

## Appendix 6

### Public Health Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

<b>Subject of assessment:</b>	PHPP 01 Reduction in the spend of the drug and alcohol service provision via contract negotiations / associated budget adjustments			
<b>Coverage:</b>	Service specific			
<b>This is a decision relating to:</b>	<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)		
<b>It is a:</b>	<b>New approach:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Revision of an existing approach:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>It is driven by:</b>	<b>Legislation:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Local or corporate requirements:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Description:</b>	<p><b>Key aims, objectives and activities</b></p> <p>To achieve savings following full delivery of the integrated commissioning model for vulnerable people by continuing the re-design of back-office and customer facing delivery. This forms a part of the wider model that was agreed in October 2019 by Executive to provide a more effective and efficient way of commissioning services for homelessness services, domestic abuse, sexual violence and substance misuse provision within a new model.</p> <p><b>Statutory drivers</b> include, Health and Social Care Act 2012 – duty to improve public health.</p> <p><b>Differences from any previous approach</b></p> <p>Executive agreed to cease commissioning of services individually, that had previously leading to duplication and gaps in provision with existing services not always effectively and efficiently support people with multiple needs. The savings proposal would continue delivery of that integrated commissioning model.</p> <p><b>Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries</b></p> <p>Internal -Public Health, Adult’s Social Care, Children’s Social Care, Early Help, Economic Development, Welfare Rights, Housing Benefits External – Current and potential future customers, existing Allied Services, Health, Best Practice/Academia/Research, Criminal Justice, Landlords, Service Providers, Local and Central Government, Voluntary Sector</p> <p><b>Intended outcomes</b></p> <p>To continue delivery of a more collaborative, integrated and strategic approach to how the organisation commissions and delivers services, with the aim of improving service user experience, improving outcomes of local residents and reducing costs.</p>			
<b>Live date:</b>	1 April 2020 onwards for next stage of the model			
<b>Lifespan:</b>	n/a			
<b>Date of next review:</b>	A desktop review will be undertaken in September 2021 to identify whether there are any unintended consequences and/or identify whether expectations around efficiencies being achieved to fully mitigate impacts of reducing global budgets have not been realised			

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
<p><b>Human Rights</b> 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 rights listed within the Human Rights Act 1998 are anticipated to be affected by the continued delivery of the integrated model first agreed by Executive in October 2019. Evidence used to assess the impact of this proposal includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Equality</b> 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 checked="" 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"> <li>• Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;</li> <li>• Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and</li> <li>• Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.</li> </ul> <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"> <li>• Removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;</li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• Encouraging people who share a protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation is low.</li> </ul> <p>As set out previously in the decision taken by Executive in October 2019, the proposal is to continue delivery of the new model in order to achieve an anticipated saving during 2020/21. 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, that being said, the proposal is for a further reduction in the global budget for services within scope, therefore there is a risk of a disproportionate adverse impact on protected equality characteristics if the reduced budget is insufficient to meet demand. It is currently believed that there is sufficient budget for the revised model to meet current demand. The budget consultation survey included a question on this proposal which will be considered as part of the stage 2 impact Assessment.</p> <p>Under the Equality Act, consideration needs to be made as to whether this impact can be avoided. Evidence shows that outcomes are not being met within the current model, therefore it is not appropriate to continue with the pre October 2019 model. The next step is to consider whether it can be mitigated. This process will be considered and set out in full within a stage 2 impact assessment, once public consultation on the proposal has been completed.</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
<b>Community cohesion</b> Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town?*	☒	☐	☐	The proposal will have a positive impact on community cohesion. It will support more individuals to remain within their communities and/or successfully return to community based tenancies.  Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of demand, feedback from consultation, engagement with partners, engagement with current and potential future providers of services, engagement with current and potential future service users.
<b>Next steps:</b> ➡ 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.				

<b>Assessment completed by:</b>	Julie Marsden	<b>Head of Service:</b>	Tom Boyd
<b>Date:</b>	28.1.2020	<b>Date:</b>	28.1.2020

## Public Health Impact Assessment Level 2: Full impact assessment

<b>Subject of assessment:</b>	PHPP 01 Reduction in the spend of the drug and alcohol service provision via contract negotiations / associated budget adjustments			
<b>Coverage:</b>	Cross-cutting.			
<b>This is a decision relating to:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Strategy</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Policy</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Service</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Function</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Process/procedure</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Programme</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Project</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Review</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Organisational change</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other (please state)</b>		
<b>It is a:</b>	<b>New approach:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Revision of an existing approach:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>It is driven by:</b>	<b>Legislation:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Local or corporate requirements:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Description:</b>	<p><b>Key aims, objectives and activities</b></p> <p>To achieve savings following full delivery of the integrated commissioning model for vulnerable people by continuing the re-design of back-office and customer facing delivery. This forms a part of the wider model that was agreed in October 2019 by Executive to provide a more effective and efficient way of commissioning services for homelessness services, domestic abuse, sexual violence and substance misuse provision within a new model.</p> <p><b>Statutory drivers</b> include, Health and Social Care Act 2012 – duty to improve public health.</p> <p><b>Differences from any previous approach</b></p> <p>Executive agreed to cease commissioning of services individually, that had previously leading to duplication and gaps in provision with existing services not always effectively and efficiently support people with multiple needs. The savings proposal would continue delivery of that integrated commissioning model.</p> <p><b>Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries</b></p> <p>Internal -Public Health, Adult's Social Care, Children's Social Care, Early Help, Economic Development, Welfare Rights, Housing Benefits External – Current and potential future customers, existing Allied Services, Health, Best Practice/Academia/Research, Criminal Justice, Landlords, Service Providers, Local and Central Government, Voluntary Sector</p> <p><b>Intended outcomes</b></p> <p>To continue delivery of a more collaborative, integrated and strategic approach to how the organisation commissions and delivers services, with the aim of improving service user experience, improving outcomes of local residents and reducing costs.</p>			
<b>Live date:</b>	April 2020 onwards			
<b>Lifespan:</b>	n/a			
<b>Next review:</b>	A desktop review will be undertaken in September 2021 to identify whether there are any unintended consequences and/or identify whether expectations around efficiencies being achieved to fully mitigate impacts of reducing global budgets have not been realised.			

Assessment issue	Impacts identified					Rationale and supporting evidence
	None	Positive	Negative		Uncertain	
			Justified	Mitigated		
<b>Human Rights</b>						
Engagement with Convention Rights (as set out in section 1, appendix 2 of the Impact Assessment Policy).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The long-term joint-commissioning proposal will be designed to ensure human rights are continuously supported through delivery of services that are person-centred. The initial recommended savings and variance of spend options have been chosen to avoid adversely impacting on human rights.
<b>Equality</b>						
<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"> <li>eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;</li> <li>advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and</li> <li>foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.</li> </ul> <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"> <li>removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;</li> <li>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</li> <li>encouraging people who share a protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation is low.</li> </ul> <p>NB – those who chose not to respond to questions have been removed from analysis for equality analysis purposes, they will be included in wider analysis when presenting consultation data.</p>						

Assessment issue	Impacts identified					Rationale and supporting evidence
	None	Positive	Negative		Uncertain	
			Justified	Mitigated		
Age	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The proposal is relevant to this characteristic because of the nature of some of the needs of current and potential future service users. In this case there is a need to support young people in particular to live independently and safely within the community, providing extra support where they have additional needs. While the proposed model will change the way in which services are provided there are no concerns that the proposed changes will result in a negative impact on thresholds or outcomes although there is a further planned reduction in the global budget being made.</p> <p>Under the Equality Act, consideration needs to be made as to whether this impact can be avoided. Evidence shows that outcomes are not being met within the current model, therefore it is not appropriate to continue with the pre October 2019 model. The next step is to consider whether it can be mitigated. Because of the nature of the services and the changes that are being made, the Council is confident that the impact of the changes will be fully mitigated by the new cohesive model.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of demand, feedback from consultation, engagement with partners, engagement with current and potential future providers of services, engagement with current and potential future service users and feedback from the budget consultation form which identified no public concerns that the proposal could result in a disproportionate adverse impact on this protected characteristic (based on analysis of free text responses) and just under half in favour of the proposal, a third with no view and around 33% against. Concerns raised by those against were most commonly around concerns around capacity within the reduced global budget. In addition views were also submitted via email, petition and at public meetings. There were no concerns expressed through these routes in relation to this proposal. Analysing the feedback by age shows that support increases for the proposal as age increases. Those under the age of 24 were least likely to support the proposal (31%).</p> <p>The service has undertaken a process of extensive engagement with current providers to understand demand, including mapping client duplication across current provision, gaps in provision and use of provision from people who live outside the town. Based on this work and current understanding of demand, the service is satisfied that the remaining budget will be sufficient to meet current expected demand through the provision of this revised commissioning model.</p> <p>Given the above it is felt that the impact of the proposal is justified because the new integrated model will improve outcomes for individuals.</p>

Assessment issue	Impacts identified					Rationale and supporting evidence
	None	Positive	Negative		Uncertain	
			Justified	Mitigated		
Disability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The proposal is relevant to this characteristic because a number of clients will also have a disability, in particular a significant number of clients may have mental health needs. Transition to the new model will have a positive impact on this group because the improved data sharing and data recording practices that will be implemented will support a better understanding of the whole needs of an individual. While not within the scope of this blended commissioning model, mental health services access will be improved as a result. Needs will be identified at the front door, supporting a focus on prevention and early intervention around needs.</p> <p>Under the Equality Act, consideration needs to be made as to whether this impact can be avoided. Evidence shows that outcomes are not being met within the current model, therefore it is not appropriate to continue with the pre October 2019 model. The next step is to consider whether it can be mitigated. Because of the nature of the services and the changes that are being made, the Council is confident that the impact of the changes will be fully mitigated by the new cohesive model.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of demand, feedback from consultation, engagement with partners, engagement with current and potential future providers of services, engagement with current and potential future service users. Feedback from the budget consultation form identified no public concerns that the proposal could result in a disproportionate adverse impact on this protected characteristic (based on analysis of free text responses) and just under half in favour of the proposal, a third with no view and around 20% against. Concerns raised by those against were most commonly around concerns around capacity within the reduced global budget. In addition views were also submitted via email, petition and at public meetings. There were no concerns expressed through these routes in relation to this proposal. Those with a disability were less likely to support the proposal than those with no disability or those that chose not to provide any equality monitoring information (41% agreed, compared to 46% and 46% respectively). A small number of respondents to the budget consultation survey used the free text box to express concern about the link between mental health admissions to hospital and substance abuse. The council acknowledges this concern and this is one of the reasons the revised model has been put in place, in order to better meet the needs of those with multiple need and reduce the number that escalate to crisis intervention.</p> <p>The service has undertaken a process of extensive engagement with current providers to understand demand, including mapping client duplication across current provision, gaps in provision and use of provision from people who live outside the town. Based on this work and current understanding of demand, the service is satisfied that the remaining budget will be sufficient to meet current expected demand through the provision of this revised commissioning model.</p> <p>Given the above it is felt that the impact of the proposal is justified because the new integrated model will improve outcomes for individuals.</p>

Assessment issue	Impacts identified					Rationale and supporting evidence
	None	Positive	Negative		Uncertain	
			Justified	Mitigated		
Gender reassignment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>By moving to a person centred commissioning model, the Council and its partners will be better able to respond to the individual needs that may be presented arising from in this case, gender reassignment, rather than attempting to fit individuals into standard packages of support that may not meet their needs.</p> <p>Under the Equality Act, consideration needs to be made as to whether this impact can be avoided. Evidence shows that outcomes are not being met within the current model, therefore it is not appropriate to continue with the pre October 2019 model. The next step is to consider whether it can be mitigated. Because of the nature of the services and the changes that are being made, the Council is confident that the impact of the changes will be fully mitigated by the new cohesive model.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of demand, feedback from consultation, engagement with partners, engagement with current and potential future providers of services, engagement with current and potential future service users.</p> <p>Feedback from the budget consultation form which identified no public concerns that the proposal could result in a disproportionate adverse impact on this protected characteristic (based on analysis of free text responses) and just under half in favour of the proposal, a third with no view and around 20% against. Concerns raised by those against were most commonly around concerns around capacity within the reduced global budget. In addition views were also submitted via email, petition and at public meetings. There were no concerns expressed through these routes in relation to this proposal.</p> <p>The service has undertaken a process of extensive engagement with current providers to understand demand, including mapping client duplication across current provision, gaps in provision and use of provision from people who live outside the town. Based on this work and current understanding of demand, the service is satisfied that the remaining budget will be sufficient to meet current expected demand through the provision of this revised commissioning model.</p> <p>Given the above it is felt that the impact of the proposal is justified because the new integrated model will improve outcomes for individuals.</p>



Assessment issue	Impacts identified					Rationale and supporting evidence
	None	Positive	Negative		Uncertain	
			Justified	Mitigated		
Pregnancy / maternity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The proposal is relevant to this protected characteristic because a number of current and potential future clients will be pregnant or recent mothers.</p> <p>By changing to a blended commissioning model, the Council will be better placed to put in place support, wrapped around those individuals that better meets their needs and improve outcomes for women and their families, rather than traditional packages of care.</p> <p>Under the Equality Act, consideration needs to be made as to whether this impact can be avoided. Evidence shows that outcomes are not being met within the current model, therefore it is not appropriate to continue with the pre October 2019 model. The next step is to consider whether it can be mitigated. Because of the nature of the services and the changes that are being made, the Council is confident that the impact of the changes will be fully mitigated by the new cohesive model.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of demand, feedback from consultation, engagement with partners, engagement with current and potential future providers of services, engagement with current and potential future service users, feedback from the budget consultation form which identified no public concerns that the proposal could result in a disproportionate adverse impact on this protected characteristic (based on analysis of free text responses) and just under half in favour of the proposal, a third with no view and around 20% against.</p> <p>Concerns raised by those against were most commonly around concerns around capacity within the reduced global budget. In addition views were also submitted via email, petition and at public meetings. There were no concerns expressed through these routes in relation to this proposal.</p> <p>The service has undertaken a process of extensive engagement with current providers to understand demand, including mapping client duplication across current provision, gaps in provision and use of provision from people who live outside the town. Based on this work and current understanding of demand, the service is satisfied that the remaining budget will be sufficient to meet current expected demand through the provision of this revised commissioning model.</p> <p>Given the above it is felt that the impact of the proposal is justified because the new integrated model will improve outcomes for individuals.</p>

Assessment issue	Impacts identified					Rationale and supporting evidence
	None	Positive	Negative		Uncertain	
			Justified	Mitigated		
Race	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>There are no concerns that implementation of this phase of the commissioning model could have a disproportionate adverse impact on the race or religion or belief protected characteristics although there is a further planned reduction proposed in the global budgets by this proposal.</p> <p>Under the Equality Act, consideration needs to be made as to whether this impact can be avoided. Evidence shows that outcomes are not being met within the current model, therefore it is not appropriate to continue with the pre October 2019 model. The next step is to consider whether it can be mitigated. Because of the nature of the services and the changes that are being made, the Council is confident that the impact of the changes will be fully mitigated by the new cohesive model.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of demand, feedback from consultation, engagement with partners, engagement with current and potential future providers of services, engagement with current and potential future service users, feedback from the budget consultation form which identified no public concerns that the proposal could result in a disproportionate adverse impact on this protected characteristic (based on analysis of free text responses) and just under half in favour of the proposal, a third with no view and around 20% against. Concerns raised by those against were most commonly around concerns around capacity within the reduced global budget. In addition views were also submitted via email, petition and at public meetings. There were no concerns expressed through these routes in relation to this proposal. Analysis of data showed there was a majority across all ethnicities and religions or beliefs in favour of the proposal.</p>
Religion or belief	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The service has undertaken a process of extensive engagement with current providers to understand demand, including mapping client duplication across current provision, gaps in provision and use of provision from people who live outside the town. Based on this work and current understanding of demand, the service is satisfied that the remaining budget will be sufficient to meet current expected demand through the provision of this revised commissioning model.</p> <p>Given the above it is felt that the impact of the proposal is justified because the new integrated model will improve outcomes for individuals.</p>

Assessment issue	Impacts identified					Rationale and supporting evidence
	None	Positive	Negative		Uncertain	
			Justified	Mitigated		
Sex	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The proposal is relevant to this characteristic because of the nature of the needs individuals have which can differ because of gender. Continued transition to the new model will have a positive impact on this group because the improved data sharing and data recording practices that will be implemented will support a better understanding of the whole needs of an individual. Needs will be identified at the front door, supporting a focus on prevention and early intervention around needs.</p> <p>While the model will change the way in which services are provided when fully implemented there are no concerns that the proposed changes will result in a negative impact on thresholds or outcomes based on analysis of demand, although there is a reduction in the global budget available.</p> <p>Under the Equality Act, consideration needs to be made as to whether this impact can be avoided. Evidence shows that outcomes are not being met within the current model, therefore it is not appropriate to continue with the pre October 2019 model. The next step is to consider whether it can be mitigated. Because of the nature of the services and the changes that are being made, the Council is confident that the impact of the changes will be fully mitigated by the new cohesive model.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of demand, feedback from consultation, engagement with partners, engagement with current and potential future providers of services, engagement with current and potential future service users, feedback from the budget consultation form which identified no public concerns that the proposal could result in a disproportionate adverse impact on this protected characteristic (based on analysis of free text responses) and just under half in favour of the proposal, a third with no view and around 20% against. Concerns raised by those against were most commonly around concerns around capacity within the reduced global budget. In addition views were also submitted via email, petition and at public meetings. There were no concerns expressed through these routes in relation to this proposal. Data from the consultation showed that men were more likely to support the proposal than women, although women were almost twice as likely to have no views on this topic, than men. Levels of those opposing the proposal were very similar (17.1% of women and 17.8% of men).</p> <p>The service has undertaken a process of extensive engagement with current providers to understand demand, including mapping client duplication across current provision, gaps in provision and use of provision from people who live outside the town. Based on this work and current understanding of demand, the service is satisfied that the remaining budget will be sufficient to meet current expected demand through the provision of this revised commissioning model.</p> <p>Given the above it is felt that the impact of the proposal is justified because the new integrated model will improve outcomes for individuals.</p>

Assessment issue	Impacts identified					Rationale and supporting evidence
	None	Positive	Negative		Uncertain	
			Justified	Mitigated		
Sexual Orientation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The proposal is relevant to this characteristic. Transition to the new model will have a positive impact on this group because the improved data sharing and data recording practices that will be implemented will support a better understanding of the whole needs of an individual, ensuring packages of care are built around the individual, rather than standard interventions.</p> <p>While the model will change the way in which services are provided when fully implemented there are no concerns that the proposed changes will result in a negative impact on thresholds or outcomes based on analysis of demand, although there is a further planned reduction in the global budget available.</p> <p>Under the Equality Act, consideration needs to be made as to whether this impact can be avoided. Evidence shows that outcomes are not being met within the current model, therefore it is not appropriate to continue with the pre October 2019 model. The next step is to consider whether it can be mitigated. Because of the nature of the services and the changes that are being made, the Council is confident that the impact of the changes will be fully mitigated by the new cohesive model.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of demand, feedback from consultation, engagement with partners, engagement with current and potential future providers of services, engagement with current and potential future service users, feedback from the budget consultation form which identified no public concerns that the proposal could result in a disproportionate adverse impact on this protected characteristic (based on analysis of free text responses) and just under half in favour of the proposal, a third with no view and around 20% against. Concerns raised by those against were most commonly around concerns around capacity within the reduced global budget. In addition views were also submitted via email, petition and at public meetings. There were no concerns expressed through these routes in relation to this proposal.</p> <p>While the return numbers are low for those identifying as Lesbian, Gay or bisexual, when analysed this group was more likely to support this proposal (73% compared to 48%).</p> <p>The service has undertaken a process of extensive engagement with current providers to understand demand, including mapping client duplication across current provision, gaps in provision and use of provision from people who live outside the town. Based on this work and current understanding of demand, the service is satisfied that the remaining budget will be sufficient to meet current expected demand through the provision of this revised commissioning model.</p> <p>Given the above it is felt that the impact of the proposal is justified because the new integrated model will improve outcomes for individuals.</p>

Assessment issue	Impacts identified					Rationale and supporting evidence
	None	Positive	Negative		Uncertain	
			Justified	Mitigated		
Marriage / civil partnership**	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>There will be a positive impact on this protected characteristic. The continued delivery of the model includes commissioning of perpetrator Domestic Violence provision which was not in place prior to October 2018. This will support work to improve outcomes for this protected characteristic and will complement existing domestic violence survivor support.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of demand, feedback from consultation, engagement with partners, engagement with current and potential future providers of services, engagement with current and potential future service users, feedback from the budget consultation form which identified no public concerns that the proposal could result in a disproportionate adverse impact on this protected characteristic (based on analysis of free text responses) and just under half in favour of the proposal, a third with no view and around 20% against. Concerns raised by those against were most commonly around concerns around capacity within the reduced global budget. In addition views were also submitted via email, petition and at public meetings.</p> <p>The service has undertaken a process of extensive engagement with current providers to understand demand, including mapping client duplication across current provision, gaps in provision and use of provision from people who live outside the town. Based on this work and current understanding of demand, the service is satisfied that the remaining budget will be sufficient to meet current expected demand through the provision of this revised commissioning model.</p> <p>There were no concerns expressed through these routes in relation to this proposal.</p>

\*\* Indicates this is not included within the single equality duty placed upon public authorities by the Equality Act. See guidance for further details.

Assessment issue	Impacts identified					Rationale and supporting evidence
	None	Positive	Negative		Uncertain	
			Justified	Mitigated		
Dependants / caring responsibilities**	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The focus of the revised model agreed in October 2019 is on providing support for families to remain in existing settings where possible, therefore impacting positively on this protected characteristic. Where this is not practical or safe, the revised model will focus on supporting families to move into alternative settings that are secure and with the option to remain there long term, improving the stability which families will experience.</p> <p>While the model will change the way in which services are provided there are no concerns that the proposed changes will result in a negative impact on thresholds or outcomes based on current demand although there is a reduction in the global budget available.</p> <p>Under the Equality Act, consideration needs to be made as to whether this impact can be avoided. Evidence shows that outcomes are not being met within the current model, therefore it is not appropriate to continue with the pre October 2019 model. The next step is to consider whether it can be mitigated. Because of the nature of the services and the changes that are being made, the Council is confident that the impact of the changes will be fully mitigated by the new cohesive model.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of demand, feedback from consultation, engagement with partners, engagement with current and potential future providers of services, engagement with current and potential future service users, feedback from the budget consultation form which identified no public concerns that the proposal could result in a disproportionate adverse impact on this protected characteristic (based on analysis of free text responses) and just under half in favour of the proposal, a third with no view and around 20% against. Concerns raised by those against were most commonly around concerns around capacity within the reduced global budget. In addition views were also submitted via email, petition and at public meetings. There were no concerns expressed through these routes in relation to this proposal.</p> <p>The service has undertaken a process of extensive engagement with current providers to understand demand, including mapping client duplication across current provision, gaps in provision and use of provision from people who live outside the town. Based on this work and current understanding of demand, the service is satisfied that the remaining budget will be sufficient to meet current expected demand through the provision of this revised commissioning model.</p> <p>Given the above it is felt that the impact of the proposal is justified because the new integrated model will improve outcomes for individuals.</p>

Assessment issue	Impacts identified					Rationale and supporting evidence
	None	Positive	Negative		Uncertain	
			Justified	Mitigated		
Criminal record / offending past**	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The proposal is relevant to this protected characteristic as some service users will have a criminal / offending past. The model will better support individuals leaving prison, transitioning from time limited, centralised support to a model in which individuals are supported to return back into their communities, within an appropriate support setting that better supports long term housing solutions, reducing uncertainty and increasing stability of placements. The proposal will increase the amount of offenders that can be supported through this scheme. While the proposed model will change the way in which services are provided there are no concerns that the proposed changes will result in a negative impact on thresholds or outcomes based on current demand although there is a further reduction in the global budget available.</p> <p>Under the Equality Act, consideration needs to be made as to whether this impact can be avoided. Evidence shows that outcomes are not being met within the current model, therefore it is not appropriate to continue with the pre October 2019 model. The next step is to consider whether it can be mitigated. Because of the nature of the services and the changes that are being made, the Council is confident that the impact of the changes will be fully mitigated by the new cohesive model.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of demand, feedback from consultation, engagement with partners, engagement with current and potential future providers of services, engagement with current and potential future service users, feedback from the budget consultation form which identified no public concerns that the proposal could result in a disproportionate adverse impact on this issue (based on analysis of free text responses) and just under half in favour of the proposal, a third with no view and around 20% against. Concerns raised by those against were most commonly around concerns around capacity within the reduced global budget. In addition views were also submitted via email, petition and at public meetings. There were no concerns expressed through these routes in relation to this proposal.</p> <p>The service has undertaken a process of extensive engagement with current providers to understand demand, including mapping client duplication across current provision, gaps in provision and use of provision from people who live outside the town. Based on this work and current understanding of demand, the service is satisfied that the remaining budget will be sufficient to meet current expected demand through the provision of this revised commissioning model.</p> <p>Given the above it is felt that the impact of the proposal is justified because the new integrated model will improve outcomes for individuals.</p>

Assessment issue	Impacts identified					Rationale and supporting evidence
	None	Positive	Negative		Uncertain	
			Justified	Mitigated		
<b>Community cohesion</b>						
Individual communities / neighbourhoods	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The proposal will have a positive impact on community cohesion. It will support more individuals to remain within their communities and/or successfully return to community based tenancies.
Relations between communities / neighbourhoods	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of demand, feedback from consultation, engagement with partners, engagement with current and potential future providers of services, engagement with current and potential future service users.

Further actions		Lead	Deadline
<b>Mitigating actions</b>	Implementation of the project to deliver the revised model, along with implementation of performance management metrics to track the impact of the model and enable officers to identify if there are any unintended impacts and address them.	Tom Boyd and Erik Scollay (Project Sponsor)	September 2020
<b>Promotion</b>	The decision will be promoted with partners, current providers and service users as necessary. Timing will vary depending upon transition arrangements and changes.	Tom Boyd and Erik Scollay (Project Sponsor)	various
<b>Monitoring and evaluation</b>	The implementation of the decision will be monitored and evaluated to identify any areas of unexpected negative impact through the Community Support Commissioning Project Board, in consultation with the Programme Management Office	Tom Boyd and Erik Scollay (Project Sponsor)	ongoing
<b>Assessment completed by:</b>	Julie Marsden	<b>Head of Service:</b>	Tom Boyd
<b>Date:</b>	4 February 2020	<b>Date:</b>	4 February 2020