


Commissioner Decision Report 17 June 2015	 TOWER HAMLETS
Report of: Chris Holme, Acting Corporate Director Resources	Classification: Unrestricted
Main Stream Grants 2012/15 – Amber Projects Extension	

Originating Officer(s)	Dave Clark, Everett Haughton
Wards affected	All wards
Key Decision?	Yes
Community Plan Theme	All

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 The report sets out details and proposals with regard to a possible 2-month ‘second phase’ extension for projects that were rated AMBER as at the end of quarter 3 within the Council’s grant performance monitoring process.
- 1.2 The agreement reached by the Commissioners was that “projects rated AMBER were to be extended initially for 3 months (to the end of June 2015) with the possibility of a further 2 months (to the end of August 2015) depending on their performance during the January to March 2015 quarter”.
- 1.3 To be awarded the additional 2 months extension, the AMBER projects will need to have moved to GREEN following assessment of their quarter 4 monitoring report.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

The Commissioners are recommended to:

- 2.1 Agree a funding extension as specified in tables 1 to 9 of section 5 of this report in respect of each project rated GREEN in those tables.
- 2.2 Agree that there should be no further funding extension in respect of projects rated AMBER or RED in tables 1 to 9 in section 5.

3. REASONS FOR DECISION

- 3.1 The decisions are required in order that the Council is able to properly manage the necessary arrangements with service providers: by advising

organisations in a timely fashion as to whether or not their projects are to be extended for a further 2 months – to the end of August 2015 or whether their project funding will finish at the end of June.

4. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

- 4.1 The commissioners may, in addition to approving the recommendation as set out in section 2 above, wish to consider approving extensions for those projects where their quarter 4 monitoring resulted in them remaining as AMBER within the RAG monitoring process.

5. DETAILS OF REPORT

- 5.1 The 2012/15 Mainstream Grants Programme was originally due to finish at the end of March 2015 following a 27 month delivery period.
- 5.2 The Commissioners Decision Meeting of 11 March 2015 considered the Main Stream Grants Programme Extension report and agreed the 'rollover' arrangements for projects that were rated as either RED GREEN or AMBER within the Councils RAG monitoring process.
- 5.3 The projects that were rated GREEN as at the end of quarter 3: (October/December 2014) were given a 5 month extension to the end of August 2015.
- 5.4 The projects that were rated AMBER as at the end of quarter 3 were given an initial 3 months extension to the end of June 2015, with the possibility of a further 2 months extension. The additional 2 months would however be subject to a review of each project's quarter 4 performance.
- 5.5 Projects that were rated as RED were not given an extension and their delivery ended as planned on 31 March.
- 5.6 All organisations were written to during the period 17-18 March to advise them of the status of their project(s) in relation to the above extension arrangements.
- 5.7 In order for AMBER rated projects to be awarded the additional 2 months' extension, projects were expected to have moved to GREEN within the RAG monitoring process.
- 5.8 The following tables 1 to 9 set out the projects that were rated Amber as at the end of quarter 3 (October-December 2015) and provides the updated status following performance monitoring at the end of quarter 4.
- 5.9 In addition to evidencing that the grant has been used for the purpose for which it has been approved, the Council's RAG process requires consideration of 2 main features of the project: (1) reporting (2) performance; details of the process is set out in Appendix 2. The

following tables set out the results of the quarter 4 monitoring of the projects.

Table 1 – Older Peoples Lunch Club Service

Organisation	Project	3 Month Extension Amount £	Q4 RAG Status	2 Month Extension Amount
Stifford TJRS TRA	Lunch Club Services	5,000	GREEN	
Wapping Bangladesh Association	Wapping Older Person's Lunch Club Project	3,333	GREEN	
Women's Health and Family Services	Dumarka - Older Somali Women's Lunch Club	2,889	GREEN	
Kingsley Hall Community Centre	Kingsley Hall Luncheon Club	889	AMBER	N/A
Wadajir Somali Community Centre	Wadajir Somali Elderly Luncheon Club	4,444	AMBER	N/A
East London Chinese Community Centre	Older People Luncheon Service for Tower Hamlets residents	1,333	AMBER	N/A
Healthy Chula CIC	Healthy Chula Luncheon Club	2,222	GREEN	1,481
Wadajir Somali Community Centre	Poplar Somali Elderly Luncheon Club	1,111	AMBER	N/A
Neighbours In Poplar *	Burcham Street Lunch Club	2,778	RED	N/A

*this project was originally rated RED by officers but was subsequently moved to AMBER following discussions at the Commissioners decision meeting of 11 March 2015

Table 2 – Children and Families Services

Organisation Details	Project	3 Month Extension Amount	Q4 RAG Status	2 Month Extension Amount
Jagonari Women's Educational Resource Centre	Special Times	2,500	RED	N/A
East London Mosque / London Muslim Centre	Improving School Attainment and Attendance in Partnership	6,667	GREEN	4,445
The Royal London Society for the Blind	Social VIPs and Families	556	AMBER	N/A

Table 3 – Early Years Services

Organisation Details	Project	3 Month Extension Amount £	Q4 RAG Status	2 Month Extension Amount
-----------------------------	----------------	---------------------------------------	----------------------	---------------------------------

Organisation Details	Project	3 Month Extension Amount £	Q4 RAG Status	2 Month Extension Amount
Ranwell Playgroup	Ranwell playgroup	3,000	GREEN	2,000
Jagonari Women Educational Resource Centre	Jagonari Playhouse	6,667	GREEN	4,445
Jagonari / Wapping Playzone	Playgroup	2,572	GREEN	1,715
Rainbow Playgroup	Rainbow Playgroup	3,808	GREEN	2,539

Table 4 – Community Language Services

Organisation Details	Project	3 Month Extension Amount £	Q4 RAG Status	2 Month Extension Amount
Ocean Somali Community Association	Literacy Through Arts	1,111	GREEN	741
Al Majidiah Trust	Al Majidiah Evening and Weekend School	2,778	GREEN	1,852
Jagonari Women Educational Resource	Wapping Creative Bangla Project	694	RED	N/A

Table 5 – Study Support Services

Organisation Details	Project	3 Month Extension Amount £	Q4 RAG Status	2 Month Extension Amount
Ocean Somali Community Association	Promoting a brighter future through study support	389	GREEN	259
Olga Education and Training Project	Study Support Programme	417	GREEN	278

Table 6 – Youth and Connexion Services

Organisation Details	Project	3 Month Extension Amount £	Q4 RAG Status	2 Month Extension Amount
Da'watul Islam UK and Eire	Shadwell Youth Project	2,333	AMBER	N/A
Wadajir Somali Community Centre	Wadajir Somali Youth Drop -In	1,667	GREEN	1,111
Tower Hamlets Street	Tower Hamlets Street Pastors	833	AMBER	N/A

Table 7 – Arts Sports and Environmental Services

Organisation Details	Project	3 Month Extension Amount £	Q4 RAG Status	2 Month Extension Amount
-----------------------------	----------------	---------------------------------------	----------------------	---------------------------------

Organisation Details	Project	3 Month Extension Amount £	Q4 RAG Status	2 Month Extension Amount
The Royal London Society for the Blind	Sporting VIPs	2,222	AMBER	N/A
Weavers Adventure Playground	Keep Fit	3,889	GREEN	2,593
Malmesbury Community Projects	MCP Healthy Living Project	1,444	GREEN	963

Table 8 – Community and Economic Engagement Services

Organisation Details	Project	3 Month Extension Amount £	Q4 RAG Status	2 Month Extension Amount
Common Ground East	A New Start	625	RED	N/A
Wadajir Somali Community Centre	Wadajir Women's Project	2,778	GREEN	1,852

Table 9 – Social Welfare Advice Services

Organisation Details	Project	3 Month Extension Amount £	Q4 RAG Status	2 Month Extension Amount
Dorset Community Association	Social Welfare Advice	3,125	GREEN	2,083

5.10 Eighteen (18) projects are rated GREEN following the quarter 4 performance monitoring process. The total funding commitment for an additional 2 months extension of these projects is £35,838.

6. COMMENTS OF THE CHIEF FINANCE OFFICER

6.1 The process for agreeing a further extension till the end of August for those projects from the 2012-15 Mainstream Grant Programme that were deemed to be “amber,” by officers undertaking quarterly monitoring was agreed by Commissioners at the meeting of 11th March 2015. Only those re-assessed as at the end of May, from quarter 4 monitoring information, as “green” would be funded for the remainder of the extension period.

6.2 This report sets out the outcomes of those reassessments. Budgetary provision exists for continuation of those projects now assessed by officers as “green” in the 2015/16 budget.

7. LEGAL COMMENTS

- 7.1 The power of the commissioners to make decisions in relation to grants arises from directions made by the Secretary of State on 17 December 2014 pursuant to powers under sections 15(5) and 15(6) of the Local Government Act 1999 (the Directions). Paragraph 4(ii) and Annex B of the Directions together provide that, until 31 March 2017, the Council's functions in relation to grants will be exercised by appointed Commissioners, acting jointly or severally. This is subject to an exception in relation to grants made under section 24 of the Housing Grants, Construction and Regeneration Act 1996, for the purposes of section 23 of that Act (disabled facilities grant).
- 7.2 To the extent that the Commissioners are exercising powers which would otherwise have been the Council's, there is a need to ensure the Council has power to make the grants in question. The Commissioners will wish to be satisfied that this is the case. It appears from the headline information that the grants are capable of being supported under a variety of the Council's powers, depending on the subject activities and the outcomes sought to be achieved, and the powers set out below appear particularly relevant.
- 7.3 Section 1 of the Localism Act 2011 gives the Council a general power of competence to do anything that individuals generally may do, subject to specified restrictions and limitations imposed by other statutes. As individuals may provide financial support to community organisations, the general power may support the giving of grants to those organisations, provided there is a good reason to do so and provided there is no statutory prohibition on doing so (which generally there is not). There may be a good reason for giving a grant if it is likely to further the Council's sustainable community strategy under section 4 of the Local Government Act 2000, set out in the Community Plan, or one of the Council's related strategies. Information is set out in the report as to the connection between the proposed theme specifications and the Council's relevant strategies.
- 7.4 A number of the grants in tables 1- 9 may be viewed as delivering on other Council functions, including the following:
- To take such steps as it consider appropriate for improving the health of the people of Tower Hamlets (National Health Service Act 2006).
 - to safeguard and promote the welfare of children in need in Tower Hamlets and, so far as consistent with that duty, to promote the upbringing of such children by their families, by providing a range and level of services appropriate to those children's needs (Children Act 1989).
 - To make arrangements to ensure that Council functions are discharged having regard to the need to safeguard and promote the welfare of children (Children Act 2004).
 - To provide facilities for recreation and social and physical training and sufficient educational and recreational leisure-time activities

for qualifying young people in Tower Hamlets (Education Act 1996).

- To meet the needs of individuals in need of care and support or carers in need of support in circumstances set out in the Care Act 2014.

- 7.5 By virtue of section 111 of the Local Government Act 1972, the Council has power to do anything which is calculated to facilitate, or is conducive or incidental to, the discharge of any of its functions. This may involve expenditure, borrowing or lending of money or the acquisition or disposal of any property or rights. This incidental power may support some grants in relation to community engagement and advice services.
- 7.6 When considering whether or not to make funds available for the purposes specified, the Council should consider whether or not this will be consistent with its best value arrangements. The Council is obliged as a best value authority under section 3 of the Local Government Act 1999 to “make arrangements to secure continuous improvement in the way in which its functions are exercised, having regard to a combination of economy, efficiency and effectiveness” (the best value duty).
- 7.7 It appears the grants have been established with some form of performance measures and monitoring, such that it has been possible for Council officers to rate them green, red or amber. Assuming relevant performance measures have been applied, this may be a reasonable way for the Council to take into account the economy efficiency and effectiveness of the grants thus far when measured against the reasons for which the grants were given. The Council should ensure that it has applied the evaluation rules consistently to all mainstream grants. Such arrangements may be consistent with the best value duty.
- 7.8 When determining what support to provide to community organisations, the Council must have due regard to the need to eliminate unlawful conduct under the Equality Act 2010, the need to advance equality of opportunity and the need to foster good relations between persons who share a protected characteristic and those who do not (the public sector equality duty).
- 7.9 The report identifies that if grant funding is not continued, then some services may no longer be available for local people or may be available at a reduced level. Staff of service providers may lose their employment. In these circumstances, it is important that the Council undertakes an analysis to ensure it understands whether these possible impacts will affect people with protected characteristics and, if so, in what ways.
- 7.10 An equalities analysis is set out at appendix 3, which identifies there may be adverse impacts on individuals in protected groups and which proposes some mitigation measures. The analysis is not based on consultation with affected individuals as to the impacts upon them. When considering whether the requirement to have “due regard” requires more detailed analysis, it seems relevant to consider that the programs are underperforming, there is a range of alternative provision and the Council

will retain its general duties as outlined in paragraph 7.4 above. However, against this must be weighed the potential level of impact on affected individuals, the fact that some individuals may not have suitable alternative provision and the degree to which the project is considered to be underperforming.

7.11 The adequacy of the equality analysis needs to be considered on a program by program basis by reference to the potential impact. Without limiting the content of such consideration, this may largely be guided by: (a) whether or not suitable alternative provision will *actually* be available for individuals in the program; and (b) consideration of the degree to which the program in question is underperforming. It is proposed that a supplementary equality analysis will be presented following this report and prior to decision by the Commissioners which addresses these considerations. If that is not provided, then decisions taken under recommendation 2.2 above may be exposed to challenge.

7.12 The Council must ensure that no part of the funds issued represents a profit element to any of the recipients. The inclusion of profit may indicate that the grant is really procurement activity and would otherwise be subject to the Council's Procurement Procedures and other appropriate domestic and European law.

7.13 All the proposed grants appear to fall under the *de minimis* threshold for the purposes of the European restrictions on providing State aid

8. ONE TOWER HAMLETS CONSIDERATIONS

8.1 The core purpose of the Main Stream Grants programme is to 'provide services for local residents' which respond to local needs across the borough. The programme encourages applications for grants that demonstrate how they contribute to the broad aims of One Tower Hamlets, specifically how they tackle inequality, strengthen cohesion and build community leadership.

8.2 The Main Stream Grants programme includes services for specialist legal advice, employment skills development and supporting elders to deal with mental and physical health issues. These services are provided by Third Sector Organisations. Additionally however, some funding is also utilised to help capacity build these organisations in an effort to (a) improve their ability to deliver quality services; and, (b) improve their overall effectiveness and sustainability.

8.4 This recommendations in this report follow on from earlier decisions relating to the management and conclusion of the current Mains Stream Grants programme. It is proposed that the projects rated GREEN following the quarter 4 performance monitoring process be extended for a further 2 months to 31 August 2015 and that a total of 12 projects which have been rated Amber or Red should not be extended for a further two months.

8.5 The following are among the potential negative impacts of not approving the extension (which is likely to mean that these projects will need to close at the end of June 2015).

- 1) Some provided services may no longer be available for local people or be available at a much reduced level. This may also mean that some service users may not be able to access appropriate alternatives.

These potential negative impacts have in part been mitigated by the provision of notice in relation to the end of the grant in March 2015. There are also additional plans to ensure services provide information and signposting related to other services.

The performance monitoring results indicate a range of concerns about the delivery of the services including compliance and health and safety which need to be balanced against the availability of the service.

- 2) Service providers may need to reduce or lose staff. TUPE does not apply in the case of grants and these issues are highlighted when organisations make applications.

9. SUSTAINABLE ACTION FOR A GREENER ENVIRONMENT

9.1 The funding priorities within the MSG Programme support the spirit of SAGE. The Council, as a funder of third sector proposals that meet these priorities assists in the implementation of the strategic aims of SAGE.

10. RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

10.1 A number of different risks arise from any funding of external organisations. The key risks are:

- The funding may not be fully utilised i.e. allocations remain unspent and outcomes are not maximised
- The funding may be used for purposes that have not been agreed e.g. in the case of fraud
- The organisations may not be able to secure additional funding necessary to deliver the agreed activities
- The organisation may not in the event have the capacity to achieve the contracted outputs/outcomes

10.2 To ensure that risks are minimised, each project/organisation will be required to comply with the standard Grant Agreement terms. There will also be appropriate renegotiated performance targets to be met and the evidence required. All extended projects will continue to be strictly monitored to ensure compliance.

11. CRIME AND DISORDER REDUCTION IMPLICATIONS

11.1 The services that will be provided through the MSG programme cover a broad spectrum of activities some of which are key drivers in contributing to the reduction in crime and disorder; these include:

- Improving community cohesion
- Getting people into employment
- Providing timely advice and advocacy
- Supporting 'at risk' individuals

12. EFFICIENCY STATEMENT

12.1 The commissioning framework for the 2012/15 MSG Programme provided transparency and clarity in the delivery of desired outcomes along with cost of providing those outcomes to facilitate more efficient alignment of funding allocations.

The funding priorities which are were set out within Grant Specifications clearly linked to delivering outcomes as set out in the Strategic Plan and Community Plan as a mechanism to deliver better outcomes for local people within available resources. Through for example giving priority to projects that promote social inclusion; and, supporting service providers who deliver cost effective services that focus on benefit the local community and meeting the expressed needs of local people.

Linked Reports, Appendices and Background Documents

Linked Report

- Commissioners Decision Report 11 March 2015 - Main Stream Grants 2012/15 Programme extension

Appendices

- Appendix 1: Text of Letter to AMBER rated projects
- Appendix 2: Project RAG rating Guidance
- Appendix 3: Equality Assessment
- Appendix 4: Additional equality analysis (to follow)

Background Documents – Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements)(Access to Information)(England) Regulations 2012

- NONE

Officer contact details for documents:

- Dave Clark, Acting Service Head Resources, Development and Renewal, 2nd floor, Mulberry Place, 5 Clove Crescent E14 2BG.
Tel: 0207 364 4644
Email: dave.clark@twerhamlets.gov.uk

APPENDIX 1

Text of Letter to AMBER rated projects

Dear

Project Title:

Commissioners Decisions: MSG Programme Extension

The current Main Stream Grants Programme was scheduled to end on 31 March 2015.

However, as you may be aware, there was a decision meeting on Wednesday 11 March, at which the Commissioners considered a report on the proposed extension of the Programme till the end of August 2015.

As part of the report proposals the following arrangements were agreed.

1. Projects rated GREEN within the Councils RAG Rating process – will be extended for 5 months to the end of August.
2. Projects rated AMBER will be extended initially for 3 months with the possibility of a further 2 months depending on their performance during the January to March 2015 quarter.
3. Projects rated RED will not be extended.

Additionally, projects which had scored below the threshold of 40 points within the original assessment process were reassessed; and if they were able to score 40 or more, they would be extended in line with either the amber or red rated projects as appropriate

I am pleased to inform you that as your project is rated as AMBER; it will be extended in line with item 2 above. Your Grant Officer will contact you shortly to confirm details of the appropriate performance requirements which will enable your project to be extended for the full 5 months.

If you require any further information please contact the Grant Officer assigned to your project.

Yours sincerely

Everett Haughton
Third Sector Programmes Manage

**MSG
RAG Rating Guidance**

RAG (Red / Amber / Green) Assessment Guidance

1. The RAG assessment process works as part of the monitoring of projects in relation to 3 key factors:
 - i. The timely submission of quarterly project progress reports;
 - ii. The delivery of targeted outputs; and,
 - iii. Demonstrating that grant funding has been used for the purpose for which it has been approved

Project Delivery Cycle

MSG projects generally operate on a quarterly cycle as set out below; however, there may be exceptions to this – including 6-monthly or relating to the 3 school terms - which will be specified within the Grant Offer Letter.

Quarter 1			Quarter 2			Quarter 3			Quarter 4		
April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	January	February	March

Project Reporting

Projects to be rated as set out below depending on the date by which the quarterly project progress report is received

Rated as GREEN if reports are received within 10 working days of the end of the quarter

Rated as AMBER where reports are received between 11 and 15 working days following the end of the quarter

Rated as RED where reports are received later than 15 working days following the end of the quarter

Project Performance

The following information provides guidance on determining the RAG rating of projects in relation to their performance

Rated as GREEN where:

- Output targets have been achieved/exceeded for the quarter in question or any under achievement is within 10%; or where
- The cumulative outputs achieved to date is not showing an under achievement of more than 10% below target; and where
- The quality of both 'the outputs' and 'the evidencing' of the outputs is clear and there are no issues
- There are no concerns regarding the proper use of the grant

Rated as AMBER where:

- Output targets for the quarter in question is showing under achievement of between 11-20%; or where
- The cumulative outputs to date is showing an under achievement of more than 15% below target; and where
- There may be **minor issues or concerns** regarding either the 'quality of the outputs' or 'the evidencing' of the outputs
- There may be concerns regarding the proper use of the grant

Rated as RED where:

- Output targets for the quarter in question is showing an under achievement greater than 20%; or where
- The cumulative outputs to date is not showing an under achievement of more than 15% below target; and where
- There are **significant issues or concerns** regarding either 'the quality of the outputs' or 'the evidencing' of the outputs
- There may be concerns regarding the proper use of the grant

Final RAG Rating

The following matrix should be used to indicate the project's final RAG rating

Project Performance			
Red	Red	Red	Red
Amber	Amber	Amber	Red
Green	Green	Green	Amber
	Green	Amber	Red
	Project Reporting		

Equality Assessment of MSG Roll-Over Funding Proposals 2015: Funding Stream

MSG Programme: Mainstream Grants 2012/15 – Amber Projects Extension

Summary

An equalities assessment was undertaken in April for each theme within the MSG programme focusing on the impact of individual projects not receiving extended funding on service users, particularly protected characteristics. This assessment updates that analysis to assess the impact of further project closures within themes.

This equalities impact assessment should be viewed within the wider context of the launch of the new MSG programme (September 2015) and the relatively short term extension period (2 months). Any adverse impacts are likely to be short term.

Looking across themes, 2 projects not recommended to receive extended funding target ex-offenders (CFS – 03 Special Times and CEE-17 A New Start) and two projects target rough sleepers (YCS – 46 Tower Hamlets Street Pastors and CEE – 17 A New Start). Within the MSG 2012-15 programmes there is limited 'targeted' provision remaining for these groups. However, there does remain alternate available provision (e.g. work advice) within the programme, and all projects were under performing. It is recommended that users are signposted to alternate provision should failure to receive extended funding lead to project closure.

More than 17 projects (out of 33) within the Older People's Lunch Club theme have not been recommended to receive extended funding, 12 in April 2015 and 5 now. Despite underperformance, it must be expected that should failure to receive extended funding lead to project closer, then this will impact individual service users. There is potential for project closures to disproportionately impact white British and Irish users (given 9 clubs offering a general provision have not received extended funding). It is recommended that users are sign posted to alternate provision where available and that learning from this programme is imbedded in the new programme.

The results of the EA for each theme are shown below (see table 1). No significant equalities impact has been identified. This is largely due to the failure of these projects to deliver, and also due to significant alternate provision available via the MSG programme. The MSG 2013-15 programme was characterised by lots of small projects, receiving small amounts of money – this has therefore limited the equalities impact of project failure. However, beneficiaries or users of individual projects are likely to be negatively affected by the closure of projects and mitigation, particularly sign posting users to alternate provision should be in place.

Theme	Impact ✓ - Positive ✗ - Adverse 0 = Neutral	Summary
Older People's Lunch Club	✗ - Adverse	<p>There were 33 projects in the original programme, 12 closed in April 2015, a further 5 are recommended not to receive further funding. This is a significant reduction based on the original offer. It must be noted that though this is largely through underperformance, there is the potential for an adverse impact for service users.</p> <p>Assuming clubs close if they do not receive extended funding; there will be a geographical impact – e.g. there will be no funding for clubs within LAP 6 and 8. Also, there will be no specific lunch club for the Chinese community and a further reduction to the Somali community. One club with a specific Bangladeshi offer will also not receive extended funding.</p> <p>2 clubs offering general provision are also not recommended to receive additional funding. This is in addition to 7 clubs that did not receive extended funding in April. White British and Irish people are the highest ethnic attending generalist lunch clubs. There is a need to ensure the generalist provision does not continue to reduce disproportionately to other provision.</p> <p>At this time, as in April, it is not known whether failure to extend funding will necessarily lead to closure of lunch clubs; a number are expected to become self-sustainable. Therefore it is difficult to assess the extent of the equalities impact if any. Risk is also mitigated to an extent by the launch of the new</p>

Theme	Impact ✓ - Positive ✗ - Adverse 0 = Neutral	Summary
		programme. In order to mitigate the potential impact of not extending funding, it is recommended that we identify those clubs that will close if funding is not extended and sign posting affected users to alternate provision.
Children & Families Services	0 = Neutral	<p>It is recommended that 2 projects do not receive extended funding. This is on top of two projects that did not receive funding in April.</p> <p>CFS-03 was the only project targeting women offenders and families; however there are alternate services that can be accessed. It is recommended that any service users are sign posted to alternate provision and supported to access it where appropriate.</p> <p>CFS-32 Social VIPs and Families targets young people with visual impairment. Two projects which did not receive further funding in April, CFS 30 – Childs Play and CFS -31 Recently diagnosed VIPS also targeted young people with visual impairment (same delivery organisation). Again none of these projects could demonstrate a positive impact for target users, therefore it is difficult to assess an adverse impact of these projects not receiving extended funding. There is also existing borough wide provision for young people with visual impairment. Therefore, there is no adverse equalities impact identified.</p>
Early Years' Services	0 = Neutral	All projects recommended to receive further funding in April will continue to receive extended funding within this theme. Therefore no adverse impact has been identified.
Study Support Services	0 = Neutral	All projects recommended to receive further funding in April will continue to receive extended funding within this theme. Therefore no adverse impact has been identified.
Youth & Connexions Service	0 = Neutral	It is recommended that a further 2 projects do not receive extended funding within this theme. This is in addition to 2 that did not receive further funding in

Theme	Impact ✓ - Positive ✘ - Adverse 0 = Neutral	Summary
		<p>April.</p> <p>This theme in particular was characterised by lots of small projects, receiving small amounts of money – this has limited the equalities impact of project failure. A number of projects were approved for funding which fell outside of the priorities and objectives of this funding stream. As such, closure of some and the decision to not award extended funding will have little impact on target users across the 9 protected characteristics as most of these programmes are being catered by mainstream youth service provision. Further, projects that have closed and not been recommended for receipt of roll over funding have not delivered agreed targets or have not been able to evidence that they have delivered. Therefore, there will be little impact on service users if these projects do not continue. There is significant crossover of provision, both via the MSG programme and mainstream funding that in most cases (projects targeting BME youth for e.g.) there is alternative options available for service users. Where applicable, service users will be signposted toward alternate provision.</p>
Community Language Services	0 = Neutral	<p>A further project within this theme, CLS-28 Wapping Creative Bangla project is not recommended to receive further funding. This is in addition to 3 which did not receive further funding in April; CLS 29 Jeremiah Children Welfare Project Limited Mother Tongue Bengali, CLS 30 Baglay Kota Boli, and CLS 36 Isle of Dogs Bangladeshi Association Mother Tongue Class. All four projects provide Bengali Mother Tongue classes. However, there has been limited evidence of delivery from these projects. There is also significant Bengali Mother Tongue projects remaining within the theme across the borough – 20 will remain across the borough.</p>
Arts, Sports & Environmental Services	0 = Neutral	<p>A total of five projects within this theme have not received further funding within this theme; 4 in April and 1 now. 44 projects remain funded. The initial</p>

Theme	Impact ✓ - Positive ✘ - Adverse 0 = Neutral	Summary
		programme provided a wide range of cross borough sporting, arts and cultural provision with both universal offering and targeted toward Bengali service users. There is also mainstream provision. Therefore it is not thought that there would be any adverse impact of not funding these projects to service users. It is difficult to ascertain as to whether there may be an organisational impact given the lack of contact with these groups.
Lifelong Learning Services	0 = Neutral	All projects recommended to receive further funding in April will continue to receive extended funding within this theme. Therefore no adverse impact has been identified.
Community & Economic Engagement	0 = Neutral	Of the original 48 projects originally funded, 44 remain funded. 4 projects gave notice to terminate their Grant Agreement and one is not recommended to receive additional funding due to under performance at Q4. The equalities assessment indicates no change in service provision to either of the groups with protected characteristics
Social Welfare Advice Services	0 = Neutral	All projects recommended to receive further funding in April will continue to receive extended funding within this theme. Therefore no adverse impact has been identified.
Third Sector Infrastructure	0 = Neutral	All projects recommended to receive further funding in April will continue to receive extended funding within this theme. Therefore no adverse impact has been identified.