

## Equality Impact Assessment (EIA)

### Title of policy/process under consideration

LA Threshold Sum

### Lead department

Corporate affairs

Is this policy/process? (Please tick)

New  Existing  Revised

Is this a full EIA? (Please tick)

Yes  No

### Please state the reasons for the above decision.

The policy has no significant impact on any of the protected characteristics.

## What are the policy/process objectives and aims?

The LA(local authority) Threshold Sum Policy sets out the required average weekly contribution that local authorities must make towards the support of group 2 users in order for them to remain eligible for ILF funding.

The original fund required no LA input but closed in 1993 and users from this fund were transferred over to the Extension fund on the same terms. A new fund open to applicants, the 1993 Fund was set up with tighter eligibility criteria including a requirement that all users be in receipt of at least £200 worth of local authority social care support or services. This Local Authority contribution input is termed the LA threshold sum and ensures that the ILF support was targeted at users with the greatest support needs.

The local authority contribution remained at £200 from 1993 until April 2008 when it was initially raised to £320, in 2010 it was further increased to £340. These changes were in response to increasing financial pressures and were intended to limit the number of new applications so as to protect support to existing users. In addition over time the ILF had been incrementally taking over an increasing portion of support of existing users as in many cases the local authority contribution remained frozen at the level of the threshold sum.

At all points where there has been an increase in the LA threshold sum (1993,2008 and 2010) the existing support provided by the ILF to existing users has been maintained, with no requirement for a change in the level of the threshold sum.

Where a group 1 user requested an increase there remains no requirement for local authority funding to be in place

Where a group 2 user requests an increase in hours of support the ILF will expect the local authority to meet this increase in all circumstances unless the local authority are contributing the highest threshold sum (£340). This does not apply to existing support where inflationary increases may be considered without any amendment to the local authority contribution.

The local authority threshold sum is an averaged award over the year, allowing for fluctuation in care needs.

The content of this policy is a procedural explanation of mandatory provisions set out in the Trust Deed which limits the discretion available to the ILF.

Whilst the policy as a whole means that only users with the greatest needs have been able to access the ILF since 1993, it may also be seen as protecting existing users support from reduction by ring-fencing it. In addition it provides a degree of continuity and certainty for users during times in which

local authority criteria have been tightened.

However in some circumstances where the local authority proceeds with a reduction in support it can result in ILF users being suspended.

Please state the reasons why the changes are taking place.

Recent amendments to the policy have been limited to changes in some wording to bring it up to date with the current position of the ILF. There has been no alteration to the content or meaning of the policy and the nature and remit of the policy is unchanged.

<b>Key</b>		
<b>-2</b>	Significant negative impact	<b>+1</b> Mild/moderate positive impact
<b>-1</b>	Mild/moderate negative impact	<b>+2</b> Significant positive impact
<b>0</b>	Neutral impact	
<b>Protected Characteristic</b>	<b>Impact</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Age	0	The policy has no significant impact relating to age.
Disability	0	The policy has no significant impact relating to disability.
Gender	0	The policy has no significant impact relating to gender.
Gender reassignment	0	The policy has no significant impact relating to gender reassignment.
Marriage and civil partnership	0	The policy has no significant impact relating to marriage and civil partnership.
Pregnancy and maternity	0	The policy has no significant impact relating to pregnancy or maternity.
Race	0	The policy has no significant impact relating to race.
Religion or belief	0	The policy has no significant impact relating to religion or belief.
Sexual orientation	0	The policy has no significant impact relating to sexual orientation.

What alternative policy/process options have been considered to reduce or alleviate any identified impact?

There is a risk to ILF users where a local authority reduces support below the threshold sum as this makes them ineligible for any continued ILF funding. The policy allows for the local authority support to be provided flexibly and staff are advised to work with local authorities to adjust their level of support back above the threshold sum rather than seek to suspend payments.

In 2012-13 ILF statistics indicate that 22 cases were closed as a result of the local authority reducing below the threshold sum accounting for 2% of cases closed.

What research has been gathered/considered when making decisions regarding the Protected Characteristics?

ILF Trust Deed.  
ILF quinquennial review  
Review of the ILF Independent Living Funds 2007

Are any future actions required for example monitoring or review?


No

EIAB comments/recommendations

The EIA was presented to the board on 24 October 2013. The board suggested a minor amendment to the EIA as detailed in the minutes for the meeting. This EIA includes the amendment and is therefore agreed by the board.

Date form completed 16 September 2013

Signature of EIAB chair



Date 7 November 2013

## Subsequent amendments to policy/process

Date of amendment

Details of amendment

Reason why a new EIA is not required

Date of amendment

Details of amendment

Reason why a new EIA is not required

Date of amendment

Details of amendment

Reason why a new EIA is not required

Date of amendment

Details of amendment

Reason why a new EIA is not required