

## **Equality Impact Assessment (EIA)**

| Title of policy/process under consideration  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| Bank/Public Holiday Costs  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| 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.   |  |  |
| As all ILF users employ care to assist them to live independently the policy applies equally to all ILF users. We have not identified any negative impact of the policy. |  |  |
|  |  |  |

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

ILF payments are normally made four weeks in arrears and paid directly to the user or their representative. Payments reflect the usual weekly cost of care and do not contain contingency costs other than those associated with employers responsibilities. Where additional costs are incurred the ILF may consider these on a case by case basis. The policy on bank holiday costs clarifies that the ILF will make payments on request.

Through tayloring payments to individual requirements the ILF is able to ensure that funding is used in a targetted manner that reflects individual and local requirements, this would not always be possible if a universal provision was made for all ILF users.

The policy reflects the differences between the different regions within the UK with regard to bank holidays.

#### Please state the reasons why the changes are taking place.

The policy has been revised with a view to reduce and/or alleviate any possible impact on users when responsibility for support needs is transfered across to local authorities\devolved administrations from April 2015.

If it is identified that the user's Local Authority pay for bank holidays in a different manner to the ILF (either averaged or as and when they occur) the user may wish to alter the ILF method of payment to align with the LA processes.

There has not been any identified negative impact as a result of this assessment.

- Key
  Significant negative impact
  Mild/moderate negative impact
  Neutral impact

- +1 Mild/moderate positive impact+2 Significant positive impact

| Protected<br>Characteristic    | Impact | Notes   |
|--------------------------------|--------|---|
| Age                            | 0      | This policy change should have a neutral impact on the protected characteristic. The change should assist the transfer process for some users |
| Disability                     | 0      | This policy change should have a neutral impact on the protected characteristic. The change should assist the transfer process for some users |
| Gender                         | 0      | This policy change should have a neutral impact on the protected characteristic. The change should assist the transfer process for some users |
| Gender<br>reassignment         | 0      | This policy change should have a neutral impact on the protected characteristic. The change should assist the transfer process for some users |
| Marriage and civil partnership | 0      | This policy change should have a neutral impact on the protected characteristic. The change should assist the transfer process for some users |
| Pregnancy and maternity        | 0      | This policy change should have a neutral impact on the protected characteristic. The change should assist the transfer process for some users |
| Race                           | 0      | This policy change should have a neutral impact on the protected characteristic. The change should assist the transfer process for some users |
| Religion or belief             | 0      | This policy change should have a neutral impact on the protected characteristic. The change should assist the transfer process for some users |
| Sexual orientation             | 0      | This policy change should have a neutral impact on the protected characteristic. The change should assist the transfer process for some users |

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

The ILF has always made payments based around the specific care costs incurred by the individual. This personalised approach allows the ILF to best support individuals given the varied nature of their circumstances.

As payments are made in arrears where extra costs are incurred it is possible for the ILF to make additional payments either as these occur or averaged out over a year.

The alternative approach would be to pay a contingency payment up front to all users regardless of actual cost. The intial costs incurred with this approach combined with the fact that the ILF normally only audit payments on a two yearly basis means that a change in policy would not be financially viable without having a negative impact on other areas of support.

The policy is applied to all ILF users throughout the UK. In having to request additional payments for each holiday or bank holiday there is an additional administrative burden for ILF users which would not necessarily be the case if the ILF paid an automatic contingency.

However this is mitigated by the fact that the ILF will make payments towards financial management, in addition 70% of ILF users have award managers to deal with financial matters on their behalf.

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

ILF statistical information has been considered for payments made towards bank holidays and how ILF funding is managed.

| Are any future actions required for example monitoring or review?   |
|---|
| This policy is due for a general review.  |
|   |
|   |
|   |
|   |
|   |
| EIAB comments/recommendations   |
| The EIAB reviewed the EIA on 25 April 2013 and subject to the minor amendment detailed in the minutes of 25 April 2013 the board agreed to the EIA. |
|   |
|   |
|   |
|   |
| Date form completed 11 April 2013   |
| Signature of EIAB chair   |
| Hair  |
| Date 26 April 2013  |

#### Subsequent amendments to policy/process

Date of amendment November 2013

#### Details of amendment

On 6 November 2013, the Court of Appeal quashed the Government's decision that was made on 18 December 2012 to close the Independent Living Fund (ILF). All activity relating to the Transfer Review Programme has therefore ceased. The policy has been amended to remove a paragraph advising assessors to consider if bank holiday payment arrangements could be aligned with the practice of the local authority to facilitate transition.

### Reason why a new EIA is not required

This amendment has no impact on the protected characteristics

Date of amendment 7 March 2014

#### Details of amendment

On 6 March 2014 the Government made a decision to close the Independent Living Fund (ILF) on 30 June 2015. The funding and responsibility for users ILF care and support needs will be transferred to local authorities in England and the devolved administrations in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland from 1 July 2015. The ILF commenced a Transfer Review Support Programme (TRSP) on 7 March 2014.

The policy has been updated to include a paragraph advising assessors to consider if bank holiday payment arrangements could be aligned with the practice of the local authority to facilitate transition.

### Reason why a new EIA is not required

The current EIA does not identify any negative impact on the protected characteristics as the policy is intended to be applied to each group equally.

The revisions to the policy do not affect this impact and therefore a new EIA is not required.