

## Equality Impact Analysis

This equality impact analysis establishes the likely effects both positive and negative and potential unintended consequences that decisions, policies, projects and practices can have on people at risk of discrimination, harassment and victimisation. The analysis considers documentary evidence, data and information from stakeholder engagement/consultation to manage risk and to understand the actual or potential effect of activity, including both positive and adverse impacts, on those affected by the activity being considered.

To support completion of this analysis tool, please refer to the equality impact analysis guidance.

### Section 1 – Analysis Details (Page 5 of the guidance document)

<b>Name of Policy/Project/Decision</b>	Adult Social Care Provider Fee Uplifts
<b>Lead Officer (SRO or Assistant Director/Director)</b>	Matthew Logan, Strategic Lead Integrated Commissioning
<b>Department/Team</b>	Community Commissioning Team
<b>Proposed Implementation Date</b>	01/04/25
<b>Author of the EqIA</b>	Matthew Logan, Strategic Lead Integrated Commissioning
<b>Date of the EqIA</b>	14/01/2025

**1.1 What is the main purpose of the proposed policy/project/decision and intended outcomes?**

As set out in section 5 of the Care Act 2014, local authorities have a duty to promote the efficient and effective operation of a market in services for meeting care and support needs, with a view to ensuring services are diverse, sustainable and high quality for the local population, including those who pay for their own care. One of the ways we do this is by carrying out an annual fee setting process for Adult Social Care Providers.

**Section 2 – Impact Assessment** (Pages 6 to 10 of the guidance document)

**2.1 Who could the proposed policy/project/decision likely have an impact on?**

Community/Residents: **Yes – increased fees to provider allows them to continue providing care and support to local residents.**

Third parties such as suppliers, providers and voluntary organisations: **Yes – Provider will receive increased fees for their work**

**2.2 Evidence to support the analysis. Include documentary evidence, data and stakeholder information/consultation**

**Data:**  
**3055 people received Adult Social Care support funded by the Local Authority**

**Stakeholder information/consultation:**

Activity	Timescale
<b>Stage 1</b> Letter and Cost Pressures Form issued to providers	First week December
Strategic Engagement Groups	Second week January
Initial fee offer developed	Third week January
Benchmark potential fee with GM Authorities	Third week January
<b>Stage 2</b> Fee proposal issued to providers for consultation	Fourth week January
Strategic Engagement Groups	First week February
Where required: Updated fee proposal issued to providers for consultation	TBC
Strategic Engagement Group	TBC
Final Deadline for fee proposal feedback	Third week February
Fee proposal signed Market Shaping Board	Fourth week February
Fee proposal signed off by Cabinet	Second week March
<b>Stage 3</b>	Third week March

Final fee offer and contract variation issued to providers	
Subject to receipt of signed contract variation; fee uplifted	1 <sup>st</sup> April

**2.3 Consider the following questions in terms of who the policy/project/decision could potentially have an impact on. Detail these in the impact assessment table (2.4) and the potential impact this could have.**

- Could the proposal prevent the promotion of equality of opportunity or good relations between different equality groups?
- Could the proposal create barriers to accessing a service or obtaining employment because of a protected characteristic?
- Could the proposal affect the usage or experience of a service because of a protected characteristic?
- Could a protected characteristic be disproportionately advantaged or disadvantaged by the proposal?
- Could the proposal make it more or less likely that a protected characteristic will be at risk of harassment or victimisation?
- Could the proposal affect public attitudes towards a protected characteristic (e.g. by increasing or reducing their presence in the community)?
- Could the proposal prevent or limit a protected characteristic contributing to the democratic running of the council?

2.4 Characteristic	Potential Impacts	Evidence (from 2.2) to demonstrate this impact	Mitigations to reduce negative impact	Impact level with mitigations Positive, Neutral, Negative
Age		Enabling the service to continue		Neutral
Disability				
Gender Reassignment				
Marriage and Civil Partnership				

Pregnancy and Maternity				
Race				
Religion and Belief				
Sex				
Sexual Orientation				
Carers				
Looked After Children and Care Leavers				
Socio-economically vulnerable				
Veterans				

**Actions required to mitigate/reduce/eliminate negative impacts or to complete the analysis**

2.5 Characteristics	Action	Action Owner	Completion Date

**Section 3 - Impact Risk**

Establish the level of risk to people and organisations arising from identified impacts, with additional actions completed to mitigate/reduce/eliminate negative impacts.

3.1 Identifying risk level (Pages 10 - 12 of the guidance document)

Impact x Likelihood = Score			Likelihood			
			1	2	3	4
			Unlikely	Possible	Likely	Very likely
Imp	4	Very High	4	8	12	16

3	High	3	6	9	12
2	Medium	2	4	6	8
1	Low	1	2	3	4
0	Positive / No impact	0	0	0	0

<b>Risk Level</b>	<b>No Risk = 0</b>	<b>Low Risk = 1 - 4</b>	<b>Medium Risk = 5 – 7</b>	<b>High Risk = 8 - 16</b>
-------------------	--------------------	-------------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------

<b>3.2 Level of risk identified</b>	<b>No Risk = 0</b>
<b>3.3 Reasons for risk level calculation</b>	Impact is neutral as allows existing services to continue.

**Section 4 - Analysis Decision** (Page 11 of the guidance document)

<b>4.1 Analysis Decision</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>Reasons for This Decision</b>
There is no negative impact therefore the activity will proceed	X	
There are low impacts or risks identified which can be mitigated or managed to reduce the risks and activity will proceed		
There are medium to high risks identified which cannot be mitigated following careful and thorough consideration. The activity will proceed with caution and this risk recorded on the risk register, ensuring continual review		

**Section 5 – Sign Off and Revisions** (Page 11 of the guidance document)

5.1 Sign Off	Name	Date	Comments
Lead Officer/SRO/Project Manager	Matthew Logan		
Responsible Asst. Director/Director	Adrian Crook		
EDI			

### EqIA Revision Log

5.2 Revision Date	Revision By	Revision Details