

Name:	Mayor's Advisors / Office
Item Ref:	15
Directorate:	Law, Probity and Governance

TRIGGER QUESTIONS	YES / NO	IF YES...
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	A growth bid was approved as part of the 2015/16 budget to fund a number of specialist advisors that would support the mayor on specific areas of policy and community engagement. The advisors are no longer required and the resources are to be allocated to other priorities.
CHANGES TO A SERVICE		
Does the change alter access to the service?	No	
Does the change involve revenue raising?	No	
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?	No	
Does the change involve a contracting out of a service currently provided in house?	No	
CHANGES TO STAFFING		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	Advisors were to be procured through external contracts. Contracts will now not be let, thus no staffing implications.
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No	

Name:	Mayor's Car and Salary
Item Ref:	16
Directorate:	Law, Probity and Governance

TRIGGER QUESTIONS	YES / NO	IF YES...
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	The mayor has taken the decision that the mayoral car is no longer required and he has also offered to take a reduction in his salary. The resources are to be reallocated to other Council priorities.
CHANGES TO A SERVICE		
Does the change alter access to the service?	No	
Does the change involve revenue raising?	No	
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?	No	
Does the change involve a contracting out of a service currently provided in house?	No	
CHANGES TO STAFFING		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	There will be no staffing reductions. However, the mayor has offered to take a reduction in his salary.
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No	

Name:	Uncommitted One Tower Hamlets Budget (directed to Somali and Cohesion activities)
Item Ref:	17
Directorate:	Law, Probity and Governance

TRIGGER QUESTIONS	YES / NO	IF YES...
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	As this involves uncommitted one tower hamlets funds, residents will not be impacted should the funding be directed to Somali and cohesion activities. It's likely that the resulting Somali and cohesion activities will have a positive impact on the residents involved and will address aspects of inequality for said communities.
CHANGES TO A SERVICE		
Does the change alter access to the service?	No	
Does the change involve revenue raising?	No	
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?	No	
Does the change involve a contracting out of a service currently provided in house?	No	
CHANGES TO STAFFING		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No	

Name:	Kobi Nazrul Savings
Item Ref:	18
Directorate:	Communities, Localities and Culture

TRIGGER QUESTIONS	YES / NO	IF YES...
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	Specific growth was agreed as part of the 2015/16 budget process to provide additional staffing and admin support to the Kobi Nazrul centre. This is currently not committed and is to be reallocated to other council priorities.
CHANGES TO A SERVICE		
Does the change alter access to the service?	No	The funds have not been committed yet and thus there will not be a change in service.
Does the change involve revenue raising?	No	
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?	No	
Does the change involve a contracting out of a service currently provided in house?	No	
CHANGES TO STAFFING		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No	

Name:	Youth Service Efficiencies
Item Ref:	19
Directorate:	Communities, Localities and Culture

The savings proposal is designed to improve the efficiency of the service without any impact. The new management controls established within the Youth Service will deliver service efficiencies on the current budget provision. There is now the opportunity to consolidate and rationalise the budgets for the delivery of the Grant programmes without any impact on the capacity and capability of staff delivering frontline services. This enables the service to deliver efficiencies under the new arrangement which has been successfully bedded in to the way the service is currently managed.

TRIGGER QUESTIONS	YES / NO	IF YES...
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	
CHANGES TO A SERVICE		
Does the change alter access to the service?	No	
Does the change involve revenue raising?	No	
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?	No	
Does the change involve a contracting out of a service currently provided in house?	No	
CHANGES TO STAFFING		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No	

Name:	Reverse growth funded by deletion of Chief Executive post
Item Ref:	20
Directorate:	Communities, Localities and Culture

TRIGGER QUESTIONS	YES / NO	IF YES...
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	The budget for the Chief Executive Post was reallocated to fund additional policing. The funds have not yet been committed and as recruitment is currently underway to appoint a new Chief executive, it is necessary for the budget to be reinstated.
CHANGES TO A SERVICE		
Does the change alter access to the service?	No	
Does the change involve revenue raising?	No	
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?	No	
Does the change involve a contracting out of a service currently provided in house?	No	
CHANGES TO STAFFING		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No	

Item Ref: 21

Budget Savings Proposals

Full Equality Analysis

Section 1: General Information

1a) Name of the savings proposal

Savings – European social fund match funding payments - £109,000.

1b) Service area

1c) Service manager

1d) Name and role of the officer/s completing the analysis

Service area:

Resources

Team name:

Third Sector Team

Service manager:

Dave Clark

Name and role of the officer completing the EA:

- Everett Haughton - Third Sector Programmes Manager

Section 2: Information about changes to services

2a) In brief please explain the savings proposals and the reasons for this change

This proposal will reduce revenue expenditure as part of the Council's 2015/16 savings targets. To achieve the above savings it is recommended that the current Corporate Match Funding Budget (£555,000) is reduced by the full amount leaving a balance of £446,000.

The proposed savings represents a 5% reduction of the current grants budget directly managed by the Third Sector Team – the funding streams and in question include:

1. Community and Economic Engagement
2. Social Welfare Advice Services
3. Third Sector Infrastructure Support
4. Corporate Match Funding

A particularly important factor for consideration however, is the fact that the current Main Stream Grants programme (which incorporates 12 separate funding streams including items 1 to 3 above) although originally scheduled to end its current programme period on 31 March 2015, has been extended for further 5 months – to the end of August. This means that there is a significant financial commitment well into the 2015/16 financial year in which the savings are to be made.

The main aim of this funding stream is to increase employability of local residents through accredited/non-accredited training, volunteering and employment support, tackling inequalities, social inclusion of marginalised sections of the community and meeting local needs.

Job seekers allowance claimant count has been used as a particular basis for assessing need within the Borough in terms of economic inclusion. The claimant count rate for Tower Hamlets as at May 2014 is 3.6% compared to London 2.7% and nationally: 2.6%. This equates to 6,950 people who were unemployed and claiming JSA in Tower Hamlets. Source: ONS claimant count with rates and proportions. Note: % is a proportion of claimant count + workforce jobs total

The main Service User target groups include the 17,900 residents who are ILO-unemployed and 8,500 economically inactive people assumed to want a job, totalling 26,400 residents. Source: ONS Annual Population Survey Jan 13 – Dec 13. Whilst there is other provision targeting this market, analysis suggests that some key groups are more disadvantaged in the borough and subsequently are disproportionately represented in lower employment and higher unemployment statistics. Equality profile is included in the 'Protected Characteristics' section.

Additionally, for the purpose of clarification it should be understood that the proposed savings come from a budget that had been used to match fund the ESF Community Grants Programme. This programme has now come to an end and the budget is not currently committed to a new programme. If the savings are approved, the remaining budget (£446,000) will be available for third sector organisations. This may be used as match funding to attract external funds or used for other purposes as agreed by the Corporate Grants Programme Board.

Whilst it is acknowledged that the identified savings could be taken on a pro-rate basis from each of the streams, due to a number of factors/considerations it is felt that the preferred option is to make the savings (of £109,000) from the Corporate Match Funding budget which currently stands at £555,000 per year.

Evidence (Consideration of Data and Information)

- What initial evidence do we have which may help us think about the impacts or likely impacts on service users or staff:
 1. ONS Joint claimant count with rates and proportions
 2. ONS Annual population Survey Jan 2013 to Dec 2013
 3. LEA consultation findings
 4. LBTH Employment Strategy (April 2011)

Additional factors which may influence disproportionate or adverse impact?

Budgets are set specific to the perceived or identified need of the various funding streams in line with directorate, strategic and community plan priorities. Therefore, in considering the implementation of potential funding reductions, due regard will need to be paid to ensuring that the 'hierarchy' of these priorities is taken into consideration.

In general with an 'across the board' reduction in funding, all groups with protected characteristics would be equally impacted by the reduction. The same would also apply if the reduction were to be from only one of the directorate funding streams.

Barriers

What are the potential or known barriers to participation for the different equality target groups e.g. communication, access, locality etc.

Projects funded under the funding streams in question are required to have due regard to equality issues and to addressing known barriers to participation for the different equality target groups.

Whilst there have been complaints regarding access or barriers to participation relating to currently funded projects we are aware of known/potential barriers – some of which are outlined below:

- Lack of childcare
- Poor accessibility
- fear
- Inappropriate/unsuitable timing
- Poor information
- Unsuitable location
- Inappropriateness of methodology/tutor/language

Officers will continue to work closely with service providers to look at how these barriers/issues can be addressed. In considering budget reductions officers will also give due regard to designing grant service specifications which maximises efficiency.

Recent consultation exercises carried out?

Detailed consultation with a range of stakeholders, including voluntary sector stakeholders on both the individual service specifications and overall programme was undertaken in 2012 as part of the build-up to developing the 2012-15 Main Stream Grants Programme. All service specifications refer to equalities duties and due regard was given to equalities considerations in the drafting and consultation on the service specifications and during all stages in the process including the application, assessment and moderation process.

Extensive consultation has also taken place in developing the 2015/18 programme. Consultation events involving a wide representation of local voluntary and community sector organisations took place on October 2014 and March 2015.

Consultation has been undertaken as part of the wider consultation process for the Council's Budget 2015/16. No major concerns can be drawn from the responses provided.

Section 3: Equality Impact Assessment

With reference to the analysis above, for each of the equality strands in the table below please record and evidence your conclusions around equality impact in relation to the savings proposal.

Please list in the table below any adverse impact identified and, where appropriate, steps that could be taken to mitigate this impact. This analysis will inform the decision making process

If you consider it likely that your proposal will have an adverse impact on a particular group (s) and you cannot identify steps which would mitigate or reduce this impact, you will need to demonstrate that you have considered at least one alternative way of delivering the change which has less of an adverse impact.

If an adverse impact cannot be mitigated please describe an alternative option, its costs and the equality impact.

Target Groups	Impact –	Reason(s)
----------------------	-----------------	------------------

	Positive or Adverse What impact will the proposal have on specific groups of service users or staff?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please add a narrative to justify your claims around impacts and, • Please describe the analysis and interpretation of evidence to support your conclusion as this will inform decision making Please also show how the proposal will promote the three One Tower Hamlets objectives? -Reducing inequalities -Ensuring strong community cohesion -Strengthening community leadership
Race	Neutral	<p>There is no disproportional negative impact on this group. Somali and Bangladeshi residents are key target groups due to the high levels of unemployment amongst these communities in Tower Hamlets as identified in the Employment Strategy. It is expected that there will be a high number of organisations applying for funding that will focus on supporting these residents.</p> <p>The suggested reduction is an overall 5% of the directorate's Third Party Payments budget. I this taken from Corporate Match funding budget as recommended, this is only likely to have a very marginal impact if any</p>
Disability	Neutral	<p>There is no disproportional negative impact on this group. People with a disability are key target groups for the targeting of services provided by grant funded projects.</p> <p>The suggested reduction is an overall 5% of the directorate's Third Party Payments budget. I this taken from Corporate Match funding budget as recommended, this is only likely to have a very marginal impact if any</p>
Gender	Neutral	<p>There is no disproportional negative impact on this group.</p> <p>The suggested reduction is an overall 5% of the directorate's Third Party Payments budget. I this taken</p>

		from Corporate Match funding budget as recommended, this is only likely to have a very marginal impact if any
Gender Reassignment	Not Known	Insufficient monitoring data available relating to this target group to draw any conclusion at this stage
Sexual Orientation	Not Known	Insufficient monitoring data available relating to this target group to draw any conclusion at this stage
Religion or Belief	Neutral	<p>There is no disproportional negatives impact on this group. Funding is available to all organisations irrespective of religion or belief; and services provided by grant recipient organisations are able to be accessed by all sections of the community regardless of their religion or belief.</p> <p>The suggested reduction is an overall 5% of the directorate's Third Party Payments budget. I this taken from Corporate Match funding budget as recommended, this is only likely to have a very marginal impact if any</p>
Age	Neutral	<p>There is no disproportional negative impact on this group. There are clear age-range targets for our funded projects, particularly those which form significant proportions of JSA claimants.</p> <p>The suggested reduction is an overall 5% of the directorate's Third Party Payments budget. I this taken from Corporate Match funding budget as recommended, this is only likely to have a very marginal impact if any</p>
Marriage and Civil Partnerships.	Not Known	Insufficient monitoring data available relating to this target group to draw any conclusion at this stage
Pregnancy and Maternity	Not Known	Insufficient monitoring data available relating to this target group to draw any conclusion at this stage
Other	Not Known	Insufficient monitoring data available relating to this target group to draw any conclusion at this stage

Socio-economic Carers		
-----------------------	--	--

Section 4: Equality Impact Assessment Action Plan

Please list in the table below any adverse impact identified and, where appropriate, steps that could be taken to mitigate this impact.

If you consider it likely that your proposal will have an adverse impact on a particular group (s) and you cannot identify steps which would mitigate or reduce this impact, you will need to demonstrate that you have considered at least one alternative way of delivering the change which has less of an adverse impact.

Recommendation	Key activity	Progress milestones including target dates for either completion or progress	Officer responsible	Progress
1. Improving the collection of equalities monitoring data from all grant funded projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review and update project progress monitoring report • Review and update guidance for projects on the collection and reporting of equalities data • Incorporate equalities data within Performance Reports to Corporate Grants Programme Board 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Quarterly report document updated – end Sep 2014 ○ Information sheet sent to all funded projects – end Sep 2014 ○ Update incorporated within GIFTS online report - Oct 2014 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EH & RM 	

If an adverse impact cannot be mitigated please describe an alternative option, its costs and the equality impact.

Section 5: Future Review and Monitoring

Please explain how and when the actual equality impact of these changes will be reviewed and monitored.

The 2012/15 Main Stream Grants Programme which was due to end 31 March 2015 was extended for 5 months to the end of August. The new Programme is therefore set to commence as from 1 September. The new programme will include regular quarterly reports – currently to Commissioners but in the longer term to the Mayor and Cabinet – where equality impact will be reviewed and monitored.

Name:	Additional Investment Income
Item Ref:	22
Directorate:	Corporate

TRIGGER QUESTIONS	YES / NO	IF YES...
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	Treasury activities are forecast to generate additional investment income.
CHANGES TO A SERVICE		
Does the change alter access to the service?	No	
Does the change involve revenue raising?	Yes	Through treasury management activities, thus no impact on residents or service users.
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	.
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?	No	
Does the change involve a contracting out of a service currently provided in house?	No	
CHANGES TO STAFFING		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No	

Name:	Accelerated delivery programme – uncommitted resources
Item Ref:	23
Directorate:	Corporate

TRIGGER QUESTIONS	YES / NO	IF YES...
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	The funding was set aside for specific priorities by the previous administration. The funds have not been committed yet and this proposal effectively reallocates the resources to new mayoral priorities.
CHANGES TO A SERVICE		
Does the change alter access to the service?	No	
Does the change involve revenue raising?	No	
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?	No	
Does the change involve a contracting out of a service currently provided in house?	No	
CHANGES TO STAFFING		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No	

Name:	Celebration Events (Reallocate part of the funding to inter-generational community cohesion events)
Item Ref:	24
Directorate:	Education, Social Care and Wellbeing

TRIGGER QUESTIONS	YES / NO	IF YES...
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	Four celebration events were planned: Two tea dances, a spring fair for carers and their families, and a "Disability Day" event. One of these events (a tea dance) took place in March 2015. There is no impact in not running the final three events as they are one-off events that have not been organised or advertised. The benefits that may have been anticipated from these events can still be realised by reallocating part of the funding to inter-generational and community cohesion events.
CHANGES TO A SERVICE		
Does the change alter access to the service?	No	
Does the change involve revenue raising?	No	
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?	No	
Does the change involve a contracting out of a service currently provided in house?	No	
CHANGES TO STAFFING		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No	