future of the Independent Living Fund took the form of an open survey in which individuals and groups could submit responses in a free text format. The overwhelming majority of individuals and groups took advantage of this to provide lengthy, detailed and nuanced responses. The Government's response

to the consultation notes that 'A significant majority of individual respondents were opposed to the proposal', however 'A significant minority of users and carers said they would be happy for local authorities to take on responsibility for their care and support as long as their care packages remained unaltered'. It is not possible to provide meaningful statistics on how many responses held particular beliefs or raised particular arguments or opinions and it would require disproportionate time to substantiate similar comments on other issues.

Question 1. Are you saying that you don't know how many responses you actually had?

Question 2. Please list the organisations you describe as similar to a disabled people's organisation and others.

Question 3. Please define what you mean by a significant majority and a significant minority.

Question 4. Are you saying that you did not bother to analyse the results and what people said in their replies? If not why not?

DWP response

It is impossible to provide statistics on the support or opposition for the Government's proposals in response to the consultation on the future of the Independent Living Fund. Respondents were free to respond to the questions with any answer they wished and were not constrained to simple 'Yes' or 'No' answers. The overwhelming majority of respondents chose to provide longer responses with many expressing mixed feelings about the proposals or laying out conditions on which they would support it. Such responses cannot be simply categorised as 'supportive' or 'opposing' nor is it always clear when a respondent is intending to provide a 'mixed' response. As such, we will not misrepresent respondent's views by attempting to categorise their views in such a narrow way. Instead we have provided in the Government's response a qualitative assessment of the opinions and arguments expressed by respondents with a high level assessment of the strength and extent of support for them. It would be impossible to provide more precise assessments of this information without also potentially being misleading or misrepresenting of the views of respondents.

In accordance with the above explanation, we have described the proportion of individual respondents who were opposed to the proposal as a 'significant majority' because in assessing the responses it was clear that the proportion that fell within this category must be higher than 50% even allowing for interpretation.

We have described the proportion of individual respondents who supported the proposal as a 'significant minority' because in assessing the responses it was clear that the proportion that fell within this category must be lower than 50%, but which nevertheless represented a substantial proportion of the overall responses.

The organisations which were referred to as 'disabled people's and similar organisations' in our previous response are as follows. We had described them as such so as to not infringe on groups right to define themselves.

- Action Disability Kensington and Chelsea
- All Wales Forum of Parents and Carers of People with a Learning Disability
- All Wales People First
- Alliance
- Ashfield Developments and Accommodation
- Aspire
- Borders Voluntary Community Care Forum
- Bournemouth People First
- Breakthrough UK
- Bristol Disability Equality Forum
- Bristol Link
- Capability Scotland
- Carers Northern Ireland
- Carers Scotland
- Carers Support
- Carers UK
- Cartref Ni
- Centre for Independent Living Northern Ireland
- Cheshire Centre for Independent Living
- Choices Advocacy
- Community Housing Cymru Group
- Cornerstone
- Cymorth Cymru
- Darlington Association on Darlington
- Deafblind UK
- Disability Action
- Disability Cornwall
- Disability in Camden
- Disability Law Service
- Disability Rights UK
- Disability Wales
- Disabled People Against Cuts
- Disabled People Against Cuts North East
- Diverse Cymru
- Enable Scotland
- Enfield Disability Action
- Enham

- Ex-ILF Contact Officer Group
- Fforwm Anableddau Dysgu Sir Ddinbych
- Flintshire Forum for Learning Disabilities
- Fragile X Society
- Gateshead Access Panel
- Gateshead Link
- Glasgow Centre for Inclusive Living
- Greater Manchester Coalition of Disabled People
- Greenwich Association of Disabled People
- Hammersmith and Fulham Action on Disability
- Harrow Association of Disabled People
- Inclusion London
- Inclusion Scotland
- Independent Living Alternatives
- Independent Living in Scotland
- Learning Disability Alliance Scotland
- Learning Disability Wales
- Leicestershire Centre for Integrated Living
- Mencap
- Mencap Cymru
- Mochridhe
- Motor Neurone Disease Association
- MS Society
- Neath Porth Talbot Council for Voluntary Service
- Newlife
- NHS Lothian
- Nottinghamshire Disabled People's Movement
- Optua
- Oxfordshire Family Support Network
- PAMIS
- People First Sefton
- Physical Disability and Sensory Impairment
- Quarriers
- Real Life Options
- Rhondda Cynon Taff People First
- Richmond Users Independent Living Scheme
- RNIB
- Scope
- Scottish Consortium for Learning Disability
- Scottish Independent Advocacy Alliance
- Sefton Advocacy
- Self Directed Support Scotland
- Sense
- Sense Scotland
- Sheffield Centre for Independent Living
- Society for Mucopolysaccharide Diseases
- South East London Direct Action Network

- South Gloucester Link
- South Lanarkshire Self Directed Support
- South Yorkshire Centre for Independent Living
- Spinal Injuries Association
- Tai Pawb
- Thurrock Coalition
- United Response
- Walsingham
- West of England Centre for Independent Living
- Weston and North Somerset DIAL
- Wiltshire Centre for Independent Living
- X by X Bromley Mencap