

Appendix 6 - Individual Impact Assessments

Subject of assessment:	Restructure of libraries and hubs			
Coverage:	Service specific			
This is a decision relating to:	<input type="checkbox"/> Strategy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Policy	<input type="checkbox"/> Service	<input type="checkbox"/> Function
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Process/procedure	<input type="checkbox"/> Programme	<input type="checkbox"/> Project	<input type="checkbox"/> Review
	<input type="checkbox"/> Organisational change	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (please state)		
It is a:	New approach:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Revision of an existing approach:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
It is driven by:	Legislation:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Local or corporate requirements:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Description:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key aims, objectives and activities To restructure libraries and hubs to ensure more efficient working practices by reducing staffing and the book fund. • Statutory drivers (set out exact reference) Libraries and Museums Act 1964 requires that Councils provide a comprehensive and efficient library service for all persons' in the area that want to make use of it. • Differences from any previous approach Under the proposals opening hours would be unaffected. Staffing would be slightly reduced however it is anticipated that this can be achieved through deletion of a vacancy and one voluntary redundancy based on engagement with staff to date. The book fund would be reduced by a maximum of £30k (30%) also to achieve required savings. • Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate) Staff and users of the library and hub services. • Intended outcomes. To ensure the Council continues to deliver its statutory duties in relation to the provision of libraries. 			
Live date:	April 2019			
Lifespan:	Open ended			
Date of next review:	Not applicable.			

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
Human Rights Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	There are no concerns that the proposals could impact adversely on human rights. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis consultation feedback and analysis of current demand provision.
Equality Could the decision result in adverse differential impacts on groups or individuals with characteristics protected in UK equality law? Could the decision impact differently on other commonly disadvantaged groups?*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) requires that when exercising its functions the Councils must have due regard to the need to:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act; • Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and • Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. <p>In having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity, the Council must consider, as part of a single equality duty:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic; • Taking steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of people who do not share it; and • Encouraging people who share a protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation is low. <p>Service users - There are no concerns that the proposal could disproportionately adversely impact on individuals or groups because they hold a protected characteristic. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis consultation feedback, analysis of provision and analysis of lending levels and spend from the book fund.</p> <p>Staff – the proposal will impact on staff, however there are no concerns that it could result in compulsory redundancies. Staffing savings as part of the proposal will be achieved by deletion of a vacancy and acceptance of a voluntary redundancy request.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis consultation feedback, analysis of provision and analysis of lending levels and spend from the book fund.</p>
Community cohesion Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town?*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>There are no concerns that the proposal could impact negatively on community cohesion. The proposal is relevant to library ad hub services, access to which will be maintained at current levels with opening hours unaffected by the proposal.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis consultation feedback, analysis of provision and analysis of lending levels and spend from the book fund.</p>

* Consult the Impact Assessment further guidance appendix for details on the issues covered by each of these broad questions prior to completion.

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	

Next steps:

- If the answer to all of the above screening questions is No then the process is completed.
- If the answer of any of the questions is Yes or Uncertain, then a Level 2 Full Impact Assessment must be completed.

Assessment completed by:	n/a	Head of Service:	Marion Walker
Date:		Date:	22/1/2019

Subject of assessment:	Implementation of Wild flower Bedding: As part of Change Programme 3:1 – ECS 08			
Coverage:	Service Specific.			
This is a decision relating to:	<input type="checkbox"/> Strategy	<input type="checkbox"/> Policy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Service	<input type="checkbox"/> Function
	<input type="checkbox"/> Process/procedure	<input type="checkbox"/> Programme	<input type="checkbox"/> Project	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Review
	<input type="checkbox"/> Organisational change	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (please state)		
It is a:	New approach:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Revision of an existing approach:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
It is driven by:	Legislation:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Local or corporate requirements:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Description:	<p>Insert short description, using the following as sub-headings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key aims, objectives and activities: To reduce the number of floral bedding displays throughout the authority. The only exception is Town Centre areas, whereby Planters/Hanging Baskets will continue to be supplied/maintained. The aim is to make a financial saving of £21K per annum. This forms part of the Change Programme 3:1. • Statutory drivers (set out exact reference): There are no statutory requirements to provide this service. • Differences from any previous approach: Floral bedding will be removed from specific areas across the authority & replaced with wild flower bedding, which is more sustainable/cost effective & therefore more economic in terms of supply/maintenance costs. • Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate): Staff, residents and visitors. • Intended outcomes: The outcome will deliver a £21K cost saving benefit to the authority. Additionally, from a residential perspective there will be negligible impact from an “aesthetic” point of view. This is founded on the premise that a floral display is still being offered, though the offering is a variant of the former 			
Live date:	1 st April 2019			
Lifespan:	From 1 st April 2019, for the foreseeable future			
Date of next review:	Not applicable			

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
Human Rights Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	There are no concerns that the proposals could impact adversely on human rights. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of staff demographics, engagement to date with staff and analysis of current service provision.
Equality Could the decision result in adverse differential impacts on groups or individuals with characteristics protected in UK equality law? Could the decision impact differently on other commonly disadvantaged groups?*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) requires that when exercising its functions the Councils must have due regard to the need to:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act; • Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and • Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. <p>In having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity, the Council must consider, as part of a single equality duty:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic; • Taking steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of people who do not share it; and • Encouraging people who share a protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation is low. <p>Service users - The proposal is not particularly relevant to any of the equality protect characteristics. Employees - There are also no concerns that the proposal could impact adversely on staff as no staff are within the scope of the proposal.</p> <p>Evidence used to support this assessment includes consultation feedback and analysis of the proposal.</p>
Community cohesion Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town?*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not applicable. There are no concerns that this proposal could have an impact on community cohesion.
Next steps: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➡ If the answer to all of the above screening questions is No then the process is completed. ➡ If the answer of any of the questions is Yes or Uncertain, then a Level 2 Full Impact Assessment must be completed. 				

Assessment completed by:	Craig Coverdale	Head of Service:	Andrew Mace
Date:	22 January 2019	Date:	22 January 2019

Subject of assessment:	Adjust the Green Waste Collection cycle			
Coverage:	Service Specific			
This is a decision relating to:	<input type="checkbox"/> Strategy	<input type="checkbox"/> Policy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Service	<input type="checkbox"/> Function
	<input type="checkbox"/> Process/procedure	<input type="checkbox"/> Programme	<input type="checkbox"/> Project	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Review
	<input type="checkbox"/> Organisational change	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (please state)		
It is a:	New approach:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Revision of an existing approach:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
It is driven by:	Legislation:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Local or corporate requirements:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Description:	<p>Insert short description, using the following as sub-headings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key aims, objectives and activities: Revise Green waste collections in order that monthly collections are delivered for October and November (option B of the proposal that was consulted on as part of the budget setting process. The aim is to make a financial saving of £20K per annum. • Statutory drivers (set out exact reference): There are currently no statutory requirements to provide this service. • Differences from any previous approach: During the past 3 years an informal extension has been in place, in that the Green Waste collections service operated until the end of November on a fortnightly basis. However, in order that the outcome is achieved (financial cost saving of £20K/annum), it is proposed that collections in October and November are monthly. The impact of this reduced service offering should be minimal as live current data indicates that green waste collection tonnages during November, year on year, are minimal. • Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate): The key stakeholders are Environmental Services, Residents & Members. The service will be reviewed only following a process of member/public consultation. • Intended outcomes: To reduce the cost of delivering the Green Waste Service. 			
Live date:	1 st April 2019.			
Lifespan:	1 st April 2019 onwards.			
Date of next review:	Not applicable			

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
<p>Human Rights Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?*</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>There are no concerns that the proposals could impact adversely on human rights. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of staff demographics, engagement to date with staff and analysis of current service provision.</p>
<p>Equality Could the decision result in adverse differential impacts on groups or individuals with characteristics protected in UK equality law? Could the decision impact differently on other commonly disadvantaged groups?*</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) requires that when exercising its functions the Councils must have due regard to the need to:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act; • Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and • Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. <p>In having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity, the Council must consider, as part of a single equality duty:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic; • Taking steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of people who do not share it; and • Encouraging people who share a protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation is low. <p>Service users – the proposal is potentially relevant to the age and disability protected characteristics if individuals holding those characteristics were less able to dispose of garden waste, however as the public are able to dispose of garden waste in general waste and/or log junk job collections, there are no concerns that this could have a disproportionate adverse impacts on these groups. In addition the timing of the proposed reductions has been chosen to further minimise the impact on the public.</p> <p>Staff - No FTE staff are within the scope of this review.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal, service provision and feedback from consultation.</p>
<p>Community cohesion Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town?*</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Not applicable. There are no concerns that this proposal could have an impact on community cohesion.</p>

* Consult the Impact Assessment further guidance appendix for details on the issues covered by each of these broad questions prior to completion.

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	

Next steps:

- ➡ If the answer to all of the above screening questions is No then the process is completed.
- ➡ If the answer of any of the questions is Yes or Uncertain, then a Level 2 Full Impact Assessment must be completed.

Assessment completed by:	Craig Coverdale	Head of Service:	Andrew Mace
Date:	24 January 2019	Date:	24 January 2019

Subject of assessment:	Increase in Bereavement Charges 19/20												
Coverage:	Service specific - Increase charges in Bereavement Services over and above annual inflationary increase of 2.5%; specifically in burial, pre-paid graves and cremation fees, memorial sales and sanctum charges.												
This is a decision relating to:	<input type="checkbox"/> Strategy	<input type="checkbox"/> Policy	<input type="checkbox"/> Service	<input type="checkbox"/> Function									
	<input type="checkbox"/> Process/procedure	<input type="checkbox"/> Programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project	<input type="checkbox"/> Review									
	<input type="checkbox"/> Organisational change	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (please state)											
It is a:	New approach:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Revision of an existing approach:	<input type="checkbox"/>									
It is driven by:	Legislation:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Local or corporate requirements:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>									
Description:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key aims, objectives and activities Increase charges in Bereavement Services over and above annual inflationary increase of 2.5%; specifically in burial and cremation fees, of 2.5% over and above the inflationary increase. Statutory drivers (set out exact reference) There are no statutory drivers in relation to the increased charges in Bereavement Services; specifically in burial, grave and cremation fees, memorial sales and sanctum charges. The Council has a statutory duty to provide burials, much of the accompanying offer is provided on a discretionary basis. Differences from any previous approach The charges will increase by between 2.5% and 5% in total. To give context, while there are a myriad of different combinations of package elements, changes to the most popular packages are set out below <table border="1" data-bbox="474 823 1980 922"> <tr> <td>Bereavement Service</td> <td>2018/19 charge</td> <td>Proposed 2019/20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Burial Cost</td> <td>£588</td> <td>£617</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cremation Cost</td> <td>£735</td> <td>£772</td> </tr> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate) These charges form part of the overall cost of a funeral which are charged by funeral companies / directors. Funeral companies have been made aware of the public consultation that was undertaken as part of the budget consultation and their views were sought. Intended outcomes. The increased charges in Bereavement Services over and above 2.5% will achieve the required income target for 19/20 as part of the 3.1 Change Programme Savings Targets. 				Bereavement Service	2018/19 charge	Proposed 2019/20	Burial Cost	£588	£617	Cremation Cost	£735	£772
Bereavement Service	2018/19 charge	Proposed 2019/20											
Burial Cost	£588	£617											
Cremation Cost	£735	£772											
Live date:	1 st of April 2019												
Lifespan:	Not applicable												
Date of next review:	To be determined by the running costs of the service.												

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
<p>Human Rights Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?*</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>There are no concerns that the proposal could impact negatively on human rights. There are a number of arrangements in place to support those who may be less able to access these services.</p> <p>Evidence used this assessment are analysis of the Human Rights and the packages of care offered by the service.</p>
<p>Equality Could the decision result in adverse differential impacts on groups or individuals with characteristics protected in UK equality law? Could the decision impact differently on other commonly disadvantaged groups?*</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) requires that when exercising its functions the Councils must have due regard to the need to:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act; advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. <p>In having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity, the Council must consider, as part of a single equality duty:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic; taking steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of people who do not share it; and encouraging people who share a protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation is low. <p>This proposal does not adversely impact on any groups or individuals with characteristics protected by UK law. The proposal will ensure the Council is able to continue to offer discretionary services around its statutory burial duties that meet the needs of its diverse communities. There are no concerns that the proposal could have a disproportionate adverse impact on groups or individuals because they hold a protected characteristic. The service will continue to provide access to entry level burial and crematorium services at no charge for children under the age of 16.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal impacts, budget consultation and consultation with funeral directors.</p>

* Consult the Impact Assessment further guidance appendix for details on the issues covered by each of these broad questions prior to completion.

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
Community cohesion Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town?*	☒	☐	☐	There are no concerns that the proposal could have an adverse impact on community cohesion. Proposal will ensure the Council is able to continue to offer discretionary services around its statutory burial duties that meet the needs of its diverse communities.
Next steps: ➡ If the answer to all of the above screening questions is No then the process is completed. ➡ If the answer of any of the questions is Yes or Uncertain, then a Level 2 Full Impact Assessment must be completed.				

Assessment completed by:	M Shepherd	Head of Service:	M Shepherd
Date:	22 January 2019	Date:	22 January 2019

Subject of assessment:	Increased income at Newham Grange Farm			
Coverage:	Service specific			
This is a decision relating to:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strategy	<input type="checkbox"/> Policy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Service	<input type="checkbox"/> Function
	<input type="checkbox"/> Process/procedure	<input type="checkbox"/> Programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project	<input type="checkbox"/> Review
	<input type="checkbox"/> Organisational change	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (please state)		
It is a:	New approach:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Revision of an existing approach:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
It is driven by:	Legislation:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Local or corporate requirements:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Description:	<p>Insert short description, using the following as sub-headings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key aims, objectives and activities: Following major inward investment into the Newham Grange Farm facilities/attraction. We aim to increase income by 100k/Annum in the first year and a further 30K in the second year To increase visitor numbers to 60,000 per annum (currently 30,000), which in turn will increase revenue to £570K. The proposed improvements would at a minimum double the current annual visitor numbers to 60,000 and this would generate additional income in the region of £386,500 (not including extra income from group visits). This is based on an assumption of an average spend per visit of £9.40 (including £4.90 admission, £3.00 catering, 75p retail spend and 75p for extras such as rides) (spend per visit is currently at £6) which is based on increasing the admission cost to make it more in line with other farm attractions but it would still be around 25% cheaper than comparable sites. Statutory drivers (set out exact reference): There are no statutory requirements. Differences from any previous approach: Prior to the capital investment the farm was very run down, lacked in maintenance and offered no real attraction benefits to its visitors. By improving on the site facilities and adding new attractions we expect visitor numbers to increase. Additionally, admission prices will increase to reflect the attractions on offer. Ultimately the visitor spend per head will increase to £9.50. The target income £531K) is derived from consultancy based data as a result of the expected increase in visitor numbers. Admission prices will increase from £3.70 to £4 for adults, child / OAP from £2.80 to £3 Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate): The key stakeholder is MBC, members & visitors. The benefits will be felt by Middlesbrough residents (a discount scheme of 20% off admission costs applies) and also the wider North east communities. Intended outcomes: The outcome will deliver the intended revenue stream as identified in Change Programme 3.1 to the authority. 			
Live date:	1 st April 2019.			
Lifespan:	From 1 st April 2019, for the foreseeable future.			
Date of next review:	A review of visitor numbers and the subsequent revenue will be reviewed every quarter from April 2019.			

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
Human Rights Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	There are no concerns that the proposals could impact adversely on human rights. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of staff demographics, engagement to date with staff and analysis of current service provision.
Equality Could the decision result in adverse differential impacts on groups or individuals with characteristics protected in UK equality law? Could the decision impact differently on other commonly disadvantaged groups?*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) requires that when exercising its functions the Councils must have due regard to the need to:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act; • Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and • Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. <p>In having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity, the Council must consider, as part of a single equality duty:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic; • Taking steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of people who do not share it; and • Encouraging people who share a protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation is low. <p>Service users – The proposal is that there would be an increase in the admission costs for the venue. Because of the nature of the site and the visitor profile, this is particularly relevant for families with young children. As a result the proposal is relevant to the age protected characteristic. There are no concerns that this small increase in entry fee could result in a disproportionate adverse impact on those affected by the proposal because the cost of entry will still be relatively small.</p> <p>Staff - No staff are affected by the proposal.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the visitor profile and the proposed cost increases and budget consultation feedback.</p>
Community cohesion Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town?*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not applicable. There are no concerns that this proposal could have an impact on community cohesion.
Next steps: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➡ If the answer to all of the above screening questions is No then the process is completed. ➡ If the answer of any of the questions is Yes or Uncertain, then a Level 2 Full Impact Assessment must be completed. 				

* Consult the Impact Assessment further guidance appendix for details on the issues covered by each of these broad questions prior to completion.

Assessment completed by:	Craig Coverdale	Head of Service:	Andrew Mace
Date:	22 January 2019	Date:	22 January 2019

Subject of assessment:	Review of all contracts with warden support to release efficiencies			
Coverage:	Service specific			
This is a decision relating to:	<input type="checkbox"/> Strategy	<input type="checkbox"/> Policy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Service	<input type="checkbox"/> Function
	<input type="checkbox"/> Process/procedure	<input type="checkbox"/> Programme	<input type="checkbox"/> Project	<input type="checkbox"/> Review
	<input type="checkbox"/> Organisational change	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (please state)		
It is a:	New approach:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Revision of an existing approach:	√
It is driven by:	Legislation:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Local or corporate requirements:	√
Description	<p>Key aims, objectives and activities Aim - To review current contracts and eligibility criteria in order to release efficiencies and ensure consistent approach to application of the service.</p> <p>Statutory drivers There is no statutory duty for Middlesbrough Council to provide this service, however it does assist in delivery of prevention duties to support people to live in their own homes for longer.</p> <p>Differences from any previous approach Current contracts in place with various suppliers with some variance in cost and levels of service. The proposed review seeks harmonise these terms and apply consistent eligibility criteria, which will be developed and consulted on during 2019/20 and an in year decision sought to implement subject to consultation and engagement.</p> <p>Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate) Service Users, staff, families and carers and delivery partners.</p> <p>Intended outcomes That a harmonised provision with consistency in approach.</p>			
Live date:	The proposal is subject to further development and scoping. To be brought forward in year for decision.			
Lifespan:	N/a.			
Date of next review:	To be determined by the final proposal			
Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
Human Rights Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation? *	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The proposal to be developed would look to maintain the provision of the service in some form. Proposed form of service will be developed with a focus on supporting individuals to remain in their own homes for longer, however the way in which it is delivered may well change. The service is focussed on older people living in sheltered accommodation. While human rights will be protected within any proposal, because the proposal has yet to be determined, at this stage the impact is uncertain. Once the proposal is developed it will be impact assessed prior to consultation.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of current contract provision and service user feedback to date.</p>

<p>Equality</p> <p>Could the decision result in adverse differential impacts on groups or individuals with characteristics protected in UK equality law? Could the decision impact differently on other commonly disadvantaged groups? *</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) requires that when exercising its functions the Councils must have due regard to the need to:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act; advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. <p>In having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity, the Council must consider, as part of a single equality duty:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic; taking steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of people who do not share it; and encouraging people who share a protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation is low. <p>The Act requires that the needs of people with a disability are considered and that steps should be taken to take these into account. As this proposal relates to a service whose primary focus is on adult service users who require sheltered accommodation because of disability or frailty due to age, then this proposal is particularly relevant to the equality duties and the protected characteristics of age and disability.</p> <p>At this stage the impact on service users is uncertain because the proposal has yet to be developed for these commissioned services. Once it is developed it will be impact assessed and subject to consultation, prior to an in year decision on this issue.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of current contract provision, budget consultation feedback and service user feedback to date.</p>
<p>Community cohesion</p> <p>Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town? *</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The proposal is that the support received will continue, however the form of that support may change. Therefore at this stage it is not possible to determine the impact on community cohesion. Once the proposal has been developed it will be impact assessed and subject to further consultation, prior to an in year decision on this issue.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of current contract provision, budget consultation feedback and service user feedback to date.</p>
<p>Next steps:</p> <p>➡ If the answer to all of the above screening questions is No then the process is completed.</p> <p>➡ If the answer of any of the questions is Yes or Uncertain, then a Level 2 Full Impact Assessment must be completed.</p>				
<p>Assessment completed by:</p>	<p>Louise Grabham, Head of Strategic Commissioning and Procurement</p>			<p>Head of Service: n/a</p>
<p>Date:</p>	<p>21/1/2019</p>			<p>Date: n/a</p>

Subject of assessment:	Implementation of a charge for the Connect Service to recipients of Pension Credit Guarantee Credit			
Coverage:	Connect Service – Adult Social Care			
This is a decision relating to:	<input type="checkbox"/> Strategy	<input type="checkbox"/> Policy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Service	<input type="checkbox"/> Function
	<input type="checkbox"/> Process/procedure	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Programme	<input type="checkbox"/> Project	<input type="checkbox"/> Review
	<input type="checkbox"/> Organisational change	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (please state)		
It is a:	New approach:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Revision of an existing approach:	<input type="checkbox"/>
It is driven by:	Legislation:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Local or corporate requirements:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Description:	<p><u>Key aims, objectives and activities</u></p> <p>Aim - To implement a charge for the Connect service recipients of Pension Credit Guarantee Credit who currently receive the service free of charge</p> <p>Objectives</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> To make the service financially secure for all users of the service, ensuring it is fair and reasonable in a way that gives fair treatment to everyone in receipt of the service, charging the same rate and keeping it proportionate and as low as possible. To bring Middlesbrough Council into line with other Local Authorities. Middlesbrough Council is currently the only Local Authority providing a monitoring and response service to those on Pension Credit Guarantee Credit, across all tenures and without any need for an assessment of care need. <p><u>Statutory Drivers</u></p> <p>There is no statutory duty to provide Connect Service for Adults by Middlesbrough Council. However there are a number of statutory requirements placed upon the council to meet identified needs after an assessment.</p> <p><u>Differences from previous approach</u></p> <p>The Connect Service currently has a total of 2357 people who use the service 1194 private customers currently pay £4.09per week for the service, from 1 April 2019 they will pay £4.19. Currently 1163 receive a free service through a subsidy from the council revenue budget (formerly Supporting People grant), which is paid at a lower rate of £3.13 per week. This is no longer sustainable and the proposal is that those people who currently receive a subsidy who are on the Pension Credit Guarantee Credit pay £4.19 per week for the service if implemented, which will provide financial security for the service</p> <p><u>Key Stakeholders</u></p> <p>Service Users and their families and/or carers – there are 1163 service users currently in receipt of Pension Credit Guarantee Credit. Connect Service staff who will be directly affected by the proposal</p> <p><u>Intended Outcome</u></p> <p>To introduce a charge for the Connect service to recipient of Pension Credit Guarantee Credit.</p>			
Live Date:	The proposal is subject to the outcome of the report to Executive to approve consultation with Connect service users in receipt of Pension Credit Guarantee Credit			
Lifespan:	N/A			
Date of review	N/A			

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
<p>Human Rights</p> <p>Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?*</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>None of the absolute or qualified rights will be infringed by these proposals.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment including analysis of service user needs.</p>
<p>Equality</p> <p>Could the decision result in adverse differential impacts on groups or individuals with characteristics protected in UK equality law? Could the decision impact differently on other commonly disadvantaged groups?*</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Decisions around the future of the service would also be relevant to the Public Sector Equality duty, contained in the Equality Act (2010) which required that the Council must have due regards to the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. <p>Having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it; encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low. <p>The proposal is relevant to the age, disability and protected characteristics because of the nature of the service and the nature of the proposals. There are up to 1163 recipient of the Pension Credit Guarantee Credit who currently receive the service who would be required to pay the charge if it is implemented. At this stage the impact on this group is uncertain as it will introduce a charge, not previously collected. Views of current service users and potential future service users will be sought through targeted and universal consultation, prior to completion of stage 2 impact assessment to be considered prior to a decision on whether to implement the proposal.</p> <p>In line with the PSED, taking into account views on impact, consideration will be given to whether it is adverse and if so, can it be mitigated. If it cannot be mitigated, the level 2 impact assessment would then consider whether it could be justified in line with the PSED.</p> <p>Evidence used to date to inform this assessment includes analysis of service user needs and feedback from budget consultation.</p>
<p>Community cohesion</p> <p>Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town? *</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The proposed options surrounding the Connect service would provide is key to ensuring the financial stability of the service and achieving the efficiencies agreed in the Council's Change Programme</p> <p>There is no evidence to indicate that service users and / or the wider community have any concerns about the impact of the proposals on community cohesion at this stage. Feedback from the consultation will be used to inform the stage 2 assessment on this issue.</p> <p>Evidence used to date to inform this assessment includes analysis of service user needs.</p>

Next steps:

- ➡ If the answer to all of the above screening questions is No then the process is completed.
- ➡ If the answer of any of the questions is Yes or Uncertain, then a Level 2 Full Impact Assessment must be completed.

Assessment completed by:	Ayo Olorukooba, Business Support Officer, Prevention, Access and Provider Services	Head of Service:	Tom Boyd – Head of Prevention, Access and Provider Services
Date:	22/1/2019	Date:	22/1/2019

Subject of assessment:	Charging Policy for Deferred Payment Agreements			
Coverage:	Service specific			
This is a decision relating to:	<input type="checkbox"/> Strategy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Policy	<input type="checkbox"/> Service	<input type="checkbox"/> Function
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Process/procedure	<input type="checkbox"/> Programme	<input type="checkbox"/> Project	<input type="checkbox"/> Review
	<input type="checkbox"/> Organisational change	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (please state)		
It is a:	New approach:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Revision of an existing approach:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
It is driven by:	Legislation:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Local or corporate requirements:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Description:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key aims, objectives and activities To review the charging policy for Deferred Payment Agreements and amend charging to reflect the cost of administration. • Statutory drivers (set out exact reference) Care Act 2014 sets out the Council has to offer deferred payments to all qualifying individuals. • Differences from any previous approach Currently a one off payment charge of £250 is levied at the beginning of the deferred payment agreement. Thereafter interest is charged on the loan agreement if it's not paid within 90 days of the death of the service user. Under the proposal, there will be a higher one off charge of £407 (to increase with inflation year on year) to reflect realistic cost of the initial administration of this process and the Introduction of annual review charge to reflect the cost of maintenance of these agreements which will be £190. In addition interest will be charged from date of agreement at the current rate of interest as set by the national interest rates. The change would apply to all new deferred payment arrangements • Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate) Service users who qualify for a Deferred Payment Agreement according to the Care Act 9.7 (P146) • Intended outcomes. It is intended to ensure the Council recovers the costs incurred in relation to deferred Payment Agreement • Mitigate the cost incurred when making an interest free loan to service users under the present approach. 			
Live date:	April 2019			
Lifespan:	Open ended			
Date of next review:	April 2020.			
Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	

Human Rights Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?*	☒	☐	☐	There are no concerns that the proposals could impact adversely on human rights. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis consultation feedback, analysis of provision and feedback from other local authorities who have implemented similar charging arrangement.
Equality Could the decision result in adverse differential impacts on groups or individuals with characteristics protected in UK equality law? Could the decision impact differently on other commonly disadvantaged groups?*	☒	☐	☐	<p>The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) requires that when exercising its functions the Councils must have due regard to the need to:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act; • Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and • Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. <p>In having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity, the Council must consider, as part of a single equality duty:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic; • Taking steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of people who do not share it; and • Encouraging people who share a protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation is low. <p>There are no concerns that the proposal could disproportionately adversely impact on individuals or groups because they hold a protected characteristic. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis consultation feedback, analysis of provision and feedback from other local authorities who have implemented similar charging arrangement.</p>
Community cohesion Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town?*	☒	☐	☐	<p>There are no concerns that the proposal could impact negatively on community cohesion. The scheme supports individuals to manage their care needs.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis consultation feedback, analysis of provision and feedback from other local authorities who have implemented similar charging arrangement.</p>
<p>Next steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➡ If the answer to all of the above screening questions is No then the process is completed. ➡ If the answer of any of the questions is Yes or Uncertain, then a Level 2 Full Impact Assessment must be completed. 				

Assessment completed by:	Lynne Smith	Head of Service:	Louise Grabham
Date: 21.05.18	22/1/2019	Date:	22/1/2019

* Consult the Impact Assessment further guidance appendix for details on the issues covered by each of these broad questions prior to completion.

Subject of assessment:	PHPP 01 (Reduce spend through transformation of the drug and alcohol service)			
Coverage:	Service specific			
This is a decision relating to:	<input type="checkbox"/> Strategy	<input type="checkbox"/> Policy	<input type="checkbox"/> Service	<input type="checkbox"/> Function
	<input type="checkbox"/> Process/procedure	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Programme	<input type="checkbox"/> Project	<input type="checkbox"/> Review
	<input type="checkbox"/> Organisational change	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (please state)		
It is a:	New approach:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Revision of an existing approach:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
It is driven by:	Legislation:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Local or corporate requirements:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Description:	<p>Reduction of substance misuse budget via transformation of service model: Key aims, objectives and activities To implement a 10% budget reduction for substance misuse in each of the next two financial years, to ensure a 20% reduction is achieved by 2020/21. In spite of this, the aim is to maintain frontline capacity and improve quality of delivery and outcomes. This will be delivered via integrating substance misuse with other Middlesbrough Council services for vulnerable people and making efficiencies across a wider range of service areas.</p> <p>Statutory drivers (set out exact reference) The need to make savings is derived from a reduction in LA funding from central Government and the impending loss of the ring-fenced public health grant.</p> <p>Differences from any previous approach Substance misuse services have traditionally been commissioned as a standalone model, as have domestic abuse, sexual violence, homelessness, etc., yet there are a significant proportion of clients in need of two or more of these services. By commissioning a new model with a mixture of a generic and specialist services, the ensuing holistic approach should better meet the needs of these vulnerable groups.</p> <p>Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate) Key stakeholders include Public Health and Stronger Communities directorates, other LA departments (e.g. adult services), the PCC, Police, CCG and health trusts, commissioned services, the local VCS, existing and potential service users and carers. The intended beneficiaries are the population of Middlesbrough, particularly vulnerable groups affected by the toxic trio (substance misuse, domestic abuse and mental health).</p> <p>Intended outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Achieving the required savings, • Reduced duplication to ensure a seamless transfer between services via improved co-ordination of care • Increased ability to manage complex cases • Increased number of people achieving sustainable recovery • Single care record for these cohorts • Reduced pressure on social care and other statutory services • Improved co-ordination and management of personalisation funding, therefore, better value derived from these care budgets • Reduction in re-presentations to services 			
Live date:	1 April 2019			
Lifespan:	Between 1 April 2019 and 31 March 2021			
Date of next review:	March 2021			

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
Human Rights Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	None of the rights listed within the Human Rights Act 1998 are anticipated to be affected by the integrated approach. Evidence used to assess the impact of this proposal includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Services providing assurance that they have appropriate, up to date policies and procedures – this will continue to be a contractual requirement within the future model; • The Recovery Service employs many experts by experience (i.e. people who have formerly had addiction issues and are now in recovery) – currently over 80% of its workforce – and this will continue to be a contractual requirement; • Continuing to offer accessible services, both in terms of physical (accessible buildings and access) and the inclusion criteria (any resident of Middlesbrough with a related vulnerability is entitled to free access to support, reasonable adjustments will be made to enable effective engagement and individually tailored support plans will be developed). Specific projects/initiatives to engage under-represented groups into services also have and will continue to be undertaken.

* Consult the Impact Assessment further guidance appendix for details on the issues covered by each of these broad questions prior to completion.

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
<p>Equality</p> <p>Could the decision result in adverse differential impacts on groups or individuals with characteristics protected in UK equality law? Could the decision impact differently on other commonly disadvantaged groups?*</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) requires that when exercising its functions the Councils must have due regard to the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act; • Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and • Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. <p>In having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity, the Council must consider, as part of a single equality duty:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic; • Taking steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of people who do not share it; and • Encouraging people who share a protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation is low. <p>As set out previously, the revised commissioned services will continue to meet the needs of service users, however the way this is done will be revised to ensure that the same or better outcomes for individuals can be achieved. It is anticipated that while costs will be reduced, the impact of the proposal will be positive as the recommissioned services will better meet identified needs. There are no concerns that capacity to deliver services that will continue to meet the (relative) needs of all of the local population could be affected by the proposal.</p> <p>Evidence used to assess the impact of this proposal includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Services providing assurance that they have appropriate, up to date policies and procedures – this will continue to be a contractual requirement within the future model; • The Recovery Service employs many experts by experience (i.e. people who have formerly had addiction issues and are now in recovery) – currently over 80% of its workforce – and this will continue to be a contractual requirement; • Continuing to offer accessible services, both in terms of physical (accessible buildings and access) and the inclusion criteria (any resident of Middlesbrough with a related vulnerability is entitled to free access to support, reasonable adjustments will be made to enable effective engagement and individually tailored support plans will be developed). Specific projects/initiatives to engage under-represented groups into services also have and will continue to be undertaken.

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
<p>Community cohesion Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town?*</p>	☒	☐	☐	<p>One of the aims of the integrated approach is to improve community cohesion via an asset based approach. As such there are no concerns that the revised commissioning model being proposed could have an adverse impact on community cohesion.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substance misuse services have and will continue to champion the cause of vulnerable groups and challenge stigma. This includes community events such as recovery walks and roadshows, as well as attending community groups and delivering from community locations; • The challenges of getting some of the most vulnerable people in society into sustainable recovery require a system-wide response. Substance misuse services have to adopt an asset-based approach in terms of utilising existing public and 3rd sector partner organisations to support and reintegrate clients into their communities – they cannot do this alone; • Challenging stigma related to addictions and vulnerable groups is one of the strategic aims for Public Health, therefore, the team will continue to work with partners, stakeholders and the public on this agenda. The impact of this workstream will continue to be monitored.
<p>Next steps:</p> <p>➡ If the answer to all of the above screening questions is No then the process is completed.</p> <p>➡ If the answer of any of the questions is Yes or Uncertain, then a Level 2 Full Impact Assessment must be completed.</p>				

Assessment completed by:	Jonathan Bowden	Head of Service:	Catherine Parker
Date:	21/12/18	Date:	21/12/18