



2016/17 revenue budget savings report equalities summary

1. Context

- 1.1 The Lewisham Future Programme 2016/17 report sets out options for £12m of savings proposals for pre-decision scrutiny prior to Mayor and Cabinet on 30 September 2015. As part of the budget setting process, equality assessment analysis of selected budget savings is carried out to better understand the likely impact on protected groups and, where possible, to mitigate any negative effects.
- 1.2 An initial assessment of the likely impact of changes on protected groups is carried out during the development of each savings proposal. A determination is also made as to whether the proposal, should it be agreed, would require a full equalities analysis assessment. This information is presented in section eight of each proforma (appended to the budget savings report).
- 1.3 The Public Sector Equality Duty requires the Council to have 'due regard' to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation as well as to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
- 1.4 Characteristics¹ covered by the Equality Duty are:
- Age
 - Disability
 - Gender reassignment
 - Pregnancy and maternity
 - Race
 - Religion or belief
 - Sex
 - Sexual orientation
 - The duty also covers marriage and civil partnerships, but only in respect of eliminating unlawful discrimination within employment and training.
- 1.5 The Council is required to demonstrate that it has had 'due regard' to the aims of the Equality Duty in decision-making. Assessing the potential impact on equality of proposed changes to policies, procedures and practices is one of the key ways in which the Council can demonstrate that it has had 'due regard'.
- 1.6 Lewisham's has a comprehensive equalities scheme (2012-16) which is based on the principles set out in the borough's sustainable communities' strategy. The scheme brings together information and intelligence about the Council's strategic approach to equality and states the Council's commitment to achieving these five objectives:

¹ See Equality and Human Rights Commission: <http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/private-and-public-sector-guidance/guidance-all/protected-characteristics> for additional information. 'Race' and 'ethnicity' as well as 'sex' and 'gender' have been used interchangeably in this report.

Appendix 17

- Tackling victimisation, harassment and discrimination
 - Improving access to services
 - Closing the gap in outcomes for citizens
 - Increasing understanding and mutual respect between communities
 - Increasing participation and engagement
- 1.7 Having due regard to the requirements of the public sector equality duty and having consideration of the objectives of the Comprehensive Equalities Scheme, it has been agreed that the assessment of the impact on equality should be focused on, and proportionate to, decisions being made.
- 1.8 Where proposals are anticipated to have an impact on staffing levels, they are subject to consultation as set out in the Council's employment policies, and services will be required to undertake an Equalities Analysis Assessment (EAA) as part of their restructuring process.

2. Equalities impact

Level of impact	Number of proposals	As a percentage of all proposals (rounded)
High impact	5	14%
Medium impact	4	11%
Low impact	8	22%
Not applicable/no initial assessment necessary	20	55%

- 2.1 Table 1 (above) provides a high-level summary of the anticipated equality impact of 2016/17 budget savings proposals. The table demonstrates that of the 36 proposals, a quarter is judged to have an overall high or medium level of impact and just over a fifth is judged as having a low level of impact. Equalities implications are judged not to be applicable (or assessment unnecessary) for half of the proposals.

Protected characteristics

- 2.2 Table 2 (below) sets out the potential impact of savings proposals on each of the nine protected characteristics. The table demonstrates that the majority of the impacts being reported for each of the protected characteristics will be low. Nonetheless, a quarter of the proposals are expected to have a high level of impact (positive and negative) on people protected by the legislation because of their age.

Appendix 17

2.3 Overall low levels of impact have been identified in relation to religion or belief; pregnancy and maternity; marriage and civil partnership; sexual orientation and gender reassignment.

	Ethnicity	Gender	Age	Disability	Religion or belief	Pregnancy & mtnty	Marriage & civil p	Sexual Orientation	Gender reassignment
High	5	4	8	5	0	0	0	1	0
Medium	2	3	4	4	0	1	0	0	0
Low	7	8	7	9	10	12	10	9	10

2.4 The table below provides details of the savings proposals, which have been identified as having a potential high equalities impact on protected characteristics.

Proposals	Ethnicity	Gender	Age	Disability	Sexual Orientation
A11: Managing and improving transition planning			Yes (positive)	Yes (positive)	
A13: Alternative Delivery Models for the provision of care and support services, including mental health			Yes (positive)	Yes (positive)	
A14: Achieving best value in care packages			Yes	Yes	
A15: New delivery models for extra care: provision of contracts	Yes		Yes	Yes	
A17: Sexual health transformation	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
B2: Supporting People- reduction in budget across all client groups	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	

Appendix 17

H2: Further reductions in Crime, Enforcement and Regulation and Environmental Health	Yes	Yes	Yes		
K4: Public Health – Drug and Alcohol Services	Yes	Yes	Yes		

2.5 Proposals relating to the smarter and deeper integration of health and social care are expected to have the greatest impact on the people protected under the characteristics of age and disability, as might be expected due to the nature of the service being provided. However, it is anticipated that the redesign of services will also have a positive impact for some service users: further detail is provided in the proformas for savings proposals A11 and A13.

2.6 Medium and low level impacts have also been identified in the savings proposals across the characteristics of religion or belief, pregnancy and maternity, marriage and civil partnership and gender reassignment. A third of the proposals are likely to have a low-level impact on people protected due to pregnancy and maternity. However, with the information provided at this stage, this does not appear to result in a higher level of cumulative impact across this group.

3. Geographical impact

3.1 Officers were also asked to consider the potential geographical impacts of the budget savings proposals. In the majority of cases, no specific ward impact has been identified. However, the proposals put forward for library and information services and leisure facilities would likely have an effect on the facilities in the affected wards.

3.2 The proposals relating to the main grants programme in 2017-18 would also be expected to have ward specific impacts – however, should these proposals be agreed, additional work would be required to determine impacts and mitigating actions for specific areas.

4. Implementation of proposals and equalities analysis

4.1 Officers have identified that full equalities analysis assessments would be required for 16 of the savings proposals. Each savings proforma sets out a timescale for the delivery, following the meeting of Mayor and Cabinet on 30 September.