

**City of Edinburgh Council**

**Equalities Impact Assessment (EQIA)**

**Revenue Budget Proposals 2012 / 13  
and Grant to Third Parties**

**Summary Report**

**February 2012**

**1. Introduction**

The Council is committed to undertaking equalities relevance scoring and equalities impact assessment of every revenue budget saving proposal and change to grants to third parties.

As well as this being an important legal duty for the Council, EQIA enables the Council to assess positive and negative impacts on vulnerable citizens and equality in the city. It also encourages the involvement and engagement of affected service users and citizens, and leads to the publication of mitigating actions to address identified negative impacts.

Described below is a summary of all the EQIA activity that has taken place across the Council in response to the full range of revenue savings proposals and grants to third parties for 2012 / 13, which are to be discussed at the 9 February 2012 City of Edinburgh Council meeting.

The accompanying full EQIA (and further information) is available from [nick.croft@edinburgh.gov.uk](mailto:nick.croft@edinburgh.gov.uk) or on the Council's website at: [www.edinburgh.gov.uk/equalities](http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/equalities).

**2. Equalities Relevance Scores**

Equalities relevance scores provide an initial indication of relevance to: (i) equality legal duties, (ii) public concern expressed by equality groups and (iii) the extent of significant negative impact that might ensue as a result of any given savings proposal on equality groups.

Each of the three dimensions above is scored out of three, giving a total equalities relevance score out of 9. All those scoring above 4 or above undergo a full EQIA.

Described below is a summary of the equalities relevance scores for each savings proposal:

<b>Service Area</b>	<b>Proposals and Equality Relevance Scores (0-3 = Low / 4-6 = Med / 7-9 = High)</b>	<b>Summary of Relevance Scores</b>	<b>Full EQIAs Required</b>
<b>C and F</b>	<b>8 Proposals</b> Firhill (L); Workforce Dev (L); Schools LT Leave (L); CLD Rates (L); CLD Staff (L); Purchasing Inflation (L); Services and Supplies (L); Back Office Staff (L)	8 - low 0 – Medium 0 – High	<b>Total - 0</b>
<b>SfC</b>	<b>7 proposals</b> Commissioning Various (M); HMO Licensing (L); Bus. Assist. Post (L); Refuse Collection (L); Roundabouts (L); Zero Waste (L); 3% Uplift Fees and Charges (L)	6 – Low 1 – Medium 0 - High	<b>Total - 1</b> Commissioning
<b>HSC</b>	<b>5 Proposals</b> Procurement Deregistration (M); Joint CHP/CEC Efficiencies (L); Residential Fees (L); Criminal Justice Overheads (M); Care Home Fees (L)	3 – Low 2 – Medium 0 – High	<b>Total - 2</b> Procurement Deregistration  Criminal justice Overheads
<b>CD</b>	<b>3 Proposals</b> Staffing Accessible Transport (L); SESTran (M); Parking (L)	2 – Low 1 – Medium 0 – High	<b>Total – 1</b> SESTran
<b>CG</b>	<b>10 Proposals</b> ICT (L); PSP Staff and Grants (M); COMS Staff (L); HR Staff (M); Financial Services Staff (L); Payments and Procurement Staff (L); Legal and Admin Supplies and Income (L); C and S Supplies and Income (L); Contact Centre Staff (L); Consultants (L)	8 – Low 2 – Medium 0 - High	<b>Total – 2</b> PSP Staff  HR Staff
<b>Total</b>	<b>33 savings proposals in total</b>	<b>27 – Low 6 – Medium 0 – High</b>	<b>6 full EQIAs to be completed</b>

In addition:

<b>Grants to Third Parties</b>	Grant Aid Savings – Including (i) specific changes in employability funding due to new priorities (H); (ii) CORE (H), CHAI (M), Shelter Gypsy Traveller Project (M) and Welcoming Project (H) grant	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Total - 1 composite proposal to undergo a full EQIA consisting of</b>
--------------------------------	---	------------	--

	proposals.		<b>the elements indicated</b>
--	------------	--	-------------------------------

### 3. Full EQIA Activity

EQIA activity is the responsibility of each council service area. The process across the Council is co-ordinated and quality assured by the Corporate Governance Department.

For those proposals undergoing a full EQIA consultation has taken place with affected service users. There has also been engagement and discussion with third party organisations affected by changes in funding levels. Ongoing support will be offered to such organisations to manage any significant negative impacts.

In summary, the major potential impacts, and associated mitigating actions, have been identified below aligned to various protected characteristics:

Age	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Where savings will affect staffing budgets there are some concerns about disproportionate negative impacts on older staff or younger staff. However, good HR policies and practices (including diversity monitoring) will ensure fair treatment and non discriminatory practice.</li> <li>- Some concerns about the reregistration of care homes to houses of multiple occupation and the affect on older service users. However, this approach has been in place for a while, and good communication and support arrangements are in place with the potential for increased benefit income and personalised care for any individuals affected.</li> </ul>
Faith / Belief	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-No specific disproportionate impacts were identified with regard to faith or belief.</li> </ul>
Sex / Gender	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Some concerns were identified with regard to changes in housing and homeless commissioning budgets. However, robust service user assessments and referral procedures are in place to ensure vulnerable female and male clients continue to receive the services they need.</li> <li>- Where savings will affect staffing budgets there are some concerns about disproportionate negative impacts on males or females. However, good HR policies and practices (including diversity monitoring) will ensure fair treatment and non discriminatory practice.</li> <li>- No other specific disproportionate impacts were identified for either sex or gender groups.</li> </ul>
Disability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Some concerns about the reregistration of care homes to houses of multiple occupation and the affect on disabled service users. However, this approach has been in place for a while, and good communication and support arrangements are in place with the potential for increased benefit income and personalised care for any individuals affected.</li> </ul>

	- Some concerns expressed about renewed assessment activity on those individuals with mental health problems who are homeless. However, robust service user assessments and referral procedures are in place to ensure vulnerable clients continue to receive the services they need.
Race	- Concerns expressed by third party organisations dealing with BME communities or other equality groups, who maybe negatively affected by changes to grant aid levels. Support services are being put in place to assist organisations and service users through any consequent significant changes.
Sexual Orientation	- No specific disproportionate impacts were identified with regard to sexual orientation.
Socio Economic	-Some concerns were identified with regard to changes in housing and homeless commissioning budgets given many clients are in acute poverty. However, robust service user assessments and referral procedures are in place to ensure vulnerable clients continue to receive the services they need.
All	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Where changes in grant aid levels affect vulnerable service users from any equality groups there will be referral systems established and support provided to affected organisations and service users.</li> <li>- Changes in employability programme priorities have placed more emphasis on disability and young people.</li> <li>- Any consequent changes in criminal justice services will be managed with minimal impact on service users. The drug treatment post and prison post are not included in any savings proposals.</li> <li>- Savings identified in back office functions (especially in Corporate Governance) do enable a degree of protection to frontline services for vulnerable clients.</li> <li>- Proposed savings in the Edinburgh Equality Network (EEN) budget are in line with the previous years under spends. In addition, opportunities for match funding EEN and community planning partner contributions will be explored.</li> </ul>

#### 4. Way Forward

A total of 12 recommendations have been agreed as a result of the full EQIA analysis. These largely relate to mitigating actions that include improved communication, service redesign, third sector organisational support and service user reassessment and referral.

Progress with regard to these recommendations will be reported as part of the 2012 /13 revenue budget implementation plans and grant to third party monitoring arrangements.