



**Money Matters -
Additional Savings 2018/19 – 2020/21
Cabinet January 2018**

www.lancashire.gov.uk

	Contents	Page
1	CYP023 – SGO PAYMENTS	3
2	CYP025 – SECTION 17 PAYMENTS	17
3	COM002c – ASSET MANAGEMENT	31
4	COM002d – ASSET MANAGEMENT	33
5	LD001 – CENTRAL GATEWAY FUND (VCFS)	36
6	LD011 – LOCAL INITIATIVE FUND	47
7	FR006 – EARLY PAYMENTS INITIATIVE	59
8	CMTY007 – RESIDUAL WASTE	61
9	CMTY022 – LMCR RESOURCE BUDGET	63
10	CMTY030 – BUS STOP INFORMATION AND PUBLICITY MATERIAL	65
11	PH007 – SUBSTANCE MISUSE	67
12	ASC028 – LEARNING, DISABILITY & AUTISM RESIDENTIAL REVIEWS	69
13	CAS003 – CUSTOMER ACCESS SERVICE	84
14	CAS006 – CUSTOMER ACCESS SERVICE	96
15	CAS007 – CUSTOMER ACCESS SERVICE	111

CYP023 – SPECIAL GUARDIANSHIP ORDER PAYMENTS

Service Name:	Special Guardianship Order (SGO) Payments		
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2018/19, 2019/20 or 2020/21	2018/19		
Gross budget 2017/18	£5.934m		
Income 2017/18	£0.000m		
Net budget 2017/18	£5.934m		
Savings Target and Profiling (discrete year):			
2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m
-0.120	-0.397	-0.673	-1.190
FTE implications:			
2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
<i>1.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>	<i>1.00</i>
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	<p>Agree to review the Special Guardianship Order (SGO) policy to consider deducting child tax credit (the additional entitlement that is a result of the securing an order on the said child) from the baseline means-test allowance that is awarded to a guardian.</p> <p>This will apply to new applicants and existing guardians where applicant is eligible for child tax credit.</p> <p>To apply the revised policy to new applications with effect from 1st April 2018, and to implement a rolling re-assessment programme for existing Guardians from that date.</p> <p>This policy has been adopted by a number of other North West authorities.</p>		
Impact upon service	<p>Allowances are currently paid for c.900 children and young people. Approximately 250 financial assessments are undertaken, and c.132 new Special Guardianship Orders with allowances are granted per annum.</p> <p>Children's Social Care (CSC) workers collate information to complete the means-test financial assessment, and forms are overseen by Exchequer Services prior to a Special Guardianship Order application, support plan and financial offer being presented in Court.</p>		

	<p>This proposal will require CSC to have evidence of the additional child tax credit entitlement either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Prior to the Court hearing, to present the correct allowance, or - After the Order is granted, once the revised benefit entitlement has been awarded, to facilitate a reassessment to the correct allowance rate. <p>The service must adhere to strict court timescales and therefore gathering additional information will impact on resources. It is proposed that a Financial Assessment post be established (adopted by a number of authorities including Manchester and Wigan) at Grade 6, consistent with similar roles currently in Exchequer Services.</p> <p>Prospective guardians may need additional support to understand their entitlement, particularly for those not currently in receipt of benefits but who may be entitled if an Order is granted. The benefits rules are complex, particularly in light of the roll-out of Universal Credit. This expertise will need to be drawn on from outside of Children's Social Care and therefore an assessment is required as to whether the support could be absorbed within existing resource.</p> <p>Upon granting of an Order a child or young person ceases to be looked after. The Authority is no longer the corporate parent and Children's Social Care statutory intervention differs. Therefore there is an impact on both social worker resource and on placement costs of a child or young person being looked after rather than being subject to Special Guardianship Order. There could be resultant pressure on social care services if guardians perceive the change in policy will have a negative financial impact.</p>
<p>Actions needed to deliver the target savings</p>	<p>Seek legal advice in relation to applying the revised financial assessment for existing Guardians.</p> <p>Cabinet Member approval to apply adjusted financial assessment.</p> <p>Notify (in writing) all existing Guardians of the intention to undertake a financial reassessment. This will in essence be a reminder to Guardians as they should have received this information when the Order was awarded.</p> <p>Assess/identify the resource required (existing or additional) to (1) provide benefit entitlement advice to prospective guardians, (2) evidence additional entitlement to inform the</p>

	financial assessment and (3) undertake a programme of reassessment in relation to existing allowances
What are the risks associated with this saving and how will they be mitigated	<p>Existing guardians may request that an Order is revoked, and prospective guardians may be deterred from progressing an application, if the financial assessment is perceived to result in a reduction of income, they may have otherwise received if the tax credit was not removed.</p> <p>Welfare reforms 2017 – Rollout of Universal Credit. The authority will need to understand how the changes will impact on this proposal</p> <p>Mitigations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - specialist advice in place to help carers access benefits they are entitled to (internal or via signposting to external support services) - Reassessment to be reviewed on a case by case basis, with discretion applied where appropriate.

What does this service deliver?

The legal framework for special guardianship:

The Adoption and Children Act 2002 provides the legal framework for special guardianship under the Children Act 1989.

A Special Guardianship Order is an order appointing a person or persons to be a child's special guardian. Applications may be made by an individual or jointly by two or more people to become special guardians.

The special guardian will have parental responsibility for the child. Subject to any later order, the special guardian may exercise parental responsibility to the exclusion of all others with parental responsibility, apart from another special guardian.

Where children were previously looked after prior to the making of a Special Guardianship Order, Children's Social Care have a duty to assess and support and this includes financial support. Carers can also request the Local Authority assess them as a Special Guardian if they are caring for a child who is not theirs. These cases are less common.

Local Authorities have a duty to assess and support and must consider comparison to foster care payments.

Section 4

Equality Analysis Toolkit

CYP023: SGO Payments
For Decision Making Items

January 2018

What is the Purpose of the Equality Decision-Making Analysis?

The Analysis is designed to be used where a decision is being made at Cabinet Member or Overview and Scrutiny level or if a decision is being made primarily for budget reasons. The Analysis should be referred to on the decision making template (e.g. E6 form).

When fully followed this process will assist in ensuring that the decision-makers meet the requirement of section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 to have due regard to the need: to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation or other unlawful conduct under the Act; to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

Having due regard means analysing, at each step of formulating, deciding upon and implementing policy, what the effect of that policy is or may be upon groups who share these protected characteristics defined by the Equality Act. The protected characteristics are: age, disability, gender reassignment, race, sex, religion or belief, sexual orientation or pregnancy and maternity – and in some circumstances marriage and civil partnership status.

It is important to bear in mind that "due regard" means the level of scrutiny and evaluation that is reasonable and proportionate in the particular context. That means that different proposals, and different stages of policy development, may require more or less intense analysis. Discretion and common sense are required in the use of this tool.

It is also important to remember that what the law requires is that the duty is fulfilled in substance – not that a particular form is completed in a particular way. It is important to use common sense and to pay attention to the context in using and adapting these tools.

This process should be completed with reference to the most recent, updated version of the Equality Analysis Step by Step Guidance (to be distributed) or EHRC guidance at

<http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/private-and-public-sector-guidance/public-sector-providers/public-sector-equality-duty>

This toolkit is designed to ensure that the section 149 analysis is properly carried out, and that there is a clear record to this effect. The Analysis should be completed in a timely, thorough way and should inform the whole of the decision-making process. It must be considered by the person making the final decision and must be made available with other documents relating to the decision.

The documents should also be retained following any decision as they may be requested as part of enquiries from the Equality and Human Rights Commission or Freedom of Information requests.

Specific advice on completing the Equality Analysis and advice, support and training on the Equality Duty and its implications is available from the County Equality and Cohesion Team by contacting:

Jeanette Binns (Equality and Cohesion Manager) at
Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk

Name/Nature of the Decision

Reduce financial support from the County Council attached to Special Guardianship Orders who meet the threshold for social care assessment and support.

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

The proposal is to review the Special Guardianship Order (SGO) policy and consider deducting child tax credit (the additional entitlement that is a result of the securing an order on the said child) from the baseline means-test allowance that is awarded to a guardian. This is proposed to apply to New Applicants and existing Guardians where applicant is eligible for child tax credit.

This is in accordance with DFE guidelines and regulation 13 (Statutory guidance for local authorities on the Special Guardianship Regulations 2005 (as amended by the Special Guardianship (Amendment) Regulations 2016)).

Is the decision likely to affect people across the county in a similar way or are specific areas likely to be affected – e.g. are a set number of branches/sites to be affected? If so you will need to consider whether there are equality related issues associated with the locations selected – e.g. greater percentage of BME residents in a particular area where a closure is proposed as opposed to an area where a facility is remaining open.

The decision will effect individuals equally across the county.

Those that would be effected are the cohort of:

- Current SGO carers whose financial allowance might reduce as a result of financial reassessment.
- Perspective SGO carers who are likely to receive less financial support from LCC in the future.

The expectation is that this additional support is claimed from other sources such as DWP.

Could the decision have a particular impact on any group of individuals sharing protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010, namely:

- Age
- Disability including Deaf people
- Gender reassignment
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race/ethnicity/nationality
- Religion or belief
- Sex/gender
- Sexual orientation
- Marriage or Civil Partnership Status

In considering this question you should identify and record any particular impact on people in a sub-group of any of the above – e.g. people with a particular disability or from a particular religious or ethnic group.

It is particularly important to consider whether any decision is likely to impact adversely on any group of people sharing protected characteristics to a disproportionate extent. Any such disproportionate impact will need to be objectively justified.

Yes. Age – those under 18 years old or 21 who are disabled.

The proposal may impact young people who have been removed from the immediate family and placed with extended family under special guardianship. This is a vulnerable group who may have previously been subject to significant harm.

Current Special Guardians may relinquish the Order if payments to them were reduced, hence the child would become Looked After. This could result in a negative impact upon the child and carer.

If you have answered "Yes" to this question in relation to any of the above characteristics, – please go to Question 1.

If you have answered "No" in relation to all the protected characteristics, please briefly document your reasons below and attach this to the decision-making papers. (It goes without saying that if the lack of impact is obvious, it need only be very briefly noted.)

Question 1 – Background Evidence

What information do you have about the different groups of people who may be affected by this decision – e.g. employees or service users (you could use monitoring data, survey data, etc to compile this). As indicated above, the relevant protected characteristics are:

- Age
- Disability including Deaf people
- Gender reassignment/gender identity
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race/Ethnicity/Nationality
- Religion or belief
- Sex/gender
- Sexual orientation
- Marriage or Civil Partnership status (in respect of which the s. 149 requires only that due regard be paid to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment or victimisation or other conduct which is prohibited by the Act).

In considering this question you should again consider whether the decision under consideration could impact upon specific sub-groups e.g. people of a specific religion or people with a particular disability. You should also consider how the decision is likely to affect those who share two or more of the protected characteristics – for example, older women, disabled, elderly people, and so on.

The proposal has the potential to impact on all service users open to LCC and receiving and SGO payment.

Allowances are currently paid for around 900 children and young people. Approximately 250 financial assessments are undertaken, and around 132 new SGO's with allowances are granted per annum.

There are likely to be individuals with protected characteristics within the current cohort. There will also be individuals with protected categories who we are not aware of who will come through the process of assessment in the future.

Question 2 – Engagement/Consultation

How have you tried to involve people/groups that are potentially affected by your decision? Please describe what engagement has taken place, with whom and when. (Please ensure that you retain evidence of the consultation in case of any further enquiries. This includes the results of consultation or data gathering at any stage of the process)

Consultation has taken place through the DFE when Special Guardianship was reviewed 2016. The request to implement is in line with the statutory guidance 2005 which was revised 2016.

[Statutory guidance for local authorities on the Special Guardianship Regulations 2005 (as amended by the Special Guardianship (Amendment) Regulations 2016) Regulation 13]

There has been no consultation with existing SGO carers.

Question 3 – Analysing Impact

Could your proposal potentially disadvantage particular groups sharing any of the protected characteristics and if so which groups and in what way?

It is particularly important in considering this question to get to grips with the actual practical impact on those affected. The decision-makers need to know in clear and specific terms what the impact may be and how serious, or perhaps minor, it may be – will people need to walk a few metres further to catch a bus, or to attend school? Will they be cut off altogether from vital services? The answers to such questions must be fully and frankly documented, for better or for worse, so that they can be properly evaluated when the decision is made.

Could your proposal potentially impact on individuals sharing the protected characteristics in any of the following ways:

- Could it discriminate unlawfully against individuals sharing any of the protected characteristics, whether directly or indirectly; if so, it must be amended. Bear in mind that this may involve taking steps to meet the specific needs of disabled people arising from their disabilities.
- Could it advance equality of opportunity for those who share a particular protected characteristic? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so?
- Does it encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so?
- Will the proposal contribute to fostering good relations between those who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not, for example by tackling prejudice and promoting understanding? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so? Please identify any findings and how they might be addressed.

Current Special Guardians may relinquish the Order if payments to them were reduced, hence the child would become Looked After. This could result in a negative impact upon the child and carer.

If the status of the young person changes there is an impact on both social worker resource and on placement costs of a CYP being looked after rather than being subject to SGO. There could be resultant pressure on social care services if guardians perceive the change in policy will have a negative financial impact.

Carers might be less able to provide provision over and above a basic need which could include participation in public life.

The proposal could affect relationships with current service users in this cohort. This impact could be mitigated by:

- Only applying to new applicants.
- Provide ample notice to the change.

Question 4 –Combined/Cumulative Effect

Could the effects of your decision combine with other factors or decisions taken at local or national level to exacerbate the impact on any groups?

For example - if the proposal is to impose charges for adult social care, its impact on disabled people might be increased by other decisions within the County Council (e.g. increases in the fares charged for Community Transport and reductions in respite care) and national proposals (e.g. the availability of some benefits) . Whilst LCC cannot control some of these decisions, they could increase the adverse effect of the proposal. The LCC has a legal duty to consider this aspect, and to evaluate the decision, including mitigation, accordingly.

If Yes – please identify these.

Welfare Reforms and changes to universal credit could result in an exacerbated impact.

Question 5 – Identifying Initial Results of Your Analysis

As a result of your analysis have you changed/amended your original proposal?

Please identify how –

For example:

Adjusted the original proposal – briefly outline the adjustments

Continuing with the Original Proposal – briefly explain why

Stopped the Proposal and Revised it - briefly explain

No. The proposal is unchanged. This proposal is in line with statutory guidance.

Question 6 - Mitigation

Please set out any steps you will take to mitigate/reduce any potential adverse effects of your decision on those sharing any particular protected characteristic. It is

important here to do a genuine and realistic evaluation of the effectiveness of the mitigation contemplated. Over-optimistic and over-generalised assessments are likely to fall short of the “due regard” requirement.

Also consider if any mitigation might adversely affect any other groups and how this might be managed.

Mitigations:

- Specialist advice in place to help carers access benefits they are entitled to (internal or via signposting to external support services)
- Reassessment to be reviewed on a case by case basis, with discretion applied where appropriate.
- Give advanced notice to cohort effected
- Take and action any legal advice
- Exercise discretion which is referred to within the regulations allowing LA to step outside of the agreed arrangement

Question 7 – Balancing the Proposal/Countervailing Factors

At this point you need to weigh up the reasons for the proposal – e.g. need for budget savings; damaging effects of not taking forward the proposal at this time – against the findings of your analysis. Please describe this assessment. It is important here to ensure that the assessment of any negative effects upon those sharing protected characteristics is full and frank. The full extent of actual adverse impacts must be acknowledged and taken into account, or the assessment will be inadequate. What is required is an honest evaluation, and not a marketing exercise. Conversely, while adverse effects should be frankly acknowledged, they need not be overstated or exaggerated. Where effects are not serious, this too should be made clear.

There is a need to reduce expenditure and there would be a saving by implementing any of the Option as detailed in the budget option.

The proposal would apply to new applicants and existing Guardians where applicant is eligible for child tax credit.

SGO Statutory guidance states that it is important to ensure that special guardians are helped to access benefits to which they are entitled. Local authorities should therefore endeavour to ensure that the special guardian or prospective special guardian is aware of, and taking advantage of, all benefits and tax credits available to them. Financial support paid under these Regulations cannot duplicate any other payment available to the special guardian or prospective special guardian and regulation 13 provides that in determining the amount of any financial support, the local authority must take account of any other grant, benefit, allowance or resource which is available to the person in respect of his needs as a result of becoming a special guardian of the child.

The proposal is consistent with statutory guidance.

There may be challenge from Special Guardians who have possible being receiving the equivalent of the child tax credit from LCC and possibly claiming Child Tax Credit from DWP. We can provide some mitigation by supporting Guardians them to claim the benefit and to pay whilst awaiting benefit. Regulation 13 supports a decision to implement this proposal if there was a legal challenge.

We could implement this proposal immediately in relation to new applicants. 28 days' notice would need to be given to current applicants plus a further 28 days from the date they were advised that there would be a change to their payments.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

In summary, what is your final proposal and which groups may be affected and how?

The final proposal is to review the Special Guardianship Order (SGO) policy and deduct child tax credit (the additional entitlement that is a result of the securing an order on the said child) from the baseline means-test allowance that is awarded to a guardian. This is proposed to apply to New Applicants and existing Guardians where applicant is eligible for child tax credit.

This proposal is in accordance with DFE guidelines and regulation 13 (Statutory guidance for local authorities on the Special Guardianship Regulations 2005 (as amended by the Special Guardianship (Amendment) Regulations 2016).

The proposal has the potential to impact on all service users open to LCC and receiving and SGO payment.

Allowances are currently paid for around 900 children and young people. Approximately 250 financial assessments are undertaken, and around 132 new SGO's with allowances are granted per annum.

There are likely to be individuals with protected characteristics within the current cohort. There will also be individuals with protected categories who we are not aware of who will come through the process of assessment in the future.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

Describe what arrangements you will put in place to review and monitor the effects of your proposal.

The effect of the proposal will be monitored through ongoing review of the numbers of new SGO applications and SGOs in place.

Equality Analysis Prepared By Josephine Lee – Strategic Senior Manager (Childrens Social Care) / Dave Carr – Head of Service (Policy, Information and Commissioning)

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Service Head

Decision Signed Off By

Cabinet Member or Director

Please remember to ensure the Equality Decision Making Analysis is submitted with the decision-making report and a copy is retained with other papers relating to the decision.

For further information please contact:

Jeanette Binns – Equality & Cohesion Manager

Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk

Thank you

CYP025 – SECTION 17 PAYMENTS

Service Name:	Section 17 Payments		
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2018/19, 2019/20 or 2020/21	2018/19		
Gross budget 2017/18	£2.729m		
Income 2017/18	£0.000m		
Net budget 2017/18	£2.729m		
Savings Target and Profiling (discrete year):			
2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m
-0.350	0.000	0.000	-0.350
FTE implications:			
2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	<p>Agree to cease a range of payments made to children, families and carers under S17 of the Children's Act.</p> <p>Agree to review commissioning arrangements for support in the community, to assist children and families remaining together.</p>		
Impact upon service	<p>Children and Families may not receive interventions and support which would de-escalate/prevent escalation of needs. If not considered and managed carefully might increase Children Looked After numbers.</p> <p>There may be a resultant pressure on in-house and existing commissioned services to provide alternatives to the one-off interventions that have been purchased using Section 17 funding. Examples of services which are likely to see demand pressures include Crisis Fund, Supporting Housing for Complex Young People, Emotional Health and Wellbeing Commissioned Service.</p>		
Actions needed to deliver the target savings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess impact on the Prevention and Early Help Crisis Fund and whether this might provide mitigation in some circumstances (noting that Section 17 support is based on a statutory assessment and the Crisis Fund preventative). Assess whether the criteria for access to the Crisis Fund allows it to be accessed when a Child In Need 		

	<p>assessment has taken place and provision is based on statutory assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify all services which should be explicitly considered prior to making Section 17 payments and develop improved guidance for social workers. • Revise the current Section 17 Policy Statement. • Communicate/engage with Lancashire County Council Services and Partner organisations (particularly in respect of Crisis Fund, Emotional Health and Wellbeing Core Offer, Department for Works and Pensions and Housing Organisations) to ensure that there are clear pathways for families to access support from other existing agencies so that Section 17 payments are only made as a last resort. • Communicate with families that might be impacted. • Redesign Children's Social Care systems and processes to reflect proposed changes. • Implement new policy and embed within Practice. • Review Commissioning arrangements for community based interventions delivered in the home.
<p>What are the risks associated with this saving and how will they be mitigated</p>	<p>Risks include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in family breakdowns/crisis and subsequent increase in Children Looked After numbers and costs of fostering or residential care. • Greater pressure on prevention and early help third party commission for emotional health and wellbeing. • Increased pressure on internal resources. • Impact on Department for Work and Pensions who may be under increased pressure to process claims/resolve issues quickly. • Impact on District Council's where families present as homeless. • Pressure on LCC budgets for children and young people with complex needs and care leavers where children and young people present as homeless.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on partner organisations generally if family breakdowns / potential for crisis increases <p>Mitigations</p> <p>Review Section 17 payments and evidence of why this was the only option available following assessment of needs so that we can:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - better identify agencies who, with more forward planning, might have been able to provide the service / prevent issue arising under their statutory duties. - develop improved guidance for social workers to ensure that S17 payments are made only as a last resort <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Early engagement and development of clear pathways with wider LCC children's and families services (eg Welfare Rights and Family Information Service) and Partner organisations to ensure that alternative provision from existing resource is identified and accessed wherever possible • Clear approach to use of Crisis Fund and whether this might provide some mitigation in exceptional circumstances.
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

What does this service deliver?

The Section 17 budget forms part of Children's Social Care service and enables social workers to give assistance (either direct financial assistance or the purchase of goods and services) to help meet statutory assessed need.

In terms of the legal definition, the Children Act 1989, sets out the following definition of Section 17, Children in Need:

It should be the general duty of every Local Authority:-

- a) To safeguard and promote the welfare of children within their area who are in need.
- b) So far as is consistent with that duty to promote the upbringing of such children by their families by providing a large and level of services appropriate to those children's needs.

The services provided by the Local Authority in the exercise of functions conferred on them by this section may include (providing accommodation) and giving assistance in kind or, in exceptional circumstances, cash for the purposes of maintaining the welfare of the child (not the adult).

Before giving assistance a Local Authority shall have regard to the means of the child concerned and of each of his parents. No person shall be liable to make any repayment of assistance of its value at any time when he is in receipt of Income Support, Child Tax Credits, or any income based JSA or of any income related employment and support allowance.

Spend is made up of hundreds of individual transactions on items. Further work is needed to review/challenge each area but significant areas of categorised spend include accommodation, childcare provision, medicals, therapeutic interventions and payments to families/carers.

Other areas of spend include Clothing, Direct Payments, Financial Assistance, Flights, Taxis, Rail fares, Food, Furniture / White Goods, Holidays/Trips and more. Cumulative spend in this areas is significant.

Section 4

Equality Analysis Toolkit

**CYP025: Children's Social Care Section 17
Payments**

For Decision Making Items

January 2018

What is the Purpose of the Equality Decision-Making Analysis?

The Analysis is designed to be used where a decision is being made at Cabinet Member or Overview and Scrutiny level or if a decision is being made primarily for budget reasons. The Analysis should be referred to on the decision making template (e.g. E6 form).

When fully followed this process will assist in ensuring that the decision-makers meet the requirement of section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 to have due regard to the need: to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation or other unlawful conduct under the Act; to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

Having due regard means analysing, at each step of formulating, deciding upon and implementing policy, what the effect of that policy is or may be upon groups who share these protected characteristics defined by the Equality Act. The protected characteristics are: age, disability, gender reassignment, race, sex, religion or belief, sexual orientation or pregnancy and maternity – and in some circumstances marriage and civil partnership status.

It is important to bear in mind that "due regard" means the level of scrutiny and evaluation that is reasonable and proportionate in the particular context. That means that different proposals, and different stages of policy development, may require more or less intense analysis. Discretion and common sense are required in the use of this tool.

It is also important to remember that what the law requires is that the duty is fulfilled in substance – not that a particular form is completed in a particular way. It is important to use common sense and to pay attention to the context in using and adapting these tools.

This process should be completed with reference to the most recent, updated version of the Equality Analysis Step by Step Guidance (to be distributed) or EHRC guidance at

<http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/private-and-public-sector-guidance/public-sector-providers/public-sector-equality-duty>

This toolkit is designed to ensure that the section 149 analysis is properly carried out, and that there is a clear record to this effect. The Analysis should be completed in a timely, thorough way and should inform the whole of the decision-making process. It must be considered by the person making the final decision and must be made available with other documents relating to the decision.

The documents should also be retained following any decision as they may be requested as part of enquiries from the Equality and Human Rights Commission or Freedom of Information requests.

Specific advice on completing the Equality Analysis and advice, support and training on the Equality Duty and its implications is available from the County Equality and Cohesion Team by contacting

Jeanette Binns (Equality and Cohesion Manager) at
Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk

Name/Nature of the Decision

Section 17 Payments

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

The proposal is to cease a range of payments made to children, families and carers under S17 of the Children Act

In terms of the legal definition, the Children Act 1989, sets out the following definition of Section 17, Children in Need:

It should be the general duty of every Local Authority:-

a) *To safeguard and promote the welfare of children within their area who are in need.*

b) *So far as is consistent with that duty to promote the upbringing of such children by their families by providing a large and level of services appropriate to those children's needs.*

The services provided by the Local Authority in the exercise of functions conferred on them by this section may include (providing accommodation) and giving assistance in kind or, in exceptional circumstances, cash for the purposes of maintaining the welfare of the child (not the adult).

Before giving assistance a Local Authority shall have regard to the means of the child concerned and of each of his parents. No person shall be liable to make any repayment of assistance of its value at any time when he is in receipt of Income Support, Child Tax Credits, or any income based JSA or of any income related employment and support allowance.

The County Council spends around £2.4m on payments made to or on behalf of children, families and carers which is recorded as spend under S17 of the Children Act. Within this, there is some spend which appears either miscoded or has been used as a work around where, for example, Foster Carers have not yet been set up for regular payments.

Spend is made up of hundreds of individual transactions on items. Further work is needed to review/challenge each area but significant areas of categorised spend identified from a review of 2016/17 spend included:

Accommodation	£127,680
Childcare/Nursery	£205,943
Medicals/Therapeutic Interventions/DNA Tests	£260,951 (will include pre-court experts)
Support	£112,000
Assistance	£113,185
Allowances	£ 98,071
Pay point (payments to families/carers)	£398,744

Other areas of spend include Clothing, Direct Payments, Financial Assistance, Flights, Taxis, Rail fares, Food, Furniture / White Goods, Holidays/Trips and more. Cumulative spend in this areas is significant.

Some elements of spend that could cease if we had a clear policy of not agreeing spend relating to accommodation, childcare and other discretionary payments to

parents/carers and avoided the use of therapeutic interventions paid for by LCC through the S17 budgets.

Is the decision likely to affect people across the county in a similar way or are specific areas likely to be affected – e.g. are a set number of branches/sites to be affected? If so you will need to consider whether there are equality related issues associated with the locations selected – e.g. greater percentage of BME residents in a particular area where a closure is proposed as opposed to an area where a facility is remaining open.

The decision will impact on children and families across Lancashire.

Could the decision have a particular impact on any group of individuals sharing protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010, namely:

- Age
- Disability including Deaf people
- Gender reassignment
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race/ethnicity/nationality
- Religion or belief
- Sex/gender
- Sexual orientation
- Marriage or Civil Partnership Status

In considering this question you should identify and record any particular impact on people in a sub-group of any of the above – e.g. people with a particular disability or from a particular religious or ethnic group.

It is particularly important to consider whether any decision is likely to impact adversely on any group of people sharing protected characteristics to a disproportionate extent. Any such disproportionate impact will need to be objectively justified.

Yes, the proposal will impact on children and young people

If you have answered "Yes" to this question in relation to any of the above characteristics, – please go to Question 1.

If you have answered "No" in relation to all the protected characteristics, please briefly document your reasons below and attach this to the decision-making papers. (It goes without saying that if the lack of impact is obvious, it need only be very briefly noted.)

Question 1 – Background Evidence

What information do you have about the different groups of people who may be affected by this decision – e.g. employees or service users (you could use monitoring data, survey data, etc to compile this). As indicated above, the relevant protected characteristics are:

- Age
- Disability including Deaf people
- Gender reassignment/gender identity
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race/Ethnicity/Nationality
- Religion or belief
- Sex/gender
- Sexual orientation
- Marriage or Civil Partnership status (in respect of which the s. 149 requires only that due regard be paid to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment or victimisation or other conduct which is prohibited by the Act).

In considering this question you should again consider whether the decision under consideration could impact upon specific sub-groups e.g. people of a specific religion or people with a particular disability. You should also consider how the decision is likely to affect those who share two or more of the protected characteristics – for example, older women, disabled, elderly people, and so on.

There are around 2000 children and young people who have CiN status at any point in time.

Within this group there will be children and young people in challenging circumstances but as a population, their needs are not defined by their protected characteristics.

Question 2 – Engagement/Consultation

How have you tried to involve people/groups that are potentially affected by your decision? Please describe what engagement has taken place, with whom and when. (Please ensure that you retain evidence of the consultation in case of any further enquiries. This includes the results of consultation or data gathering at any stage of the process)

There has been no engagement with service users/families regarding this decision. There has been some ongoing engagement with health partners to identify scenarios where therapeutic interventions paid for by the County Council should be either jointly funded or paid for entirely by Health budgets.

If the proposal is progressed, there should be further stakeholder engagement to ensure that wider LCC services and Partners are clear about approach and impact.

Question 3 – Analysing Impact

Could your proposal potentially disadvantage particular groups sharing any of the protected characteristics and if so which groups and in what way?

It is particularly important in considering this question to get to grips with the actual practical impact on those affected. The decision-makers need to know in clear and specific terms what the impact may be and how serious, or perhaps minor, it may be – will people need to walk a few metres further to catch a bus, or to attend school? Will they be cut off altogether from vital services? The answers to such questions must be fully and frankly documented, for better or for worse, so that they can be properly evaluated when the decision is made.

Could your proposal potentially impact on individuals sharing the protected characteristics in any of the following ways:

- Could it discriminate unlawfully against individuals sharing any of the protected characteristics, whether directly or indirectly; if so, it must be amended. Bear in mind that this may involve taking steps to meet the specific needs of disabled people arising from their disabilities
- Could it advance equality of opportunity for those who share a particular protected characteristic? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so?
- Does it encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so?
- Will the proposal contribute to fostering good relations between those who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not, for example by tackling prejudice and promoting understanding? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so? Please identify any findings and how they might be addressed.

-

The impact of reducing Section 17 payments will be dependent on the individual needs of children, young people and their families and the alternative ways that are identified to ensure that assessed needs are met.

Risks include:

- Possible increase in family breakdowns/crisis and subsequent increase in Children Looked After numbers and costs of fostering and residential care.
- Greater pressure on prevention and early help third party commission for emotional wellbeing.
- Increased pressure on internal resources.

- Impact on DWP who may be under increased pressure to process/resolve claims/issues quickly.
- Impact on District Councils where families present as homeless.
- Pressure on Lancashire County Council budgets for children and young people with complex needs and care leavers where children and young people present as homeless.
- Impact on partner organisations generally if family breakdowns/potential for crisis increases

Question 4 –Combined/Cumulative Effect

Could the effects of your decision combine with other factors or decisions taken at local or national level to exacerbate the impact on any groups?

For example - if the proposal is to impose charges for adult social care, its impact on disabled people might be increased by other decisions within the County Council (e.g. increases in the fares charged for Community Transport and reductions in respite care) and national proposals (e.g. the availability of some benefits) . Whilst LCC cannot control some of these decisions, they could increase the adverse effect of the proposal. The LCC has a legal duty to consider this aspect, and to evaluate the decision, including mitigation, accordingly.

If Yes – please identify these.

Yes. If there are potential reductions in other areas of support relating to preventative or crisis services there may be a cumulative impact, especially if these include services such as Welfare Rights or the Prevention and Early Help Fund. These services are those which provide the mitigation to this option. If provision is not available or identified through such services then support will need to be commissioned from third parties. Where this provision is in respect of an identified need under statutory assessment processes, there will be a continued need to meet the costs of provision.

Question 5 – Identifying Initial Results of Your Analysis

As a result of your analysis have you changed/amended your original proposal?

Please identify how –

For example:

Adjusted the original proposal – briefly outline the adjustments

Continuing with the Original Proposal – briefly explain why

Stopped the Proposal and Revised it - briefly explain

The proposal is unchanged. We will seek to meet needs through more effective use of resources where possible.

Question 6 - Mitigation

Please set out any steps you will take to mitigate/reduce any potential adverse effects of your decision on those sharing any particular protected characteristic. It is important here to do a genuine and realistic evaluation of the effectiveness of the mitigation contemplated. Over-optimistic and over-generalised assessments are likely to fall short of the “due regard” requirement.

Also consider if any mitigation might adversely affect any other groups and how this might be managed.

The statutory duty remains for the County Council to safeguard and promote the welfare of children within their area who are in need and; so far as is consistent with that duty to promote the upbringing of such children by their families by providing a large and level of services appropriate to those children's needs.

The needs of children and young people must continue to be met but we need to apply clear criteria to the use of resources.

In the case of therapeutic interventions as an example, we would place greater emphasis in ensuring that the Local Authority's own resources must always be considered first, prior to the external commissioning of an agency. This means, for example, that we would always consider the Children and Families Service Emotional Wellbeing Core Offer before commissioning an external agency to provide interventions which could be offered by that service. We would also look to ensure that appropriate referrals were made to NHS commissioned services before our own external commissioning. We would seek to ensure that statutory needs continue to be met, but making better use of both our own resources and the strengths of children and families.

In the case of paying for childcare as an example, we would make clear reference to the different kinds of existing financial support available to help people pay for childcare, including free early education.

To assist in identifying mitigations we will need to review S17 payments and evidence of why this was the only option available following assessment of needs so that we can:

- Better identify agencies where, with more forward planning, might have been able to provide the service/prevent issue arising under their statutory duties.
- Develop improved guidance for social workers to ensure that S17 payments are only made as a last resort.

Question 7 – Balancing the Proposal/Countervailing Factors

At this point you need to weigh up the reasons for the proposal – e.g. need for budget savings; damaging effects of not taking forward the proposal at this time – against the

findings of your analysis. Please describe this assessment. It is important here to ensure that the assessment of any negative effects upon those sharing protected characteristics is full and frank. The full extent of actual adverse impacts must be acknowledged and taken into account, or the assessment will be inadequate. What is required is an honest evaluation, and not a marketing exercise. Conversely, while adverse effects should be frankly acknowledged, they need not be overstated or exaggerated. Where effects are not serious, this too should be made clear.

The County Council will continue to meet the needs of children and young people, primarily through better use of existing in-house and partner resources.

The ability to deliver savings through this option does depend on continued availability of in-house and partner services and ensuring that payments made from Section 17 budget by the County council are only as a last resort.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

In summary, what is your final proposal and which groups may be affected and how?

The proposal is to cease a range of payments made to children, families and carers under S17 of the Children Act. This will impact on the way that the needs of children and young people are met but ultimately the statutory responsibilities to meet those needs, and the requirement for use of Section 17 budgets as a last resort, still remains with the County Council.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

Describe what arrangements you will put in place to review and monitor the effects of your proposal.

The impact will be monitored through a range of indicators, related to CIN, reported to the Post Inspection Improvement Board and operational management.

Equality Analysis Prepared By Dave Carr

Position/Role Head of Service, Policy, Information and Commissioning (Start Well)

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Service Head

Decision Signed Off By

Cabinet Member or Director

Please remember to ensure the Equality Decision Making Analysis is submitted with the decision-making report and a copy is retained with other papers relating to the decision.

For further information please contact

Jeanette Binns – Equality & Cohesion Manager

Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk

Thank you

COM002c – ASSET MANAGEMENT – ENERGY RECHARGE

Service Name:	Asset Management – Energy Recharge			
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2018/19, 2019/20 or 2020/21	2018/19			
Gross budget 2017/18	£0.424m			
Income 2017/18	£0.378m			
Net budget 2017/18	£0.046m			
Savings Target and Profiling (discrete year):				
	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
	£m	£m	£m	£m
	-0.027	0.000	0.000	-0.027
FTE implications:				
	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
	<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	Agree to increase the premium charged through the traded service for management of school energy contracts which has not been increased since 2013.			
Impact upon service	An increase in the tariff levied on energy suppliers would make a minimal impact on the energy costs of most schools.			
Actions needed to deliver the target savings	Review contractual arrangements and provide appropriate notification to schools.			
What are the risks associated with this saving and how will they be mitigated	<p>There is a risk that non-maintained schools may choose to make their own arrangements for energy supply and Display Energy Certificate (DEC) certification. This would have an impact on income generation and wider training opportunities with schools.</p> <p>The Schools Funding Team in Financial Resources are currently providing support to the Schools Forum in order to understand the impact of the national schools funding formula on settings in Lancashire.</p>			

What does this service deliver?

The Asset Management Service provides a range of functions that ensure that the organisation is able to meet its statutory duties including:

- Strategic management of LCC's property portfolio (operational and non-operational) helping the delivery of corporate priorities.
- Strategic commissioner of education provision in Lancashire.
- Prioritising capital and revenue works.
- Energy related matters including electricity, fuel and water and energy conservation management.
- Systematic management and maintenance of highway infrastructure assets.
- Promotion, recruitment and coordination of volunteering across County Council services.

COM002d – ASSET MANAGEMENT – REPAIRS AND MAINTENANCE

Service Name:	Asset Management – Repairs and Maintenance		
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2018/19, 2019/20 or 2020/21	2018/19		
Gross budget 2017/18	£4.570m		
Income 2017/18	£0.000m		
Net budget 2017/18	£4.570m		
Savings Target and Profiling (discrete year):			
2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m
-0.750	-0.750	-0.750	-2.250
FTE implications:			
2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	Agree to a reduction in the revenue repairs and maintenance budget following the implementation of a planned programme of condition led, capital investment across property assets. Reduce the repairs and maintenance budget.		
Impact upon service	<p>The Repairs and Maintenance budget comprises three elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service contracts e.g. statutory compliance and maintenance aspects such as alarm testing, legionella testing, lift maintenance etc. • Planned maintenance • Day-to-day maintenance <p>This proposal will result in a reduced revenue capacity for unplanned works to property assets in the event of unforeseen need for repairs.</p>		
Actions needed to deliver the target savings	Production of a corporate property asset management plan underpinned by a planned programme of condition led, capital investment across property assets. The capital programme will be informed by detailed quinquennial condition surveys, statement of premise compliance returns, and wider property information e.g.		

	<p>fire risk assessment, asbestos surveys, energy efficiency etc. Adopt a lifecycle planning approach to the maintenance of county council property assets.</p> <p>Defects reported through systems will be reviewed to assess where they should be aligned with the capital programme. An agreed financial threshold will be set to enable small scale works to progress in a timely manner.</p> <p>Review service contracts to identify where efficiencies can be made.</p> <p>Consider where inspection schedules may be adopted in line with regulatory guidance and so reduce the frequency of visits.</p> <p>Develop agreed process and standards for carrying out planned maintenance where this cannot be addressed through the capital programme.</p> <p>Develop agreed process and standards for carrying out reactive repairs where they are necessary to ensure the health and safety of premise users and suitability of service delivery.</p> <p>Delivery of the capital programme will be aligned with suitability works required for service delivery as appropriate.</p>
<p>What are the risks associated with this saving and how will they be mitigated</p>	<p>Reduced flexibility to carryout reactive works. Corporate asset management board to be established with oversight of corporate asset management plan, programme of works and delivery.</p> <p>There is a risk in reducing the revenue budget available in advance of new arrangements being developed in order to progress a comprehensive capital programme. Propose to utilise £0.75m revenue in 2018/19 in order to ensure relevant data is collected, collated, stored on the Property Asset Management System (PAMS) and analysed in order to inform the capital programme. This may entail appointment of additional capacity within asset management, the commissioning of a range of premise compliance data, and the production of a corporate asset management plan.</p>

What does this service deliver?

The Asset Management Service provides a range of functions that ensure that the organisation is able to meet its statutory duties including:

- strategic management of LCC's property portfolio (operational and non-operational) helping the delivery of corporate priorities
- strategic commissioner of education provision in Lancashire
- prioritising capital and revenue works
- energy related matters including electricity, fuel and water and energy conservation management
- systematic management and maintenance of highway infrastructure assets
- promotion, recruitment and coordination of volunteering across County Council services

LD001 – CENTRAL GATEWAY FUND (VOLUNTARY AND COMMUNITY FAITH SECTOR (VCFS))

Service Name:	Central Gateway Fund (Voluntary Community and Faith Sector)		
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2018/19, 2019/20 or 2020/21	2018/19		
Gross budget 2017/18	£0.673m		
Income 2017/18	£0.035m		
Net budget 2017/18	£0.638m		
Savings Target and Profiling (discrete year):			
	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
	£m	£m	£m
	-0.673	0.000	0.000
			Total
			£m
			-0.673
FTE implications:			
	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
	<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>
			Total
			<i>0.00</i>
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	Agree to cease the Central Gateway Fund (Voluntary Community and Faith Sector) Grants.		
Impact upon service	The grants would cease.		
Actions needed to deliver the target savings	The last round of Central Gateway Funding ran from 2016-18, therefore no specific actions would be necessary to cease the service. A decision on what to do with any grant funding not awarded by the end of 2017/18 would be required. Potential applicants would need to be informed of the decision.		
What are the risks associated with this saving and how will they be mitigated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk of criticism from Voluntary Community and Faith Sector partners, and potentially other partners providing funding for the sector. • Potential for reduced capacity within Voluntary Community and Faith Sector. 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Gateway Grants are used for infrastructure purposes. The viability of third sector groups may be affected by withdrawal. • Central Gateway Grants are made in line with corporate priorities, and so may affect delivery of such priorities. • Other grant funding streams offered by the Council have already been proposed to be withdrawn as savings measures. Part of the mitigation for those earlier decisions was that this funding stream was to continue. • Piecemeal withdrawal of individual grants/funding streams for the Voluntary Community and Faith Sector may not deliver the full savings potential of a wholesale review across the county of all funding provided Voluntary Community and Faith Sector. <p>Efforts have been made in the last round of awards (2016-18) to ensure the funding was directed to building capacity within the sector to encourage sustainability and self-sufficiency.</p> <p>The grants are non-statutory. However, as they are awarded in line with corporate priorities, withdrawal of front line services delivered by VCFS through CG funding may result in increased demand on LCC Services and may adversely affect particular groups.</p>
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

What does this service deliver?

Central Gateway Grants offer an opportunity for infrastructure organisations or organisations providing significant infrastructure support to other third sector organisations to apply for strategic funding to help deliver Lancashire County Council's priorities and key objectives.

Section 4

Equality Analysis Toolkit

**LD001: Central Gateway Fund Grants
For Decision Making Items**

January 2018

What is the Purpose of the Equality Decision-Making Analysis?

The Analysis is designed to be used where a decision is being made at Cabinet Member or Overview and Scrutiny level or if a decision is being made primarily for budget reasons. The Analysis should be referred to on the decision making template (e.g. E6 form).

When fully followed this process will assist in ensuring that the decision-makers meet the requirement of section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 to have due regard to the need: to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation or other unlawful conduct under the Act; to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

Having due regard means analysing, at each step of formulating, deciding upon and implementing policy, what the effect of that policy is or may be upon groups who share these protected characteristics defined by the Equality Act. The protected characteristics are: age, disability, gender reassignment, race, sex, religion or belief, sexual orientation or pregnancy and maternity – and in some circumstances marriage and civil partnership status.

It is important to bear in mind that "due regard" means the level of scrutiny and evaluation that is reasonable and proportionate in the particular context. That means that different proposals, and different stages of policy development, may require more or less intense analysis. Discretion and common sense are required in the use of this tool.

It is also important to remember that what the law requires is that the duty is fulfilled in substance – not that a particular form is completed in a particular way. It is important to use common sense and to pay attention to the context in using and adapting these tools.

This process should be completed with reference to the most recent, updated version of the Equality Analysis Step by Step Guidance (to be distributed) or EHRC guidance at

<http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/private-and-public-sector-guidance/public-sector-providers/public-sector-equality-duty>

This toolkit is designed to ensure that the section 149 analysis is properly carried out, and that there is a clear record to this effect. The Analysis should be completed in a timely, thorough way and should inform the whole of the decision-making process. It must be considered by the person making the final decision and must be made available with other documents relating to the decision.

The documents should also be retained following any decision as they may be requested as part of enquiries from the Equality and Human Rights Commission or Freedom of Information requests.

Specific advice on completing the Equality Analysis and advice, support and training on the Equality Duty and its implications is available from the County Equality and Cohesion Team by contacting:

Jeanette Binns (Equality and Cohesion Manager) at
Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk

Name/Nature of the Decision

To cease Central Gateway Fund Grants

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

That the Central Gateway Fund Grants scheme ceases from 2018/19. The scheme provides infrastructure funding of £0.673m per annum to the Voluntary Community and Faith Sector in Lancashire.

Is the decision likely to affect people across the county in a similar way or are specific areas likely to be affected – e.g. are a set number of branches/sites to be affected? If so you will need to consider whether there are equality related issues associated with the locations selected – e.g. greater percentage of BME residents in a particular area where a closure is proposed as opposed to an area where a facility is remaining open.

Grants are County-Wide.

Could the decision have a particular impact on any group of individuals sharing protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010, namely:

- Age
- Disability including Deaf people
- Gender reassignment
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race/ethnicity/nationality
- Religion or belief
- Sex/gender
- Sexual orientation
- Marriage or Civil Partnership Status

In considering this question you should identify and record any particular impact on people in a sub-group of any of the above – e.g. people with a particular disability or from a particular religious or ethnic group.

It is particularly important to consider whether any decision is likely to impact adversely on any group of people sharing protected characteristics to a disproportionate extent. Any such disproportionate impact will need to be objectively justified.

Further analysis needs to be undertaken to assess the potential impact on any group or individuals sharing protected characteristics. However, grants are to support infrastructure development across the Voluntary Community and Faith Sector. No particular sector is targeted or given priority.

If you have answered "Yes" to this question in relation to any of the above characteristics, – please go to Question 1.

If you have answered "No" in relation to all the protected characteristics, please briefly document your reasons below and attach this to the decision-making papers. (It goes without saying that if the lack of impact is obvious, it need only be very briefly noted.)

Question 1 – Background Evidence

What information do you have about the different groups of people who may be affected by this decision – e.g. employees or service users (you could use monitoring data, survey data, etc to compile this). As indicated above, the relevant protected characteristics are:

- Age
- Disability including Deaf people
- Gender reassignment/gender identity
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race/Ethnicity/Nationality
- Religion or belief
- Sex/gender
- Sexual orientation
- Marriage or Civil Partnership status (in respect of which the s. 149 requires only that due regard be paid to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment or victimisation or other conduct which is prohibited by the Act).

In considering this question you should again consider whether the decision under consideration could impact upon specific sub-groups e.g. people of a specific religion or people with a particular disability. You should also consider how the decision is likely to affect those who share two or more of the protected characteristics – for example, older women, disabled, elderly people, and so on.

Close partnership working with the umbrella organisation One Lancashire provides information on the use of the funding. The most recent round of funding, covering 2016-2018, was designed to boost resilience and sustainability in the sector generally, rather than target specific delivery outcomes.

Question 2 – Engagement/Consultation

How have you tried to involve people/groups that are potentially affected by your decision? Please describe what engagement has taken place, with whom and when. (Please ensure that you retain evidence of the consultation in case of any further enquiries. This includes the results of consultation or data gathering at any stage of the process)

No specific consultation has been undertaken at this stage but engagement with the sector is ongoing and the proposal to cease further funding has been discussed as an option post March 2018.

Question 3 – Analysing Impact

Could your proposal potentially disadvantage particular groups sharing any of the protected characteristics and if so which groups and in what way?

It is particularly important in considering this question to get to grips with the actual practical impact on those affected. The decision-makers need to know in clear and specific terms what the impact may be and how serious, or perhaps minor, it may be – will people need to walk a few metres further to catch a bus, or to attend school? Will they be cut off altogether from vital services? The answers to such questions must be fully and frankly documented, for better or for worse, so that they can be properly evaluated when the decision is made.

Could your proposal potentially impact on individuals sharing the protected characteristics in any of the following ways:

- Could it discriminate unlawfully against individuals sharing any of the protected characteristics, whether directly or indirectly; if so, it must be amended. Bear in mind that this may involve taking steps to meet the specific needs of disabled people arising from their disabilities
- Could it advance equality of opportunity for those who share a particular protected characteristic? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so?
- Does it encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so?
- Will the proposal contribute to fostering good relations between those who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not, for example by tackling prejudice and promoting understanding? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so? Please identify any findings and how they might be addressed.

The most recent round of funding has been aimed to develop resilience and sustainability within the sector, on the understanding that there was no guarantee that additional funding would be provided post-2018. It is anticipated, therefore, that planning by the Voluntary Community and Faith Sector recipients has already taken into account the scenario that the funding could be withdrawn. However, there could still be an impact in scaled down activity undertaken by Voluntary Community and Faith Sector groups on the basis of this assumption. Many Voluntary Community and Faith Sector groups support preventative activities and/or services and their capacity to do this going forward may be adversely affected.

Question 4 –Combined/Cumulative Effect

Could the effects of your decision combine with other factors or decisions taken at local or national level to exacerbate the impact on any groups?

For example - if the proposal is to impose charges for adult social care, its impact on disabled people might be increased by other decisions within the County Council (e.g. increases in the fares charged for Community Transport and reductions in respite care) and national proposals (e.g. the availability of some benefits) . Whilst LCC cannot control some of these decisions, they could increase the adverse effect of the proposal. The LCC has a legal duty to consider this aspect, and to evaluate the decision, including mitigation, accordingly.

If Yes – please identify these.

The council has already proposed withdrawing two other funding streams aimed at the third sector – Members grants and Young Persons small grants. Other organisations which offer grant funding, especially elsewhere in the public sector, are under similar financial pressure and may also seek to reduce or withdraw non-statutory funding to the third sector. There could be a cumulative effect.

Question 5 – Identifying Initial Results of Your Analysis

As a result of your analysis have you changed/amended your original proposal?

Please identify how –

For example:

Adjusted the original proposal – briefly outline the adjustments

Continuing with the Original Proposal – briefly explain why

Stopped the Proposal and Revised it - briefly explain

At this stage it is proposed to continue with the original proposal pending the outcome of the further analysis identified above. Once this analysis has taken place the proposal maybe adjusted or stopped.

Question 6 - Mitigation

Please set out any steps you will take to mitigate/reduce any potential adverse effects of your decision on those sharing any particular protected characteristic. It is important here to do a genuine and realistic evaluation of the effectiveness of the mitigation contemplated. Over-optimistic and over-generalised assessments are likely to fall short of the “due regard” requirement.

Also consider if any mitigation might adversely affect any other groups and how this might be managed.

Consideration will need to be given to communicating the change with the Voluntary Community and Faith Sector and specifically with One Lancashire.

A wider review or assessment of all funding and support given to the Voluntary Community and Faith Sector by the County Council may be beneficial both in

ensuring funding is targeted and in identifying further efficiencies (to ensure best use of any funding).

Question 7 – Balancing the Proposal/Countervailing Factors

At this point you need to weigh up the reasons for the proposal – e.g. need for budget savings; damaging effects of not taking forward the proposal at this time – against the findings of your analysis. Please describe this assessment. It is important here to ensure that the assessment of any negative effects upon those sharing protected characteristics is full and frank. The full extent of actual adverse impacts must be acknowledged and taken into account, or the assessment will be inadequate. What is required is an honest evaluation, and not a marketing exercise. Conversely, while adverse effects should be frankly acknowledged, they need not be overstated or exaggerated. Where effects are not serious, this too should be made clear.

The Central Gateway Fund was always intended as an enabler, supporting self-sufficiency within the sector. Whilst stopping the funding will undoubtedly be felt, the current use of the fund and planning for beyond 2018 was always made on the assumption that the funding may end March 18.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

In summary, what is your final proposal and which groups may be affected and how?

As originally proposed subject to the outcome of further analysis and consultation.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

Describe what arrangements you will put in place to review and monitor the effects of your proposal.

Continue to monitor impact on other grant funding streams and feedback from third sector groups.

Equality Analysis Prepared By Josh Mynott
Position/Role democratic and Member Services Manager
Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Service Head
Paul Bond Head of Legal & Democratic Services
Decision Signed Off By
Cabinet Member or Director

Please remember to ensure the Equality Decision Making Analysis is submitted with the decision-making report and a copy is retained with other papers relating to the decision.

For further information please contact
Jeanette Binns – Equality & Cohesion Manager
Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk

Thank you

LD011 – LOCAL INITIATIVE FUND

Service Name:	Local Initiative Fund		
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2018/19, 2019/20 or 2020/21	2018/19		
Gross budget 2017/18	£0.127m		
Income 2017/18	£0.000m		
Net budget 2017/18	£0.127m		
Savings Target and Profiling (discrete year):			
2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m
-0.127	0.000	0.000	-0.127
FTE implications:			
2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings			
Agree to cease the Local Initiative Fund Grants.			
Impact upon service			
The grants would cease.			
Actions needed to deliver the target savings			
Local Initiative Fund Grants are awarded on an annual basis, therefore no specific actions would be necessary to cease the service. However potential applicants would need to be contacted to let them know that the funding stream will cease. A decision on what to do with any grant funding not awarded by the end of 2017/18 would be required.			
What are the risks associated with this saving and how will they be mitigated			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk of criticism from Voluntary Community and Faith Sector partners, and potentially other partners providing funding for the sector. • Potential for reduced capacity within Voluntary Community and Faith Sector. • LIF grants operate on a district footprint, and so may affect locality working opportunities and priorities. 			

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LIF Grants are made in line with corporate priorities, and so may affect delivery of such priorities. • Withdrawal of front line services delivered by Voluntary Community and Faith Sector through Local Initiative Fund Grants may result in increased demand on Lancashire County Council services. • Other grant funding streams offered by the council have already been proposed to be withdrawn as savings measures. Part of the mitigation for those earlier decisions was that this funding stream was to continue. • Piecemeal withdrawal of individual grant/funding streams for the Voluntary Community and Faith Sector may not deliver the full savings potential of a wholesale review across the county of all funding provided to the sector.
--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

What does this service deliver?

The Local Initiative Fund scheme, now in its sixth year, is a more targeted way of providing medium-sized grants to voluntary, community and faith sector groups that carry out important work to help communities across Lancashire. Third sector groups/organisations in Lancashire can apply for grants from £1,000 to £5,000 to support the council's priorities.

Section 4

Equality Analysis Toolkit

**LD011: Local Initiative Fund Grants
For Decision Making Items**

January 2018

What is the Purpose of the Equality Decision-Making Analysis?

The Analysis is designed to be used where a decision is being made at Cabinet Member or Overview and Scrutiny level or if a decision is being made primarily for budget reasons. The Analysis should be referred to on the decision making template (e.g. E6 form).

When fully followed this process will assist in ensuring that the decision-makers meet the requirement of section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 to have due regard to the need: to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation or other unlawful conduct under the Act; to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

Having due regard means analysing, at each step of formulating, deciding upon and implementing policy, what the effect of that policy is or may be upon groups who share these protected characteristics defined by the Equality Act. The protected characteristics are: age, disability, gender reassignment, race, sex, religion or belief, sexual orientation or pregnancy and maternity – and in some circumstances marriage and civil partnership status.

It is important to bear in mind that "due regard" means the level of scrutiny and evaluation that is reasonable and proportionate in the particular context. That means that different proposals, and different stages of policy development, may require more or less intense analysis. Discretion and common sense are required in the use of this tool.

It is also important to remember that what the law requires is that the duty is fulfilled in substance – not that a particular form is completed in a particular way. It is important to use common sense and to pay attention to the context in using and adapting these tools.

This process should be completed with reference to the most recent, updated version of the Equality Analysis Step by Step Guidance (to be distributed) or EHRC guidance at

<http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/private-and-public-sector-guidance/public-sector-providers/public-sector-equality-duty>

This toolkit is designed to ensure that the section 149 analysis is properly carried out, and that there is a clear record to this effect. The Analysis should be completed in a timely, thorough way and should inform the whole of the decision-making process. It must be considered by the person making the final decision and must be made available with other documents relating to the decision.

The documents should also be retained following any decision as they may be requested as part of enquiries from the Equality and Human Rights Commission or Freedom of Information requests.

Specific advice on completing the Equality Analysis and advice, support and training on the Equality Duty and its implications is available from the County Equality and Cohesion Team by contacting:

Jeanette Binns (Equality and Cohesion Manager) at
Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk

Name/Nature of the Decision

To cease Local Initiative Fund (LIF) Grants

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

That the Local Initiative Fund Grants scheme ceases from 2018/19. The scheme provides grants of between £1000 and £5000 to medium sized Voluntary Community and Faith Sector groups across Lancashire.

Is the decision likely to affect people across the county in a similar way or are specific areas likely to be affected – e.g. are a set number of branches/sites to be affected? If so you will need to consider whether there are equality related issues associated with the locations selected – e.g. greater percentage of BME residents in a particular area where a closure is proposed as opposed to an area where a facility is remaining open.

LIF Grants are awarded on a district footprint. As such, they are distributed across Lancashire.

Could the decision have a particular impact on any group of individuals sharing protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010, namely:

- Age
- Disability including Deaf people
- Gender reassignment
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race/ethnicity/nationality
- Religion or belief
- Sex/gender
- Sexual orientation
- Marriage or Civil Partnership Status

In considering this question you should identify and record any particular impact on people in a sub-group of any of the above – e.g. people with a particular disability or from a particular religious or ethnic group.

It is particularly important to consider whether any decision is likely to impact adversely on any group of people sharing protected characteristics to a disproportionate extent. Any such disproportionate impact will need to be objectively justified.

Yes – Grants are allocated in accordance with three priorities :

- Supporting a Total Family Approach;
- Providing Skills and Employment Initiatives;

- Providing Activities and Programmes for Young People aged 12 – 19 (up to 25 for people with learning difficulties or disabilities)

Grants may be awarded to groups offering services to all parts of the community, but the criteria clearly indicate that there is a likelihood that such grants will benefit young people to a greater extent.

If you have answered "Yes" to this question in relation to any of the above characteristics, – please go to Question 1.

If you have answered "No" in relation to all the protected characteristics, please briefly document your reasons below and attach this to the decision-making papers. (It goes without saying that if the lack of impact is obvious, it need only be very briefly noted.)

Question 1 – Background Evidence

What information do you have about the different groups of people who may be affected by this decision – e.g. employees or service users (you could use monitoring data, survey data, etc to compile this). As indicated above, the relevant protected characteristics are:

- Age
- Disability including Deaf people
- Gender reassignment/gender identity
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race/Ethnicity/Nationality
- Religion or belief
- Sex/gender
- Sexual orientation
- Marriage or Civil Partnership status (in respect of which the s. 149 requires only that due regard be paid to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment or victimisation or other conduct which is prohibited by the Act).

In considering this question you should again consider whether the decision under consideration could impact upon specific sub-groups e.g. people of a specific religion or people with a particular disability. You should also consider how the decision is likely to affect those who share two or more of the protected characteristics – for example, older women, disabled, elderly people, and so on.

Records are held of all groups who apply, and there is a robust application and assessment process to ensure that groups meet one of the three criteria set out above. Given these criteria, age and disability protected characteristics will be the most adversely affected by this proposal.

Question 2 – Engagement/Consultation

How have you tried to involve people/groups that are potentially affected by your decision? Please describe what engagement has taken place, with whom and when. (Please ensure that you retain evidence of the consultation in case of any further enquiries. This includes the results of consultation or data gathering at any stage of the process).

No specific consultation has been undertaken at this stage but engagement with the sector is ongoing and the proposal to cease further funding has been discussed as an option post March 2018.

Question 3 – Analysing Impact

Could your proposal potentially disadvantage particular groups sharing any of the protected characteristics and if so which groups and in what way?

It is particularly important in considering this question to get to grips with the actual practical impact on those affected. The decision-makers need to know in clear and specific terms what the impact may be and how serious, or perhaps minor, it may be – will people need to walk a few metres further to catch a bus, or to attend school? Will they be cut off altogether from vital services? The answers to such questions must be fully and frankly documented, for better or for worse, so that they can be properly evaluated when the decision is made.

Could your proposal potentially impact on individuals sharing the protected characteristics in any of the following ways:

- Could it discriminate unlawfully against individuals sharing any of the protected characteristics, whether directly or indirectly; if so, it must be amended. Bear in mind that this may involve taking steps to meet the specific needs of disabled people arising from their disabilities.
- Could it advance equality of opportunity for those who share a particular protected characteristic? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so?
- Does it encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so?
- Will the proposal contribute to fostering good relations between those who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not, for example by tackling prejudice and promoting understanding? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so? Please identify any findings and how they might be addressed.

The grant awarding criteria does support the advancing equality of opportunity PSED (Public Service Equality Duty) general aim and more widely participation in public life of young people including those with learning disabilities or other disabilities.

Funding cannot be used for infrastructure purposes, and is instead intended to support specific projects or activities. Some opportunities might be lost to engage in particular activities. However, these will likely be one off, and given the maximum funding award of £5000, limited in impact.

Question 4 –Combined/Cumulative Effect

Could the effects of your decision combine with other factors or decisions taken at local or national level to exacerbate the impact on any groups?

For example - if the proposal is to impose charges for adult social care, its impact on disabled people might be increased by other decisions within the County Council (e.g. increases in the fares charged for Community Transport and reductions in respite care) and national proposals (e.g. the availability of some benefits). Whilst LCC cannot control some of these decisions, they could increase the adverse effect of the proposal. The LCC has a legal duty to consider this aspect, and to evaluate the decision, including mitigation, accordingly.

If Yes – please identify these.

The council has already proposed withdrawing two other funding streams aimed at the third sector – Member Grants and Young People Small Grants. Other organisations which offer grant funding, especially elsewhere in the public sector, are under similar financial pressure and may also seek to reduce or withdraw non-statutory funding to the third sector. There could be a cumulative effect.

Question 5 – Identifying Initial Results of Your Analysis

As a result of your analysis have you changed/amended your original proposal?

Please identify how –

For example:

Adjusted the original proposal – briefly outline the adjustments

Continuing with the Original Proposal – briefly explain why

Stopped the Proposal and Revised it - briefly explain

At this stage it is proposed to continue with the original proposal pending the outcome of the further analysis and consultation identified above. Once this has taken place the proposal maybe adjusted or stopped.

Question 6 - Mitigation

Please set out any steps you will take to mitigate/reduce any potential adverse effects of your decision on those sharing any particular protected characteristic. It is important here to do a genuine and realistic evaluation of the effectiveness of the mitigation contemplated. Over-optimistic and over-generalised assessments are likely to fall short of the “due regard” requirement.

Also consider if any mitigation might adversely affect any other groups and how this might be managed.

Consideration will need to be given to communicating the change, especially to groups who apply regularly, and perhaps signposting to other grant schemes.

A wider review or assessment of all funding and support given to the Voluntary Community and Faith Sector by the County Council may be beneficial both in

ensuring funding is targeted and in identifying further efficiencies to ensure best use of any funding.

Question 7 – Balancing the Proposal/Countervailing Factors

At this point you need to weigh up the reasons for the proposal – e.g. need for budget savings; damaging effects of not taking forward the proposal at this time – against the findings of your analysis. Please describe this assessment. It is important here to ensure that the assessment of any negative effects upon those sharing protected characteristics is full and frank. The full extent of actual adverse impacts must be acknowledged and taken into account, or the assessment will be inadequate. What is required is an honest evaluation, and not a marketing exercise. Conversely, while adverse effects should be frankly acknowledged, they need not be overstated or exaggerated. Where effects are not serious, this too should be made clear.

Local Initiative Fund Grants have been in place for a number of years and are valued by the organisations which apply and benefit from them. The value of individual grants is relatively small, however, albeit that the total saving to the council is £0.127m.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

In summary, what is your final proposal and which groups may be affected and how?

As originally proposed subject to the outcome of further analysis and consultation. Younger people who may have learning difficulties or disabilities may be affected more than other groups but further analysis is required to ascertain how.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

Describe what arrangements you will put in place to review and monitor the effects of your proposal.

Continue to monitor impact on other grant funding streams and feedback from third sector groups.

Equality Analysis Prepared By: Josh Mynott
Position/Role: Democratic and Member Services Manager

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Service Head:
Paul Bond Head of Legal & Democratic Services

Decision Signed Off By
Cabinet Member or Director

Please remember to ensure the Equality Decision Making Analysis is submitted with the decision-making report and a copy is retained with other papers relating to the decision.

For further information please contact:

Jeanette Binns – Equality & Cohesion Manager
Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk

Thank you

FR006 – EXCHEQUER SERVICES - EARLY PAYMENTS INITIATIVE

Service Name	Exchequer Services – Early Payments Initiative		
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2018/19, 2019/20 or 2020/21	2018/19		
Gross budget 2017/18* <i>*(Estimated value of transactions)</i>	£83.333m		
Income 2017/18	£0.000m		
Net budget 2017/18	£83.333m		
Savings Target and Profiling (discrete year):			
2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m
-0.100	-0.300	-0.100	-0.500
FTE implications:			
2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	To agree the contractual arrangement with Oxygen Finance to implement the Early Payments Scheme which will mean if the County Council pays creditors' earlier than traditional payment terms then a discount will be incurred.		
Impact upon service	A number of improvements in operational practice are expected to flow from this arrangement if agreed, with a major one being the opportunity to increase take up of early payments by increasing the level of electronic invoicing.		
Actions needed to deliver the target savings	The County Council will need to collaborate with Oxygen Finance to adapt its operational procedures for paying creditors. Contractual terms of trading will need to be properly implemented.		

<p>What are the risks associated with this saving and how will they be mitigated</p>	<p>Loss of potential income due to less than rigorous implementation/co-operation on the project.</p> <p>The main mitigation of this risk is expected to flow from forming a joint team, specifically working on this project, drawn from Exchequer Services staff and staff provided by Oxygen Finance who are experienced in implementing and maintaining such projects.</p> <p>This project will also be the direct responsibility of the Head of Exchequer Services.</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

What does this service deliver?

Essentially this service offers creditors of the Council early settlement of their payment claims in exchange for a discount payment.

It is important to note that SME's will be offered this facility at no cost.

This arrangement is based financially on a revenue sharing agreement between the County Council and Oxygen Finance – there are no other direct costs for the County Council to bear.

CMTY007 – RESIDUAL WASTE

Service Name:	Residual Waste		
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2018/19, 2019/20 or 2020/21	2018/19		
Gross budget 2017/18	£45.550m		
Income 2017/18	£5.694m		
Net budget 2017/18	£39.856m		
Savings Target and Profiling (discrete year):			
2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m
-1.120	0.000	0.000	-1.120
FTE implications:			
2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	<p>Agree to additional waste recycling processes to reduce the weight of waste that cannot be recycled, which will result in a reduction in the amount of waste being sent to landfill and therefore help save money.</p> <p>The process will use existing machinery which is currently out of use, to dry out the waste making it weigh less therefore reducing landfill costs as well as potentially creating a better product for those who can make use of some of the waste by creating energy (Refuse Derived Fuel).</p> <p>Proposal to be implemented initially at the Thornton Waste Recovery Park on a trial basis to prove ongoing financial and operational viability.</p>		
Impact upon service	Improved environmental performance and increased diversion from landfill.		
Actions needed to deliver the target savings	<p>Initial temporary employment of 13 FTE at the Council's waste company Global Renewables Lancashire Operations Ltd (GRLOL), to become permanent subject to successful delivery of the trial.</p> <p>Approval of GRLOL Board of Directors required.</p>		

	Minor modifications and maintenance to existing equipment to enable the proposed operations which will be managed within existing service budgets.
What are the risks associated with this saving and how will they be mitigated	<p>Savings based on a weight loss prediction of 25% of processed material. Target weight loss levels of 25% may not be achieved. No mitigation available due to process being untested however it is anticipated that a minimum of 20% weight loss will be achieved, therefore unlikely to result in a negative cost position.</p> <p>Part element of saving is in production of additional Refuse Derived Fuel (RDF) from residual waste. Markets which take additional RDF may not be available. Market driven requirements fluctuate and cannot be predicted or mitigated.</p> <p>Re-introduction of composting processes increases the environmental risk in the form of odour emissions. However, the operation of existing on site odour management systems has been factored into net costs.</p>

What does this service deliver?

Under the terms of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 Lancashire County Council is a 'Waste Disposal Authority' (WDA). Its role as a WDA is to make arrangements for the processing, treatment and/or disposal of all of the waste collected by district councils in their role as Waste Collection Authorities. The WDA also has a statutory duty to provide places at which householders can deposit household waste; which we do through a network of 15 Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRCs). More than half a million tonnes of municipal waste is generated in Lancashire each year, every tonne of which the county council must ensure is dealt with.

The Waste Management service delivers some of its activities through third party contracts. These include:

- Composting of garden waste
- Processing of residual waste
- Landfilling of residual waste
- Operation of HWRCs (until April 2018)
- Operation of waste transfer stations (until April 2018)
- Miscellaneous treatment/disposal contracts: including hazardous waste, clinical waste, batteries, tyres, abandoned vehicles, chemicals and animal carcasses.

CMTY022 – RESOURCE BUDGET FOR LIBRARIES, MUSEUMS, CULTURE AND REGISTRARS

Service Name:		Libraries, Museums, Culture and Registrars – Resource Budget	
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2018/19, 2019/20 or 2020/21		2018/19	
Gross budget 2017/18		£1.238m	
Income 2017/18		£0.000m	
Net budget 2017/18		£1.238m	
Savings Target and Profiling (discrete year):			
2018/19		2019/20	
£m		£m	
-0.150		0.000	
2020/21		Total	
£m		£m	
-0.130		-0.280	
FTE implications:			
2018/19		2019/20	
0.00		0.00	
2020/21		Total	
0.00		0.00	
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	To reduce the resource fund by £0.280m. The Resource Fund covers not only physical stock on shelves but also the e-book and e-audio collections we have and licences to online reference resources.		
Impact upon service	<p>This reduction in the Resource Fund would impact on the quality of service that each service point could offer. The Library Service charges 60p per reserved item (proposals will be being presented this year to increase this cost to 75p). The expectation of the library user is that the reservation they place is satisfied as soon as possible. Current performance is as follows: - reservations satisfied within 7 days - 40% (from 55% in 2017 as the resource fund has decreased), 15 days - 78% and 30 days - 86%. We have minimal complaints with this performance level, however, with the reduction in budget we could see a decrease in customer satisfaction and an increase in complaints.</p> <p>Less up to date stock on the shelves may result in fewer visits to libraries and the service will not be able to provide as many items of stock (virtual or physical). This may impact on literacy levels especially as regards children and young people and the service's ability to support their reading development, as well as impacting on the mental health and wellbeing of our communities.</p>		

	<p>Our contract with library suppliers may mean that our spending power will reduce; we will pay more for the processing of a book which rose from 20p to 30p in September 2016 when the contract was last reviewed and also the discount we receive which has last year gone from 44.5% to 42% and will reduce this year again.</p> <p>In context this would be a further reduction in spend as over the last 3 years we have already reduced the fund by £1m.</p> <p>Spend would be on average 80p per person in Lancashire following this reduction.</p>
<p>Actions needed to deliver the target savings</p>	<p>Suppliers will need to be informed of the reduction in spend which may result in a reduction in the discount received by the service.</p>
<p>What are the risks associated with this saving and how will they be mitigated</p>	<p>There is a risk that a reduction in stock availability may lead to concerns about our ability to deliver a comprehensive and efficient service.</p> <p>The risk could be mitigated by a review of the collections policy to increase stock levels through investing resources in making good donated items so they can be used by the public.</p>

What does this service deliver?

The provision of both physical and virtual stock is a key aspect of the statutory public library service. The resource fund is fundamental in providing up to date resources to meet the requirements of the public. The Society of Chief librarians has six offers which include, reading, digital, health, learning and information. This fund enables the service to deliver all those offers alongside the Library Taskforce Ambition strategy.

CMTY030 – BUS STOP INFORMATION AND PUBLICITY MATERIAL

Service Name:	Bus Stop Information and Publicity Material		
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2018/19, 2019/20 or 2020/21	2018/19		
Gross budget 2017/18	£0.120m		
Income 2017/18	£0.000m		
Net budget 2017/18	£0.120m		
Savings Target and Profiling (discrete year):			
2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m
-0.015	-0.019	0.000	-0.034
FTE implications:			
2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
<i>-1.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>	<i>-1.00</i>
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	<p>Reduce the cost to LCC associated with the provision of bus stop information, timetable leaflets and other literature, including bus station stand departure information.</p> <p>Agree to work with bus operators to develop a model for activity and cost sharing in relation to public transport information provision at bus stops and bus stations throughout Lancashire.</p> <p>Increase the charge for timetable changes when carried out by LCC.</p>		
Impact upon service	<p>The 2000 Transport Act makes it a duty on the local authority to make sure that appropriate transport information is made available to the public. LCC discharges this duty by producing coordinated information literature and recharging an element of this cost to the operators, whilst maintaining a similar level of service.</p> <p>The cost sharing model is likely to require the loss of one member of staff.</p>		

<p>Actions needed to deliver the target savings</p>	<p>Consult with staff affected.</p> <p>Negotiate with bus operators on options available to develop cost sharing for information that is currently provided on behalf of bus operators.</p>
<p>What are the risks associated with this saving and how will they be mitigated</p>	<p>There is a risk that it will not be possible to negotiate a suitable arrangement and that the cost saving will not be possible to achieve whilst maintaining an acceptable level of service.</p> <p>Without adequate supervision, there is a risk that the quality of service will deteriorate resulting in timetable and bus stop information being less accessible to the public. There is a substantial risk that poorer quality passenger information will result in fewer passengers, leading to higher contract costs on the tendered bus network and also commercial service deregistration's, leading to further pressures on the tendered bus services budget.</p> <p>This information is of great value to people with protected characteristics as defined by our Public Sector Equality Duty and depending on the outcome of the discussions with operators the potential equalities impact will be reviewed.</p>

What does this service deliver?

The service produces bus stop timetables and timetable leaflets for those bus services operated on behalf of and funded by the county council which are distributed to information points throughout the county. Information on changes to bus services are provided direct to County Councillors, customers and other stakeholders.

The service produces bus station passenger information, customer information posters and promotional material for sites like the Park and Rides in Preston and Lancaster and maintains bus stop plates and other related infrastructure, including bus shelter timetable cases.

The service also assists in other public transport promotional activities including providing passenger information notices for road closures and route diversions for Lancashire County Council supported services.

PH007 – SUBSTANCE MISUSE

Service Name:	Substance Misuse		
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2018/19, 2019/20 or 2020/21	2018/19		
Gross budget 2017/18	£15.833m		
Income 2017/18	£0.280m		
Net budget 2017/18	£15.553m		
Savings Target and Profiling (discrete year):			
2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m
-0.300	0.000	0.000	-0.300
FTE implications:			
2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings			
To agree to reduce the budget provision for dispensing fees in relation to controlled drugs, in support of substance misuse treatment, primarily opiate substitution therapy e.g. methadone, buprenorphine.			
Impact upon service			
No direct impact on service / service users – the budget has been incorporated into the financial provisions of the forthcoming tender for adult substance misuse treatment services.			
Actions needed to deliver the target savings			
To reduce the Lancashire County Council budget provision for dispensing fees in relation to controlled drugs, in support of substance misuse treatment, primarily opiate substitution therapy.			
What are the risks associated with this saving and how will they be mitigated			
None – the budget has been incorporated into the financial provisions of the forthcoming tender for adult substance misuse treatment services.			

What does this service deliver?

Substance misuse services provide clinical and psychosocial treatment for adults with dependency on drugs and / or alcohol, including the prescription of maintenance and detox medications.

ASC028 – LEARNING, DISABILITY & AUTISM RESIDENTIAL REVIEWS

Service Name:		Learning Disability and Autism Residential Reviews	
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2018/19, 2019/20 or 2020/21		2018/19	
Gross budget 2017/18*		£16.019m	
Income 2017/18*		£ 1.906m	
Net budget 2017/18*		£14.113m	
*LCC share of LD Pooled Budget			
Savings Target and Profiling (discrete year):			
2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m
-0.045	-0.724	-0.257	-1.026
FTE implications:			
2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	<p>Agree to review people with learning disabilities and autism placed in Care Quality Commission registered residential packages located both in and out of county with an aim to</p> <p>Provide alternative local accommodation services in a more affordable and cost effective way. Primarily by offering supported living vacancies to people currently living in residential care.</p> <p>There is currently a significant over-provision of accommodation in supported living settings which represents a significant cost to the Council as a result of units of accommodation standing empty.</p>		
Impact upon service	<p>The number of residential placements both in Lancashire and out of county placements will reduce as a consequence of this proposal.</p> <p>There are currently just under 270 people (82 outside of Lancashire) with a learning disability and autism who have been placed in Care Quality Commission registered residential accommodation located inside or outside of Lancashire. The current annual cost of these placements is £13.666m (of which out of County is £6.933m)</p>		

	<p>Many of these placements are deemed to be "high cost" and when looked at by independent consultants it was felt that in approximately 50% of the cases it may be possible to offer good alternative services at a lower and more affordable cost.</p> <p>Additional impacts are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There may be resistance to change from service users, their families and some residential support providers to a potential move. • Some residential providers both in and outside Lancashire will lose business, but other local providers will gain new business if individuals move into their services. This will mean more of the council's spend on services will be in Lancashire rather than outside. • Some residential providers may become financially unviable if people leave the service as they will no longer benefit from economies of scale which would impact on other residents.
<p>Actions needed to deliver the target savings</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consult with those potentially affected by the proposal, including service users, their families and providers. • Undertake market analysis to identify gaps in local provision and develop a commissioning strategy to create local services. • Review the needs of service users in residential care including those living outside Lancashire. • Develop and secure approval for a clear council policy framework for decision making in individual cases, ensuring appropriate stakeholder consultation. • Explore current vacancies in local supported living settings or other accommodation to identify the possibility of arranging for people to move to more local and appropriate alternatives. • A full equality analysis will need to be undertaken informed by the outcomes of the consultation. Cabinet will also need to consider the potential

	Human Rights implications where service users do not agree to move from their current accommodation.
<p>What are the risks associated with this saving and how will they be mitigated</p>	<p>There are likely be some challenges by service users or their representative to any proposals to move to alternative accommodation. However, before any moves are proposed a full review/assessment of needs will be undertaken and discussed with service users, their family and any representatives.</p> <p>The Learning Disability Partnership Board made up of people with learning disabilities, unpaid carers, professionals and care providers have been consulted and are supportive of this proposal have been consulted and are broadly supportive of this proposal.</p> <p>The Local Housing / Residential Sector may not be able to deliver alternative accommodation. In order to mitigate this the local market will be alerted to future commissioning intentions to ensure that there is sufficient local provision.</p> <p>Service Providers may struggle to recruit staff in particular locations. Skills for Care have offered to support recruitment for care staff in Lancashire.</p>

What does this service deliver?

Residential care offers accommodation based support, usually in a large setting, with care shared between several residents. In some instances residential care is provided for people who may have conditions that require specialised care, which is available in limited settings, this was particularly likely where people have moved away from Lancashire. In some instances people have lived in residential settings since before supported living options were developed.

Section 4

Equality Analysis Toolkit

ASC028: Learning Disability & Autism (LDA) Residential reviews

For Decision Making Items

January 2018

What is the Purpose of the Equality Decision-Making Analysis?

The Analysis is designed to be used where a decision is being made at Cabinet Member or Overview and Scrutiny level or if a decision is being made primarily for budget reasons. The Analysis should be referred to on the decision making template (e.g. E6 form).

When fully followed this process will assist in ensuring that the decision-makers meet the requirement of section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 to have due regard to the need: to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation or other unlawful conduct under the Act; to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

Having due regard means analysing, at each step of formulating, deciding upon and implementing policy, what the effect of that policy is or may be upon groups who share these protected characteristics defined by the Equality Act. The protected characteristics are: age, disability, gender reassignment, race, sex, religion or belief, sexual orientation or pregnancy and maternity – and in some circumstances marriage and civil partnership status.

It is important to bear in mind that "due regard" means the level of scrutiny and evaluation that is reasonable and proportionate in the particular context. That means that different proposals, and different stages of policy development, may require more or less intense analysis. Discretion and common sense are required in the use of this tool.

It is also important to remember that what the law requires is that the duty is fulfilled in substance – not that a particular form is completed in a particular way. It is important to use common sense and to pay attention to the context in using and adapting these tools.

This process should be completed with reference to the most recent, updated version of the Equality Analysis Step by Step Guidance (to be distributed) or EHRC guidance at

<http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/private-and-public-sector-guidance/public-sector-providers/public-sector-equality-duty>

This toolkit is designed to ensure that the section 149 analysis is properly carried out, and that there is a clear record to this effect. The Analysis should be completed in a timely, thorough way and should inform the whole of the decision-making process. It must be considered by the person making the final decision and must be made available with other documents relating to the decision.

The documents should also be retained following any decision as they may be requested as part of enquiries from the Equality and Human Rights Commission or Freedom of Information requests.

Specific advice on completing the Equality Analysis and advice, support and training on the Equality Duty and its implications is available from the County Equality and Cohesion Team by contacting:

Jeanette Binns (Equality and Cohesion Manager) at
Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk

Name/Nature of the Decision

Agree to review people with learning disabilities and autism placed in Care Quality Commission registered residential packages located both in and out of county with an aim to re-providing alternative, local accommodation services in a more affordable and cost effective way. Doing so would represent a cost saving as the Council is currently meeting the current costs of vacancies in supported living schemes.

There are currently just under 270 people in residential accommodation (82 outside Lancashire), the cost of the placements being £13.666m (of which £5.933m is out of County).

There are 173 vacant rooms in supported living, 60 of these attract void costs representing a total cost of £1.379m.

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

To review/re-assess people placed in residential care with a view to offering them a community based setting, with particular focus on considering supported living vacancies. Many of these residential placements are deemed to be "high cost" and when looked at by independent consultants it was felt that in approximately 50% of the cases it may be possible to offer good alternative services at a lower and more affordable cost.

In some instances a move to local services and will offer an enhanced opportunity to ensure the health and well-being of those service users currently placed out of county as they can be more closely monitored if they are living in Lancashire using local services. It is nationally recognised, in published articles such as Mansell (2015) and the follow up report to the Winterbourne View enquiry 'Out of Sight', that out of area placements are not ideal as people are often distant from their families meaning visiting is more difficult, monitoring from home services is more complicated and less reliable, while safeguarding enquiries are managed by the local services, meaning that there can be inconsistency in managing risk and in the delivery of oversight. Local Authorities and the NHS are committed to avoiding out of area placements where possible, further to a government directive in April 2016 following the publication of '*Too Far to Go*'

Is the decision likely to affect people across the county in a similar way or are specific areas likely to be affected – e.g. are a set number of branches/sites to be affected? If so you will need to consider whether there are equality related issues associated with the locations selected – e.g. greater percentage of BME residents in a particular area where a closure is proposed as opposed to an area where a facility is remaining open.

No

Could the decision have a particular impact on any group of individuals sharing protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010, namely:

- Age
- Disability including Deaf people
- Gender reassignment
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race/ethnicity/nationality
- Religion or belief
- Sex/gender
- Sexual orientation
- Marriage or Civil Partnership Status

In considering this question you should identify and record any particular impact on people in a sub-group of any of the above – e.g. people with a particular disability or from a particular religious or ethnic group.

It is particularly important to consider whether any decision is likely to impact adversely on any group of people sharing protected characteristics to a disproportionate extent. Any such disproportionate impact will need to be objectively justified.

This will affect adults with learning disabilities & autism living in residential care placed both inside and outside Lancashire who are currently funded by LCC.

If you have answered "Yes" to this question in relation to any of the above characteristics, – please go to Question 1.

If you have answered "No" in relation to all the protected characteristics, please briefly document your reasons below and attach this to the decision-making papers. (It goes without saying that if the lack of impact is obvious, it need only be very briefly noted.)

Question 1 – Background Evidence

What information do you have about the different groups of people who may be affected by this decision – e.g. employees or service users (you could use monitoring data, survey data, etc to compile this). As indicated above, the relevant protected characteristics are:

- Age
- Disability including Deaf people
- Gender reassignment/gender identity
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race/Ethnicity/Nationality
- Religion or belief
- Sex/gender
- Sexual orientation
- Marriage or Civil Partnership status (in respect of which the s. 149 requires only that due regard be paid to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment or victimisation or other conduct which is prohibited by the Act).

In considering this question you should again consider whether the decision under consideration could impact upon specific sub-groups e.g. people of a specific religion or people with a particular disability. You should also consider how the decision is likely to affect those who share two or more of the protected characteristics – for example, older women, disabled, elderly people, and so on.

There are currently just under 270 people (82 outside Lancashire) with a Learning Disability / Autism who have been placed in Residential Accommodation. This group is diverse, in respect of age, gender and complexity of disability.

Question 2 – Engagement/Consultation

How have you tried to involve people/groups that are potentially affected by your decision? Please describe what engagement has taken place, with whom and when. (Please ensure that you retain evidence of the consultation in case of any further enquiries. This includes the results of consultation or data gathering at any stage of the process)

This group as a whole would be difficult to engage with due their dispersed locations. There will also be difficulties due to the nature of their learning disability and/or autism and consultation will therefore include families and/or advocates/representatives as necessary. Notwithstanding this difficulty all residents affected by this budget option will be written to for them and their carers to be given the opportunity to have a say on the budget option proposed.

The Learning Disability Partnership Board (LDPB), made up of people with learning disabilities, unpaid carers, professionals and care providers have been consulted

and are supportive of this proposal. There will be further consultation and if the option goes ahead regular progress reports given to the LDPB.

An engagement exercise was undertaken with local residential care and supported living providers in 2016 and was broadly supportive of the proposal, including changes being proposed further to individual reviews. Supported living providers were confident that they were able to support people to move to supported living and they were keen to develop services to meet the changing demands of the community. However, they remain concerned that the opportunities to grow their businesses are limited by the relatively small cohort of people that use their provision in comparison to older adults' services.

Meetings will take place with Lancashire residential providers who are likely that they will be concerned by the proposals as they represent a shift away from residential care although they can be supported to help them modernise services. Consultation would continue throughout the implementation process as provider network meetings take place every 6 weeks.

The Housing Delivery Plan detailed within *Valuing People Now (2010)* notes a National Government objective to reduce the number of people with learning disabilities living in residential care, promoting a greater emphasis on more cost effective approaches and community support models. Supported accommodation, presents opportunities for individuals such as tenants' rights, greater access to benefits, and sharing with fewer people than is usually available in residential care will be beneficial for people. There is a concern that the policy will compromise the viability of some smaller residential care homes locally if people move out.

Question 3 – Analysing Impact

Could your proposal potentially disadvantage particular groups sharing any of the protected characteristics and if so which groups and in what way?

It is particularly important in considering this question to get to grips with the actual practical impact on those affected. The decision-makers need to know in clear and specific terms what the impact may be and how serious, or perhaps minor, it may be – will people need to walk a few metres further to catch a bus, or to attend school? Will they be cut off altogether from vital services? The answers to such questions must be fully and frankly documented, for better or for worse, so that they can be properly evaluated when the decision is made.

Could your proposal potentially impact on individuals sharing the protected characteristics in any of the following ways:

- Could it discriminate unlawfully against individuals sharing any of the protected characteristics, whether directly or indirectly; if so, it must be amended. Bear in

mind that this may involve taking steps to meet the specific needs of disabled people arising from their disabilities

- Could it advance equality of opportunity for those who share a particular protected characteristic? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so?
- Does it encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so?
- Will the proposal contribute to fostering good relations between those who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not, for example by tackling prejudice and promoting understanding? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so? Please identify any findings and how they might be addressed.

Moving home can have a significant emotional impact and for people with learning disabilities or autism that impact can be more significant due to cognitive impairments. Managing change can be particularly difficult for people with autistic spectrum disorders, this will be taken into account in care plans, ensuring sufficient time and adjustments are made to support any move.

People with learning disabilities and / or autism may need additional support to acclimatise to community settings and to become accustomed to new environments. Supported living means that the Council uses resources to fund care rather than buildings maintenance or utility costs, meaning resources will be utilised to fund individualised care enabling people to access the community, take part in activities and to become members of their local community.

People will however be inconvenienced by having to move, they may leave people with whom they have a good relationship, either staff or other residents which may be a significant issue for people with autism. Support for these relationships to continue will be encouraged from new settings and included in new care plans.

'Building the Right Home' guidance issued by NHS England, the Local Government Association and Association of Directors Adult Social Services as part of the Transforming Care Programme in 2016, details that people should be offered settled accommodation, residential care is not considered to be settled accommodation. In settled accommodation a person should be supported to live independently with an individual care and support package based on their needs and preferences. It is important that people have access to a variety of options to choose the accommodation that is right for them.

Settled accommodation includes:

- Owner occupier/shared ownership schemes (where the tenant purchases a percentage of the home value from the landlord)
- Supported or sheltered accommodation, supported lodgings, or a supported group home
- Approved accommodation for offenders released from prison or under probation supervision (such as a probation hostel)
- Settled mainstream accommodation with family/friends
- General needs accommodation e.g. Local Authority, registered housing provider, Housing Association, or a private landlord.

Supported tenancies are most often sited on ordinary streets in the community meaning that people will be more able to participate in the life of their neighbourhood, ideally encouraging potential new relationships and presence in the community.

Question 4 –Combined/Cumulative Effect

Could the effects of your decision combine with other factors or decisions taken at local or national level to exacerbate the impact on any groups?

For example - if the proposal is to impose charges for adult social care, its impact on disabled people might be increased by other decisions within the County Council (e.g. increases in the fares charged for Community Transport and reductions in respite care) and national proposals (e.g. the availability of some benefits) . Whilst LCC cannot control some of these decisions, they could increase the adverse effect of the proposal. The LCC has a legal duty to consider this aspect, and to evaluate the decision, including mitigation, accordingly.

If Yes – please identify these.

By moving people from residential care, the remaining care provision may become unviable, thereby other service users may find themselves in the position of having to move home, which may not be as easy or beneficial for them. Providers may be able to fill vacancies with people assessed as appropriate for residential care. The number of supported living vacancies are sufficient to meet any other people who may be affected. There are already existing vacancies in residential accommodation that can be utilised.

Residential care is well suited to people who need to move urgently, such as those people who are in hospital or whose family carers are suddenly unable to continue in their caring role, therefore by freeing up vacancies, the system will be more flexible to meet urgent need and respite care.

Question 5 – Identifying Initial Results of Your Analysis

As a result of your analysis have you changed/amended your original proposal?

Please identify how –

For example:

Adjusted the original proposal – briefly outline the adjustments

Continuing with the Original Proposal – briefly explain why

Stopped the Proposal and Revised it - briefly explain

The activity will focus primarily with people who will experience most benefit, such as younger people and those with networks in the vicinity of Lancashire, as moving long distances may be more traumatic and may represent an unreasonable expectation with poorer overall outcomes.

Question 6 - Mitigation

Please set out any steps you will take to mitigate/reduce any potential adverse effects of your decision on those sharing any particular protected characteristic. It is important here to do a genuine and realistic evaluation of the effectiveness of the mitigation contemplated. Over-optimistic and over-generalised assessments are likely to fall short of the “due regard” requirement.

Also consider if any mitigation might adversely affect any other groups and how this might be managed.

People who are offered a move to supported living will be given an introduction to the new setting, typically this will include meeting potential housemates and staff members, tea visits and overnight stays to minimise difficulties with adjustment to the move.

Relationships can be maintained through visits from friends to the new settings and back, similarly trips out and phone calls will be supported to ensure networks and relationships are maintained.

The impact on residential care settings will be mitigated by the utilisation of beds by people in urgent need, though this may not be sufficient to off-set the impact, meaning that some settings may close, and remaining residents moved, this will be managed as sensitively as possible, with some residents moving to other residential homes and some being reconsidered for supported living opportunities. All assessments and support plans will be delivered through person centred, strength based assessments.

Where it is not possible to support an unviable residential home, individual residents, family members and advocates will be involved in developing plans together with social workers and learning disability health professionals to develop support plans and move to a more sustainable setting.

Question 7 – Balancing the Proposal/Countervailing Factors

At this point you need to weigh up the reasons for the proposal – e.g. need for budget savings; damaging effects of not taking forward the proposal at this time – against the findings of your analysis. Please describe this assessment. It is important here to ensure that the assessment of any negative effects upon those sharing protected characteristics is full and frank. The full extent of actual adverse impacts must be acknowledged and taken into account, or the assessment will be inadequate. What is required is an honest evaluation, and not a marketing exercise. Conversely, while adverse effects should be frankly acknowledged, they need not be overstated or exaggerated. Where effects are not serious, this too should be made clear.

Moving home may be difficult upsetting, confusing and difficult for individuals with learning disabilities and particularly so for those with autism. However, it is a familiar scenario to support providers who have experience in developing ways of managing situations to maximise involvement and confidence and minimise upset.

The longer term benefits of living in supported accommodation rather than in residential care will be advanced as people who live in supported living means:

- More access to welfare benefits in comparison to those in residential care, meaning there is greater opportunity to spend time away from the care setting, thereby having greater access to local community services.
- They will live in ordinary streets in the community meaning that people will be more able to participate in the life of their neighbourhood, ideally encouraging potential new relationships and presence in the community.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

In summary, what is your final proposal and which groups may be affected and how?

To consult on the proposal to review the care packages of people with learning disabilities and autism who are currently supported in CQC registered residential care, with a view re-providing alternative local accommodation services in a more affordable and cost effective way where appropriate.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

Describe what arrangements you will put in place to review and monitor the effects of your proposal.

This Equality Analysis will be updated following consultation and reported back to Cabinet for them to consider.

If the proposal is then agreed, implementation will be monitored through monthly reporting into governance board meetings within the County Council.

Progress will also be reported to provider network meetings and the LDPB.

Equality Analysis Prepared By Charlotte Hammond
Position/Role Head of Service, Learning Disabilities, Autism and Mental Health
Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Service Head
Decision Signed Off By
Cabinet Member or Director

Please remember to ensure the Equality Decision Making Analysis is submitted with the decision-making report and a copy is retained with other papers relating to the decision.

For further information please contact
Jeanette Binns – Equality & Cohesion Manager
Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk

Thank you

CAS003 – CUSTOMER ACCESS SERVICE – OPERATING HOURS

Service Name:	Customer Access Service		
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2018/19, 2019/20 or 2020/21	2018/19		
Gross budget 2017/18	£3.853m		
Income 2017/18	£0.035m		
Net budget 2017/18	£3.818m		
Savings Target and Profiling (discrete year):			
2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m
-0.170	0.000	0.000	-0.170
FTE implications:			
2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
-6.50	0.00	0.00	-6.50
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	Agree to reduce the operating hours for the Customer Access Service Social Care and bring in line with the corporate service delivered (i.e. reduce Social Care opening times to 8:00 to 18:00 Mon to Fri, instead of 8:00 to 20:00 - 7 days a week).		
Impact upon service	<p>This could be seen as a withdrawal of service, however with agreement that professionals refer into the authority in a more structured way, and a review of the Emergency Duty Team it is very feasible. There would need to be considerable investment in the cultural and behavioural changes required from our partners and Social Work teams. The Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH) model could also be impacted, however at this time they operate standard hours.</p> <p>Partners would need to agree to different ways of working and align to the authorities risk model. Agreement that only emergencies would be handled at these times.</p> <p>The call volumes that Customer Access Service (CAS) would no longer be handling would be picked up by the Emergency Duty Team (EDT) and would require a 2.50 fte transfer (£57k per annum) to the EDT establishment, reducing the CAS savings to 6.50 fte (£170k per annum).</p> <p>Savings to be made by March 2019.</p>		

<p>Actions needed to deliver the target savings</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define exact details of restructure and impact assess the proposal. • Link to technology deliverable. • Agree timescales and communicate out within the business, including any formal consultation needed • Transfer resource (2.50 fte) from CAS establishment to EDT establishment. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1.27 fte @ Grade 5 - 1.23 fte @ Grade 4 • Begin immediate re-enforcement of the 'emergency only' service delivered outside of core hours, driving down volumes of contacts. •
<p>What are the risks associated with this saving and how will they be mitigate</p>	<p>Ensuring the appetite and determination to drive the cultural changes required are in place. In order to mitigate this all key stakeholders will be engaged throughout the implementation of this change.</p>

What does this service deliver?

Customer Access Service (CAS) is the first point of contact for 60% of all incoming telephony and email enquiries to Lancashire County Council. Our Service strategic plan has been for additional services to be delivered by CAS in order to better serve the citizens of Lancashire whilst improving costs and efficiency. The service is structured and divided into two distinct operational areas:

1. Within the dedicated Social Care Centre a highly specialised and sensitive service is delivered, offering information, advice and assistance on all matters relating to Adult & Children's Social Care. Requests ranging from simple ones such as meals on wheels applications are processed all the way through to handling more complex child and adult safeguarding contacts.
2. Within the Customer Contact Centre twenty six services are delivered including: Highways, Ask HR, Libraries, NoWcard Concessionary Travel, Registration, Certificates, Waste, and Welfare Rights. Alongside these also sits a signposting service to direct customers to other agencies across the public sector, district councils and partner organisations.

Section 4

Equality Analysis Toolkit

Customer Access Service – Cash Saving Option
CAS003

Reduction of operating hours within the Social Care area of Customer Access

January

2018

What is the Purpose of the Equality Decision-Making Analysis?

The Analysis is designed to be used where a decision is being made at Cabinet Member or Overview and Scrutiny level or if a decision is being made primarily for budget reasons. The Analysis should be referred to on the decision making template (e.g. E6 form).

When fully followed this process will assist in ensuring that the decision-makers meet the requirement of section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 to have due regard to the need: to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation or other unlawful conduct under the Act; to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

Having due regard means analysing, at each step of formulating, deciding upon and implementing policy, what the effect of that policy is or may be upon groups who share these protected characteristics defined by the Equality Act. The protected characteristics are: age, disability, gender reassignment, race, sex, religion or belief, sexual orientation or pregnancy and maternity – and in some circumstances marriage and civil partnership status.

It is important to bear in mind that "due regard" means the level of scrutiny and evaluation that is reasonable and proportionate in the particular context. That means that different proposals, and different stages of policy development, may require more or less intense analysis. Discretion and common sense are required in the use of this tool.

It is also important to remember that what the law requires is that the duty is fulfilled in substance – not that a particular form is completed in a particular way. It is important to use common sense and to pay attention to the context in using and adapting these tools.

This process should be completed with reference to the most recent, updated version of the Equality Analysis Step by Step Guidance (to be distributed) or EHRC guidance at

<http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/private-and-public-sector-guidance/public-sector-providers/public-sector-equality-duty>

This toolkit is designed to ensure that the section 149 analysis is properly carried out, and that there is a clear record to this effect. The Analysis should be completed in a timely, thorough way and should inform the whole of the decision-making process. It must be considered by the person making the final decision and must be made available with other documents relating to the decision.

The documents should also be retained following any decision as they may be requested as part of enquiries from the Equality and Human Rights Commission or Freedom of Information requests.

Specific advice on completing the Equality Analysis and advice, support and training on the Equality Duty and its implications is available from the County Equality and Cohesion Team by contacting:

Jeanette Binns (Equality and Cohesion Manager) at
Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk

Name/Nature of the Decision

Proposal to change the operating hours for the Social Care element of the Customer Access Service (CAS) to bring it in line with the other corporate services delivered through Customer Access. Citizens of Lancashire, partners, and other professionals are currently able to contact the authority through the CAS between 08:00 and 18:00 Monday to Friday. However, for enquiries relating to Social Care they are able to make contact through CAS between 08:00 and 20:00, 7 days a week. This proposal, if agreed, would result in a reduction of staff in CAS which would be managed in the first instance through vacancies and would follow the Lancashire County Council staffing consultation protocols.

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

Changes to the operating hours for the Social Care element of the CAS to bring it in line with the other corporate services delivered through CAS. Citizens of Lancashire are currently able to contact the authority through the CAS between 08:00 and 18:00 Monday to Friday. However, for enquiries relating to Social Care they are able to make contact through CAS between 08:00 and 20:00, 7 days a week.

Currently, contacts regarding Social Care received into CAS during normal working hours (08:00 to 17:00 Monday to Friday), are triaged by the Customer Service Advisers (CSAs), who determine what action is needed working closely with the daytime Social Work teams who operate between 09:00 and 17:00 Monday to Friday. After 17:00 Monday to Friday and at the weekends these Social Work teams are not available and the County Council have an Emergency Duty Team (EDT) who respond to any emergency enquiries relating to Social Care. The Emergency Duty Team who work between 17:00 and 08:00 Monday to Friday and all day at weekends.

Between 17:00 to 20:00 Monday to Friday and 08:00 to 19:00 Saturday and Sunday, CAS answer the EDT telephone line and transfer/log emergencies to EDT. From 20:00 to 08:00 EDT answer the telephone line themselves. CAS is offering a duplicated service during the periods of 17:00 to 20:00 Monday to Friday and 08:00 to 19:00 at weekends which means there is a duplication of resource, both CSAs and managers, required. The proposal to standardise the operating hours of the CAS into 08:00 – 18:00 Monday to Friday would generate savings and yet the citizens of Lancashire would still be able to raise emergency Social Care issues as they do now.

Is the decision likely to affect people across the county in a similar way or are specific areas likely to be affected – e.g. are a set number of branches/sites to be affected? If so you will need to consider whether there are equality related issues associated with the locations selected – e.g. greater percentage of BME residents in a particular area where a closure is proposed as opposed to an area where a facility is remaining open.

The proposal does not impact on any specific group. This proposal would affect all citizens of Lancashire experiencing a social care emergency. The effect could potentially be unnoticeable. The majority of contacts made into EDT are from other professionals and partner stakeholders (i.e. Police, NHS) who need to liaise with EDT directly.

Could the decision have a particular impact on any group of individuals sharing protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010, namely:

- Age
- Disability including Deaf people
- Gender reassignment
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race/ethnicity/nationality
- Religion or belief
- Sex/gender
- Sexual orientation
- Marriage or Civil Partnership Status

In considering this question you should identify and record any particular impact on people in a sub-group of any of the above – e.g. people with a particular disability or from a particular religious or ethnic group.

It is particularly important to consider whether any decision is likely to impact adversely on any group of people sharing protected characteristics to a disproportionate extent. Any such disproportionate impact will need to be objectively justified.

Although this proposal would affect all citizens of Lancashire the impact of the change, managed appropriately, would be seamless as this is the service already provided between 20:00 to 08:00 by EDT.

If you have answered "Yes" to this question in relation to any of the above characteristics, – please go to Question 1.

If you have answered "No" in relation to all the protected characteristics, please briefly document your reasons below and attach this to the decision-making papers. (It goes without saying that if the lack of impact is obvious, it need only be very briefly noted.)

The change would mean any citizens of Lancashire wanting to report an emergency social care situation would be able to speak directly to the team responsible for dealing with those situations. Providing the service is managed appropriately by the Emergency Duty Team, as is the current model between 20:00 and 08:00, the change would be seamless.

Question 1 – Background Evidence

What information do you have about the different groups of people who may be affected by this decision – e.g. employees or service users (you could use monitoring data, survey data, etc. to compile this). As indicated above, the relevant protected characteristics are:

- Age
- Disability including Deaf people
- Gender reassignment/gender identity
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race/Ethnicity/Nationality
- Religion or belief
- Sex/gender
- Sexual orientation
- Marriage or Civil Partnership status (in respect of which the s. 149 requires only that due regard be paid to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment or victimisation or other conduct which is prohibited by the Act).

In considering this question you should again consider whether the decision under consideration could impact upon specific sub-groups e.g. people of a specific religion or people with a particular disability. You should also consider how the decision is likely to affect those who share two or more of the protected characteristics – for example, older women, disabled, elderly people, and so on.

The majority of these calls that are presented to the EDT telephone line come from professionals involved or working with service users; the police and care agencies being the most common of these. As these agencies are well versed in the processes outside of 'core' hours, often reporting similar incidents on a regular basis (e.g. reporting falls or being unable to locate a service user) they prefer to speak directly with the EDT in order to resolve the situation as quickly as possible. This would model the Children's Social Care line following changes made earlier this year, where professionals speak directly to Social Workers. This has led to a reduction in follow up calls and a reduction of inappropriate referrals. The screening role that Customer Access undertake can be seen as unnecessary and an added step that they need to go through. This proposal would result in less staff in CAS, and although EDT would need to review their resource pool there would still be net savings for the authority.

On average Monday to Friday CAS handle 18 calls each evening between 18:00 and 20:00 on behalf of EDT, and 90 calls each day at the weekend.

Question 2 – Engagement/Consultation

How have you tried to involve people/groups that are potentially affected by your decision? Please describe what engagement has taken place, with whom and when.

(Please ensure that you retain evidence of the consultation in case of any further enquiries. This includes the results of consultation or data gathering at any stage of the process)

No engagement/consultation has taken place as no approval has been received to proceed with this cash savings option. The majority of calls received to report emergency Social Care situations are professionals including the Police and Care Agencies who are working during these periods and report situations on a regular basis. The service will not change for the user experience and instead of CAS answering the telephone 17:00 to 20:00 Monday to Friday and 08:00 to 19:00 Saturday and Sunday, EDT staff will take this on, in line with the model outside of these time periods.

Question 3 – Analysing Impact

Could your proposal potentially disadvantage particular groups sharing any of the protected characteristics and if so which groups and in what way?

It is particularly important in considering this question to get to grips with the actual practical impact on those affected. The decision-makers need to know in clear and specific terms what the impact may be and how serious, or perhaps minor, it may be – will people need to walk a few metres further to catch a bus, or to attend school? Will they be cut off altogether from vital services? The answers to such questions must be fully and frankly documented, for better or for worse, so that they can be properly evaluated when the decision is made.

Could your proposal potentially impact on individuals sharing the protected characteristics in any of the following ways:

- Could it discriminate unlawfully against individuals sharing any of the protected characteristics, whether directly or indirectly; if so, it must be amended. Bear in mind that this may involve taking steps to meet the specific needs of disabled people arising from their disabilities
- Could it advance equality of opportunity for those who share a particular protected characteristic? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so?
- Does it encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so?
- Will the proposal contribute to fostering good relations between those who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not, for example by tackling prejudice and promoting understanding? If not could it be developed

or modified in order to do so? Please identify any findings and how they might be addressed.

No specific group would be disadvantaged by the proposed changes as they would be applicable to all citizens of Lancashire. However the impact to staffing will need to be considered. This could also be a positive change as staff impacted would be offered to take up work patterns that are more work life balance friendly, particularly staff with caring responsibilities, staff who use public transport, etc, which would also have a positive impact on recruitment and retention.

Question 4 –Combined/Cumulative Effect

Could the effects of your decision combine with other factors or decisions taken at local or national level to exacerbate the impact on any groups?

For example - if the proposal is to impose charges for adult social care, its impact on disabled people might be increased by other decisions within the County Council (e.g. increases in the fares charged for Community Transport and reductions in respite care) and national proposals (e.g. the availability of some benefits) . Whilst LCC cannot control some of these decisions, they could increase the adverse effect of the proposal. The LCC has a legal duty to consider this aspect, and to evaluate the decision, including mitigation, accordingly.

If Yes – please identify these.

Not anticipated.

Question 5 – Identifying Initial Results of Your Analysis

As a result of your analysis have you changed/amended your original proposal?
Please identify how –

For example:

Adjusted the original proposal – briefly outline the adjustments

Continuing with the Original Proposal – briefly explain why

Stopped the Proposal and Revised it - briefly explain

Continuing with the original proposal. By working closely with the EDT, the transition should be invisible to service users.

Question 6 - Mitigation

Please set out any steps you will take to mitigate/reduce any potential adverse effects of your decision on those sharing any particular protected characteristic. It is important here to do a genuine and realistic evaluation of the effectiveness of the mitigation contemplated. Over-optimistic and over-generalised assessments are likely to fall short of the “due regard” requirement.

Also consider if any mitigation might adversely affect any other groups and how this might be managed.

Politically, this could be seen as a withdrawal of service. The communication of this change would need to be clear in that the service is not being withdrawn and that the EDT would still be dealing with emergency situations as normal. The success of this is dependent on the EDT managing the calls effectively and there should be engagement with other professional agencies to ensure they are referring into the authority in a more structured way. Work will be required with the EDT Head of Service to establish their resource needs and hand over - this could reduce the overall saving by approximately 2 FTE.

Question 7 – Balancing the Proposal/Countervailing Factors

At this point you need to weigh up the reasons for the proposal – e.g. need for budget savings; damaging effects of not taking forward the proposal at this time – against the findings of your analysis. Please describe this assessment. It is important here to ensure that the assessment of any negative effects upon those sharing protected characteristics is full and frank. The full extent of actual adverse impacts must be acknowledged and taken into account, or the assessment will be inadequate. What is required is an honest evaluation, and not a marketing exercise. Conversely, while adverse effects should be frankly acknowledged, they need not be overstated or exaggerated. Where effects are not serious, this too should be made clear.

The reason for this proposal is as a contribution to the cash savings programme for the authority. The savings will be generated by a reduction in the pool of team leaders and CSAs that cover at the times that EDT also have business support officers and managers covering.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

In summary, what is your final proposal and which groups may be affected and how?

Changes to the operating hours for the Social Care element of the CAS to bring it in line with the other corporate services delivered through Customer Access – 08:00 – 18:00 Monday to Friday. Removing the duplication in resources handling contacts between CAS and EDT.

No specific groups are affected as the service remains in place the change is to 'the team' delivering the service at these times.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

Describe what arrangements you will put in place to review and monitor the effects of your proposal.

The effects of this proposal will be reviewed on an ongoing basis in terms of the performance of the EDT as well as feedback from key partners, i.e. Police, Health, etc.

Equality Analysis Prepared By - Terry White
Position/Role - Customer Service Manager

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Service Head- Sarah Jenkins
Decision Signed Off By
Cabinet Member or Director

Please remember to ensure the Equality Decision Making Analysis is submitted with the decision-making report and a copy is retained with other papers relating to the decision.

For further information please contact
Jeanette Binns – Equality & Cohesion Manager
Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk

Thank you

CAS006 – CUSTOMER ACCESS SERVICE – PROFESSIONAL REFERRALS

Service Name:	Customer Access Service – Professional Referrals		
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2018/19, 2019/20 or 2020/21	2020/21		
Gross budget 2017/18	£3.853m		
Income 2017/18	£0.035m		
Net budget 2017/18	£3.818m		
Savings Target and Profiling (discrete year):			
	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
	£m	£m	£m
	0.000	0.000	-0.140
			Total
			£m
			-0.140
FTE implications:			
	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
			Total
	0.00	0.00	-7.00
			-7.00
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	<p>Agree to implement a Social Care self-service portal for professional referrers.</p> <p>Currently professionals refer to both Adults and Children's Social Care using a variety of forms and also by telephone. Inappropriate referrals which do not meet the statutory levels are often received and mandatory information is often excluded. This results in a high percentage of work being stepped down and both Customer Access Service (CAS) and Social Care receiving repeat calls and emails. The savings illustrated are for CAS only and do not include potential savings in the Social Work teams.</p>		
Impact upon service	<p>This proposal in addition to creating savings, would improve the collaboration between key partners and stakeholders, working to agreed thresholds, and e-referrals into our electronic systems. This would support the Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH) models and the time to react to situations our most vulnerable families find themselves in.</p>		
Actions needed to deliver the target savings	<p>Define exact details of restructure and impact assess the proposal.</p> <p>Link to technology that can help delivery.</p>		

	<p>Agree timescales and communicate out within the business, including any formal consultation needed.</p> <p>The size and scope of this option should not be underestimated, and this proposal will cut across technology and cultures.</p> <p>This option will be a huge benefit to LCC, resulting in professionals referring consistently to the agreed thresholds. Implementing a robust self-service pathway for professionals and only accepting referrals via this method would reduce the contact capacity within Customer Access significantly. Initial investment would be required to implement a robust self-service option but this would align to the corporate digital strategy and generate ongoing savings. The referrals in the main could be presented directly to the Social Work teams with the confidence that they contain sufficient details.</p> <p>This strategy would require communication with and engagement from our partner agencies and would need to be a county wide policy as challenges and negative feedback would be generated, particularly in the early stages of implementation. This would deliver savings in the Social Work teams as well as the Customer Access Service.</p> <p>The above savings will only be realised following the successful deployment of a technology solution which would be a dynamic e-referral web form that could integrate with Liquid Logic. Costs would also be incurred (in addition to the technical solution) for staffing to implement the technology.</p>
<p>What are the risks associated with this saving and how will they be mitigated</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technology. • Buy in from external stakeholders. • Cultural change in Adults and Children's Services. <p>In order to mitigate these risks the following will be put in place:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree decision making and governance. • • Realistic programme of work. • The proposal would require an extensive scoping exercise and the design and development of a

	<p>technological solution. Engagement with other agencies during this phase would be key.</p> <p>Even with a robust pre-implementation plan a period of snagging would be required to ensure the solution is working as expected for both the customer and Lancashire County Council and that referrals are being received as expected.</p>
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

What does this service deliver?

Customer Access Service (CAS) is the first point of contact for 60% of all incoming telephony and email enquiries to Lancashire County Council. Our Service strategic plan has been for additional services to be delivered by CAS in order to better serve the citizens of Lancashire whilst improving costs and efficiency. The service is structured and divided into two distinct operational areas:

1. Within the dedicated Social Care Centre a highly specialised and sensitive service is delivered, offering information, advice and assistance on all matters relating to Adult & Children's Social Care. Requests ranging from simple ones such as meals on wheels applications are processed all the way through to handling more complex child and adult safeguarding contacts.

2. Within the Customer Contact Centre twenty six services are delivered including: Highways, Ask HR, Libraries, NoWcard Concessionary Travel, Registration, Certificates, Waste, and Welfare Rights. Alongside these also sits a signposting service to direct customers to other agencies across the public sector, district councils and partner organisations.

Section 4

Equality Analysis Toolkit

Customer Access Service – Cash Savings Option
CASoo6

Implementation of Social Care Professional Self Service Portal

January 2018

What is the Purpose of the Equality Decision-Making Analysis?

The Analysis is designed to be used where a decision is being made at Cabinet Member or Overview and Scrutiny level or if a decision is being made primarily for budget reasons. The Analysis should be referred to on the decision making template (e.g. E6 form).

When fully followed this process will assist in ensuring that the decision-makers meet the requirement of section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 to have due regard to the need: to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation or other unlawful conduct under the Act; to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

Having due regard means analysing, at each step of formulating, deciding upon and implementing policy, what the effect of that policy is or may be upon groups who share these protected characteristics defined by the Equality Act. The protected characteristics are: age, disability, gender reassignment, race, sex, religion or belief, sexual orientation or pregnancy and maternity – and in some circumstances marriage and civil partnership status.

It is important to bear in mind that "due regard" means the level of scrutiny and evaluation that is reasonable and proportionate in the particular context. That means that different proposals, and different stages of policy development, may require more or less intense analysis. Discretion and common sense are required in the use of this tool.

It is also important to remember that what the law requires is that the duty is fulfilled in substance – not that a particular form is completed in a particular way. It is important to use common sense and to pay attention to the context in using and adapting these tools.

This process should be completed with reference to the most recent, updated version of the Equality Analysis Step by Step Guidance (to be distributed) or EHRC guidance at

<http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/private-and-public-sector-guidance/public-sector-providers/public-sector-equality-duty>

This toolkit is designed to ensure that the section 149 analysis is properly carried out, and that there is a clear record to this effect. The Analysis should be completed in a timely, thorough way and should inform the whole of the decision-making process. It must be considered by the person making the final decision and must be made available with other documents relating to the decision.

The documents should also be retained following any decision as they may be requested as part of enquiries from the Equality and Human Rights Commission or Freedom of Information requests.

Specific advice on completing the Equality Analysis and advice, support and training on the Equality Duty and its implications is available from the County Equality and Cohesion Team by contacting:

Jeanette Binns (Equality and Cohesion Manager) at
Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk

Name/Nature of the Decision

To implement a Self Service Portal that will allow professionals and other key partners to make referrals into Social Care for assessments and support for the citizens of Lancashire, including Early Help services and Safeguarding Adults – all of whom we receive referrals from in a variety of inconsistent sources. This will be a digital service that will replace the paper-based referrals currently received and reduce the additional time and effort required to manage these.

This proposal, if agreed, would see a reduction in staff within CAS which could be up to 7 FTE. This would be managed through vacancies and using the LCC consultation protocols, including redeployment arrangements where applicable.

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

To implement a Self Service Portal that will allow professionals to make referrals into Social Care for assessments and support for the citizens of Lancashire. Currently professionals will refer into both Adults and Children's Social Care using a variety of forms or via telephone. This can result in inappropriate referrals which do not meet the statutory levels for support or referrals which contain insufficient information that require extensive information gathering from both Customer Access Service (CAS) and Adults / Children's Social Care. This can be a time consuming, and as a result, costly process.

This proposed change will be a huge benefit to Lancashire County Council, resulting in professionals referring consistently to the agreed thresholds. Implementing a robust self-service pathway for professionals and only accepting referrals via this method would reduce the contact capacity within Customer Access significantly. Initial investment would be required to implement a robust self-service option but this would align to the corporate digital strategy and generate ongoing savings. The referrals in the main could be presented directly to the Social Work teams with the confidence that they contain sufficient details.

This proposal, in addition to creating savings, would improve the collaboration between key partners and stakeholders while working to agreed thresholds. It would support the MASH models and the time to react to situations our most vulnerable families find themselves in.

Is the decision likely to affect people across the county in a similar way or are specific areas likely to be affected – e.g. are a set number of branches/sites to be affected? If so you will need to consider whether there are equality related issues associated with the locations selected – e.g. greater percentage of BME residents in a particular area where a closure is proposed as opposed to an area where a facility is remaining open.

The proposal would affect people in the same way as it would be a standard referral pathway for all professionals wishing to make referrals into Lancashire's Social Care services.

Could the decision have a particular impact on any group of individuals sharing protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010, namely:

- Age
- Disability including Deaf people
- Gender reassignment
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race/ethnicity/nationality
- Religion or belief
- Sex/gender
- Sexual orientation
- Marriage or Civil Partnership Status

In considering this question you should identify and record any particular impact on people in a sub-group of any of the above – e.g. people with a particular disability or from a particular religious or ethnic group.

It is particularly important to consider whether any decision is likely to impact adversely on any group of people sharing protected characteristics to a disproportionate extent. Any such disproportionate impact will need to be objectively justified.

If you have answered "Yes" to this question in relation to any of the above characteristics, – please go to Question 1.

If you have answered "No" in relation to all the protected characteristics, please briefly document your reasons below and attach this to the decision-making papers. (It goes without saying that if the lack of impact is obvious, it need only be very briefly noted.)

The proposed change would not have a direct impact on any of the protected characteristics although engagement from professionals would be required in order to ensure that no group are indirectly impacted.

This proposal will be positive in terms of responding to referrals for service users, as this will speed up the process, and will also benefit from key facts and information being a mandatory element of the form. In terms of professionals using the new portal, guidance will be given on any new system as part of its implementation. Also, in scoping for the new technology, consideration will be given to compatibility of any new system with assistive technology used by disabled employees – e.g. equipment

used by visually impaired, dyslexic or other employees would need, wherever possible, to function with any new system.

Question 1 – Background Evidence

What information do you have about the different groups of people who may be affected by this decision – e.g. employees or service users (you could use monitoring data, survey data, etc to compile this). As indicated above, the relevant protected characteristics are:

- Age
- Disability including Deaf people
- Gender reassignment/gender identity
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race/Ethnicity/Nationality
- Religion or belief
- Sex/gender
- Sexual orientation
- Marriage or Civil Partnership status (in respect of which the s. 149 requires only that due regard be paid to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment or victimisation or other conduct which is prohibited by the Act).

In considering this question you should again consider whether the decision under consideration could impact upon specific sub-groups e.g. people of a specific religion or people with a particular disability. You should also consider how the decision is likely to affect those who share two or more of the protected characteristics – for example, older women, disabled, elderly people, and so on.

Different professional agencies use their own forms / methods of referring into Adult Social Care and in many cases, Children's Social Care. Often the forms used are not fit for purpose as they do not contain mandatory information and require outbound calls to be made in order to gather additional information. As the professionals who are making these referrals are also handling their own case work they are not always readily available to provide the missing information, which at times adds further delays into the process and getting the referral to the appropriate Social Work team.

Lancashire Constabulary use their own system to refer into Social Care, as do the Northwest Ambulance Service. The NHS use a variety of paper based forms, from hospital discharges to ordering occupational therapy equipment which are often handwritten and sometimes difficult to translate. These all require deciphering and manually rekeying into the Lancashire County Council Social Care systems (Liquid Logic).

Carer's services also use paper forms as do housing associations and care agencies. None of the forms align to the Liquid Logic systems and are based on the information they presume is relevant to provide, not the information that Social Care services require.

GPs will write to request an assessment of a person without any details of the reasons for the referral and without the person's consent. This can result in inappropriate and unwanted referrals which are time consuming and result in repeat contacts into Customer Access.

The proposal could result in an improved service for the public as outcomes from referrals might be speeded up. Given that these are social care related referrals the age (younger and older people) disabled people and pregnancy and maternity protected characteristics could be expected to be the most affected as they are more likely to be recipients of social care.

Question 2 – Engagement/Consultation

How have you tried to involve people/groups that are potentially affected by your decision? Please describe what engagement has taken place, with whom and when. (Please ensure that you retain evidence of the consultation in case of any further enquiries. This includes the results of consultation or data gathering at any stage of the process)

Limited prior engagement with various agencies has occurred previously at an operational level and there was some resistance to change.

However agreement would be needed by the associated safeguarding boards for both Adults and Children and following this arrangements for consultation could be defined.

Some agencies would welcome the change as it would be more efficient for them and it would align to the digital transformation of all organisations.

Prior to any consultation with external stakeholders, the Adult and Children services will need to work closely with BTLS, Core Systems and the Web team to design an e-referral form, which aligns to Liquid Logic. Work is already taking place regarding the Early Help models (including systems) – this proposal would also need consideration at this the board for this project.

Question 3 – Analysing Impact

Could your proposal potentially disadvantage particular groups sharing any of the protected characteristics and if so which groups and in what way?

It is particularly important in considering this question to get to grips with the actual practical impact on those affected. The decision-makers need to know in clear and specific terms what the impact may be and how serious, or perhaps minor, it may be – will people need to walk a few metres further to catch a bus, or to attend school? Will they be cut off altogether from vital services? The answers to such questions must be fully and frankly documented, for better or for worse, so that they can be properly evaluated when the decision is made.

Could your proposal potentially impact on individuals sharing the protected characteristics in any of the following ways:

- Could it discriminate unlawfully against individuals sharing any of the protected characteristics, whether directly or indirectly; if so, it must be amended. Bear in mind that this may involve taking steps to meet the specific needs of disabled people arising from their disabilities
- Could it advance equality of opportunity for those who share a particular protected characteristic? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so?
- Does it encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so?
- Will the proposal contribute to fostering good relations between those who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not, for example by tackling prejudice and promoting understanding? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so? Please identify any findings and how they might be addressed.

No specific group would be impacted directly by the proposed change but engagement throughout with all partners and professional referrers would be required to ensure that groups with protected characteristics are not indirectly impacted. If an organisation were to be resistant towards the adopted referral pathway it could lead to a delay in the referral of a service user.

Consideration is needed regarding the authorities Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) and relating this to the scope of any associated technology.

Question 4 –Combined/Cumulative Effect

Could the effects of your decision combine with other factors or decisions taken at local or national level to exacerbate the impact on any groups?

For example - if the proposal is to impose charges for adult social care, its impact on disabled people might be increased by other decisions within the County Council (e.g. increases in the fares charged for Community Transport and reductions in respite care) and national proposals (e.g. the availability of some benefits) . Whilst LCC cannot control some of these decisions, they could increase the adverse effect of the proposal. The LCC has a legal duty to consider this aspect, and to evaluate the decision, including mitigation, accordingly.

If Yes – please identify these.

There are no known issues that might combine with this proposed change to have a cumulative effect but each agency will have their own technology roadmap and their plans may clash with this. It is important that from a strategic level that Lancashire County Council are clear in what the requirements are for referring someone for one of their services.

Question 5 – Identifying Initial Results of Your Analysis

As a result of your analysis have you changed/amended your original proposal?

Please identify how –

For example:

Adjusted the original proposal – briefly outline the adjustments

Continuing with the Original Proposal – briefly explain why

Stopped the Proposal and Revised it - briefly explain

Continuing with the original proposal. The proposal would require an extensive scoping exercise and the design and development of a technological solution. Engagement with other agencies during this phase would be key.

Even with a robust pre-implementation plan a period of snagging would be required to ensure the solution is working as expected for both the customer and Lancashire County Council and that referrals are being received as expected.

Question 6 - Mitigation

Please set out any steps you will take to mitigate/reduce any potential adverse effects of your decision on those sharing any particular protected characteristic. It is important here to do a genuine and realistic evaluation of the effectiveness of the mitigation contemplated. Over-optimistic and over-generalised assessments are likely to fall short of the “due regard” requirement.

Also consider if any mitigation might adversely affect any other groups and how this might be managed.

Although this should be seen as a step forward into the digital era there will undoubtedly be some resistance to change at an operational level within different organisations, particularly large organisations such as the NHS which have multiple departments and complex communication requirements. It is essential that buy in is received at the appropriate level for not only the acceptance of the change but also of the need to ensure the change is fully adopted throughout the organisation. They will need the appetite and vision to see the positive impact pan-Lancashire not just for Lancashire County Council.

As the change would not affect non-professionals there would be limited political implications from the general public and they would still be able to request help and support from all access channels.

The impact to staff who currently key the referrals into the system – the first option is to manage this through vacancies, using the LCC consultation protocols and redeployment arrangements where applicable.

Consideration for guidance and support of professionals and other stakeholders who will be referring through this channel to ensure that the experience is positive and all mandatory data is collected through the on line form.

Question 7 – Balancing the Proposal/Countervailing Factors

At this point you need to weigh up the reasons for the proposal – e.g. need for budget savings; damaging effects of not taking forward the proposal at this time – against the findings of your analysis. Please describe this assessment. It is important here to ensure that the assessment of any negative effects upon those sharing protected characteristics is full and frank. The full extent of actual adverse impacts must be acknowledged and taken into account, or the assessment will be inadequate. What is required is an honest evaluation, and not a marketing exercise. Conversely, while adverse effects should be frankly acknowledged, they need not be overstated or exaggerated. Where effects are not serious, this too should be made clear.

The reason for this proposal is as a contribution to the cash savings programme for the authority. The savings will be generated by a reduction in the pool of CSAs that currently re-key email/other referrals from professionals and other key partners, and also reduce the time spent trying to retrieve mandatory information missing from the referrals.

Providing the change is carefully managed the impact on the citizens of Lancashire could be minimal and it would be viewed as a progressive step towards Lancashire County Council's digital agenda.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

In summary, what is your final proposal and which groups may be affected and how?

To implement a Self Service Portal that will allow professionals to make referrals into Social Care for assessments and support for the citizens of Lancashire. This will be a digital service that will replace the paper-based/email referrals currently received and reduce the additional time and effort required to manage these.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

Describe what arrangements you will put in place to review and monitor the effects of your proposal.

The effects of this proposal will be reviewed on an ongoing basis in terms of the take up from each agency, the volume of referrals received and the need for additional information gathering required.

The performance of Customer Access would also be assessed against previous performance in this area to ensure the proposed financial and staffing benefits are realised.

Equality Analysis Prepared By - Terry White
Position/Role - Customer Service Manager

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Service Head – Sarah Jenkins
Decision Signed Off By
Cabinet Member or Director

Please remember to ensure the Equality Decision Making Analysis is submitted with the decision-making report and a copy is retained with other papers relating to the decision.

For further information please contact
Jeanette Binns – Equality & Cohesion Manager
Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk

Thank you

CAS007 – CUSTOMER ACCESS SERVICE – INTERNAL ASK HR SELF SERVICE

Service Name:		Customer Access Service – Internal Ask HR Self Service	
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2018/19, 2019/20 or 2020/21		2018/19	
Gross budget 2017/18		£3.853m	
Income 2017/18		£0.035m	
Net budget 2017/18		£3.818m	
Savings Target and Profiling (discrete year):			
2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m
-0.174	0.000	0.000	-0.174
FTE implications:			
2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
-7.00	0.00	0.00	-7.00
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings		<p>Agree to implement a self-service option for internal customers for Ask HR.</p> <p>The Ask HR service has the highest service level agreement (95% calls answered) with contacts generated entirely from internal Lancashire County Council employees, 65% regarding corporate HR and 35% from schools. Enforcing self-service for the corporate element, facilitated through improved online guidance and escalated through managers would generate savings within the Customer Access Service. In 2016/17 84k calls were made to the Ask HR line, of these 54K were made by LCC staff. A further 43K email enquiries were also received.</p>	
Impact upon service		<p>If managed in line with the other options proposed by Customer Access Service and the technology implementation. This approach will require cultural change for Lancashire County Council staff to be reminded to use the Intranet at the first point of contact. This transition could be supported by the Web Chat tool within CA, supporting users to navigate. Initial work to re-design and re-build resources would be required as would communication and engagement with all Lancashire County Council employees.</p>	

<p>Actions needed to deliver the target savings</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreement from HR Services (Corporate and BTLS). The intranet would need to be updated to enable user friendly self-service options, the information and guidance is clear, and related transactions can be completed at information source within the intranet. Users should be able to track the progress of their transaction electronically, for example job advert executed, new post set up etc. • Communication to all staff • Introduction of Web Chat to transition self -service in a supported manner. • The 'HR Front Door Board' would need to be re-focused to scope the work needed to, the technology, it may be appropriate to pilot the approach on one of the frequently asked topics, - i.e. queries around pay or leave. Board members previously included representation from Corporate HR, BTLS, CAS and Core systems.
<p>What are the risks associated with this saving and how will they be mitigated</p>	<p>Ensuring that the relevant aspects of the intranet is fit for purpose</p> <p>Agreeing a process for progressing exceptions</p> <p>Ensure that the proposal is only implemented with the dependencies</p> <p>The reliance on option delivering the savings should not be underestimated, if the technology, guidance and self-service tools are not simple and innovative, users will find workarounds which could result in additional work for other teams, BTLS and Corporate HR. This option will need to involve training for managers, and buy in from Executive Directors to be accountable through their Directors and Heads of Service. The flows between the self- service information and guidance will need to be seamless between the policies managed by Corporate HR and the transactions managed by BTLS, with an end to end review of key tasks undertaken by managers, recruit a new member of staff, set up the appropriate system logins, and refer to OHU etc.</p>

What does this service deliver?

Customer Access Service (CAS) is the first point of contact for 60% of all incoming telephony and email enquiries to Lancashire County Council. Our Service strategic plan has been for additional services to be delivered by CAS in order to better serve the citizens of Lancashire whilst improving costs and efficiency. The service is structured and divided into two distinct operational areas:

1. Within the dedicated Social Care Centre a highly specialised and sensitive service is delivered, offering information, advice and assistance on all matters relating to Adult & Children's Social Care. Requests ranging from simple ones such as meals on wheels applications are processed all the way through to handling more complex child and adult safeguarding contacts.
2. Within the Customer Contact Centre twenty six services are delivered including: Highways, Ask HR, Libraries, NoWcard Concessionary Travel, Registration, Certificates, Waste, and Welfare Rights. Alongside these also sits a signposting service to direct customers to other agencies across the public sector, district councils and partner organisations.