

**Equality Assessment of MSG Roll-Over Funding Proposals 2015 : Funding Stream****Section 1: Equality Assessment Summary****MSG Funding – Social Welfare Advice Services**

**Assessment of the potential equality impact of:** Proposal to extend or discontinue Main Stream Grant (MSG) beyond 31<sup>st</sup> March 2015 to projects based on a criteria agreed with DCLG Commissioners.

**Responsible Directorate:** Development & Renewal

**Service Manager:** Everett Haughton

**Prepared by:** Ali Ahmed & Dyana Browne

**Priorities/Objectives**

Priorities for this funding is aimed at supporting low income residents, to access free quality assured community legal and social welfare advice, at both a general and specialist level.

**Funding Stream Assessment Outcome**

A detailed breakdown of the length of funding recommended is set out in

	Above Line	Below Line	Total
<b>Total no of Projects funded (2012-2015)</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Number of projects recommended for roll-over funding:</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Number of projects not recommended for roll-over funding</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Number of projects now closed – Grant Terminated</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**Impact Summary**

*Summarise any overall impact of the assessment on the various groups with protected characteristics*

The proposal recommends that 17 of the original projects receive extended funding for a period of 5 months and 1 project (assessed as amber) receive extended funding for an initial period of 3 months.

As a result the service provision will remain the same over the first 3 months, of the funding extension period, as has the potential to remain unchanged until the end of the full funding extension period.

Should the project granted funding for only 3 months not have the funding extended further the overall result would mean that the full service provision was maintained throughout the extension period.

This Equality Impact considers the impact to be neutral.

Decision



Green

**Value of Recommended Extensions funding****£ 316,788.52**

## Section 2: Identified Need

Deprivation, and the particular combination of challenges that face the borough, are significant drivers of the demand for advice services.

Table 1 below provides a summary of annual need/demand, identified from the 2011/12 monitoring data from currently funded advice projects.

TABLE 1

Type of Provision	Beneficiary target group/Area	Est. Units of needs (based on past LBTH monitoring data 2011/12)	Est. Units of need per annum met by CGPB recommendations	Difference
Specialist Help Level (caseload numbers)	Borough wide	1,300	1050	-250
Specialist Debt Advice	Borough wide	New project	200	200
<b>Total Specialist Advice (Estimated caseload numbers)</b>		<b>1,300</b>	<b>1,250</b>	<b>-50 (-4%)</b>
Boroughwide General Help Level (caseload)	Borough wide	11,000	9,000	-2000 (-18%)
Locality based – General Help (caseload numbers)	Locality	16,690	14,395	-2295 (-14%)
Language based – General Help Provision: (Somali, Chinese, Other New Migrants & BSL)	Borough wide	3400	2905	-495 (-15%)
<b>Total General Help Level (estimated caseload numbers)</b>		<b>31,090</b>	<b>26,300</b>	<b>-4,790 (-15%)</b>

## Section 3: Equality Impact Assessment

Target Groups	Impact ✓ - Positive ✗ - Adverse 0 = Neutral What impact will the proposal have on specific groups of service users or staff?	Reason(s) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add a narrative to justify your claims around impacts and,</li> <li>Describe the analysis and interpretation of evidence to support your conclusion as this will inform decision making</li> </ul>
Race	0 = Neutral	The service provision/funding will be unaffected by the proposals and therefore has no impact on beneficiaries with this protected characteristic. The profile of users, based on race is currently reflective of the local community with people of Bangladeshi descent being the highest users, followed closely by people of white British then Somali descent.
Disability	0 = Neutral	The proposed recommendation will have no impact on the current service provision to people with a disability. It is anticipated that Over 11% of clients using the general services have disability or health related condition.
Gender	0 = Neutral	The proposed recommendation will have no impact on the current service to people of a specific gender. Service uptake is highest by males. (60/40)
Gender Reassignment	0 = Neutral	No related data is available as it has not been collected by previously MSG-funded organisations – however since the proposal has not resulted in a change or reduction of the services provided it is considered that there will be no impact on people with this protected characteristic.
Sexual Orientation	0 = Neutral	Whilst there is currently insufficient data to quantify the benefit to people of the LBGBT community. The proposed award, (which is a new contribution) and will benefit this sector of the community - however since the proposal has not resulted in a change or reduction of the services provided it is considered that there will be no impact on people with this protected characteristic.
Religion or Belief	0 = Neutral	No data related to religion or belief is available - however since the proposal has not resulted in a change or reduction of the services provided it is considered that there will be no impact on people with this protected characteristic.
Age	0 = Neutral	The proposed recommendation will have no impact on the current service based on age. Indications are that the majority of the advice service client group continue to be those aged between 26 and 60 with approx. 10% over 60.
Marriage and Civil Partnerships.	0 = Neutral	Insufficient monitoring data available to draw any conclusion - however since the proposal has not resulted in a change or reduction of the services provided it is considered that there will be no impact on people with this protected characteristic.
Pregnancy and Maternity	0 = Neutral	Insufficient monitoring data available to draw any conclusion - however since the proposal has not resulted in a change or reduction of the services provided it is considered that there will be no impact on people with this protected characteristic.
Other Socio-economic Carers	0 = Neutral	The proposed recommendation will have no impact on the current service to people based on their socio-economic status. Low income households are the main users of advice services in the borough and the provision remains unchanged.

## Section 4: Equality Impact Assessment Action Plan

The table below sets out potential disproportionate adverse effect (on a particular group), identified as a result of undertaking this Equality Impact assessment and proposes actions that can be taken to mitigate the impact.

At least one alternative way of delivering the change which will lessen any potential adverse impact, has been considered.

**Table 4: Proposals for mitigating potential adverse impact**

Adverse impact	Proposed actions to mitigate adverse impact
N/A	
The equalities assessment indicates no change in service provision to either of the groups with protected characteristics as a result of the recommendations for extension of MSF funding, therefore there are no adverse impact have been identified.	

In our view the following identified potential impact cannot be mitigated options, therefore alternative options have been considered as a means of progressing with the proposal.

**Table 5: Alternative options where potential negative impact cannot be mitigated.**

Adverse impact	Option/s	Estimated Costs
N/A		
The equalities assessment indicates no change in service provision to either of the groups with protected characteristics, as a result of the recommendations for extension of MSF funding, therefore there are alternative to mitigating actions are not applicable.		

## Section 5: Future Review and Monitoring

The funding made available through the Main Stream Grant process is categorised as “discretionary” funding in that the Council has no statutory or legal obligation to make funding/grants available in this way. As a result there is no obligation on the Council to provide further funding to the current, projects or organisations that are subject to this assessment.

Extended funding under this programme period will be subject to monitoring and performance review process set out in the funding agreement.

## Section 6 – Project Information

### Overview of all projects funded 2012-15 (Nos. 18)

(Incorporates) - Overall summary of projects **recommended for extension** of funding

No	Beneficiary Target Group	Geographic Area/s of Delivery	Evaluation	
			Original	Re-evaluated
SWAS-01	Income Maximisation - vulnerable clients with a focus on claiming disability related benefits	Borough wide	98	<b>GREEN</b>
SWAS-02	Complex welfare law cases including benefits ,housing and immigration	Borough wide	91	<b>GREEN</b>
SWAS-03	Benefits ,debt and housing advice	Borough wide	89	<b>GREEN</b>
SWAS-04	Complex Debt and money management cases	Borough wide	79	<b>GREEN</b>
SWAS-05	Deaf and hearing impaired	Borough Wide – General/Specialist	61	<b>GREEN</b>
SWAS-07	Welfare benefits, debt and housing	Mile End and Bromley by Bow Wards (LAP 6) at 6 outreach	105	<b>GREEN</b>
SWAS-08	Benefits, debt and housing	Limehouse , East India and Lansbury,LAP 7 at 3 outreach	103	<b>GREEN</b>
SWAS-09	Benefits, debt, housing, consumer, immigration, family matters	(LAP 3and4) delivered via 5 outreach	91	<b>GREEN</b>
SWAS-10	Benefits, debt, housing, employment rights,	Weavers , Bethnal Green North , Mile End and Globe Town wards (LAP1)	88	<b>GREEN</b>
SWAS-11	Welfare benefits, debt, housing etc	Spitalfields and Banglatown and Bethnal Green South (LAP 2 )	88	<b>GREEN</b>
SWAS-12	Benefits, debt, housing, consumer, immigration, employment	Bow East and Bow West (LAP 5)	86	<b>GREEN</b>
SWAS-13	Benefits, debt, housing, consumer, immigration, employment	Milwall , Blackwall and Cubitt Town (LAP 8)	86	<b>GREEN</b>
SWAS-14	Social Welfare Advice	Weavers	58	<b>GREEN</b>
SWAS-15	Social Welfare Advice		ineligible	<b>AMBER</b>
<del>SWAS-16*</del>	<del>Older residents – information and social activities</del>	<del>Ocean Estate</del>	ineligible	<del>GREEN</del>
SWAS-17	Outreach advice, benefit and debt sessions	LAP 1 and LAP 4	ineligible	<b>GREEN</b>

No	Beneficiary Target Group	Geographic Area/s of Delivery	Evaluation	
			Original	Re-evaluated
SWAS-18	Somali residents	Boroughwide with outreach sessions at Wadajir (E14), London Somali Action forum (E1) SIT (E2)	85	GREEN
SWAS-19	New residents including African, East European and other new migrants.	Borough wide	73	GREEN
SWAS-21	Chinese/Vietnamese residents	Borough wide	61	GREEN

**Commentary**

\*SWAS-16 Application was ineligible for SWAS but was funded under CEE. Not scored originally. Reassessed and scored 46. See EEC funding stream.

Final column shows projects recommended for extension of funding by GREEN and AMBER shading

**3. Projects not recommended for extended funding (0)**

No	Beneficiary Target Group	Geographic Area/s of Proposed Delivery	Anticipated Output/Users per annum
	N/A		

**Commentary:**

There are no projects not recommended for extension of funding

**4. Projects that gave notice to terminate their Grant Agreement and are now closed(0)**

No	Beneficiary Target Group	Geographic Area/s of Proposed Delivery	Anticipated Output/Users per annum
	N/A		

**Commentary:**

There are no closed projects