

Equality Questionnaire

This questionnaire is a pre Equality Impact Assessment tool which will enable you to decide whether or not the **new, proposed or significantly changed** policy/ practice/ procedure/ function/ service needs to go through a full Equality Impact Assessment. For further information on the equality questionnaire see the [guidance](#).

Name of policy/ practice/ procedure/ function/ service being assessed:	Future of Furniture Reuse Organisations (FROs)
Department and Section:	Adults and Communities (A&C), Environment and Transport Department (E&T), Chief Executives Department (CE), Children and Young People Service (CYPS)
Name of lead officer and others completing this assessment:	Chandni Motivaras
Contact telephone numbers:	0116 3057450
Date EIA assessment completed:	24/10/2013
1.	<p>What is its purpose?</p> <p>To highlight the potential impacts to LCC of the withdrawal of funding to the FROs.</p>
2.	<p>What are its main objectives?</p> <p>To outline a proposal for how a co-ordinated approach to how LCC supports the FROs could be undertaken by offering a conditional support package to the FROs that provides them with an opportunity to become more sustainable, and at the same time mitigates against the impact on other departments and on LCC of any loss of service.</p>
3.	<p>What will it achieve? Who are its beneficiaries?</p> <p>The key benefits to LCC of adopting a co-ordinated approach to how it supports and engages with the FROs are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Opportunity to clearly demonstrate joined up thinking and working across several departments. - Supports all departments in achieving both their strategic and budget saving requirements while supporting and developing the voluntary sector within Leicestershire and assisting the most vulnerable in the county. - Opportunity to reduce the cost of providing furniture and other items as part of the LWP which will result in efficiencies for the LWP budget as the FROs will be able to provide items at a lower cost than currently provided. - Avoidance of reputational damage to LCC. - Provides mitigation against additional and/or future costs for LCC. - Opportunity for LCC to support the local economy by supporting the LRRN which intends to establish a social enterprise to undertake the increased reuse activity and the provision of training and volunteering opportunities that this provides. - Contribute to development of an effective FRO service which would be one element of a comprehensive Early Intervention and Prevention programme.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Maintain and enhance the positive working relationship that has been development with the FROs over the last 3 years. 		
4.	Who is responsible for implementing it? It is the responsibility of all departments to implement this as it is a co-ordinated approach.		
		Yes	No
5.	Has prior consultation on the proposal been undertaken?	Yes – with each of the FROs	No – not with the wider public
6.	Has this consultation indicated any dissatisfaction with it from a particular section of the community?		No – none of the FROs raised any dissatisfaction in relation to any client group or section of the community
7.	If yes to Question 6, please state what this dissatisfaction is:		
		Yes	No
8.	Is there evidence or any other reason to suggest that it could have a different effect or adverse impact on any section of the community? Or more specifically, one or more of the protected characteristics?	The potential risk to the future of two of the FROs will have an impact on local communities and related local support services working with vulnerable people in the county. Those particularly who may be adversely affected include primary client groups (e.g. Mental Health, Young People and Learning Disability) and those affected by the impact of the Welfare Reforms. It would take some time for the Communities in Charge Programme to develop such services to replace the FROs. Families who rely on the availability	

		of the FROs would potentially not have a service available to them. This may result in CYPS needing to identify other services/resources that might be able to help or provide a service to the most vulnerable families impacting on required budget savings.		
9.	Is a system in place to monitor its impact?		No	
10.	If yes to Q9, what does this monitoring show?			
Note: If no to Question 9, you will need to ensure that monitoring systems are established to check for impact on all nine protected characteristics.				
11.	Who is likely to be affected by the proposal? Which of the protected characteristics? (Please tick) Explain how each protected characteristic is likely to be affected below: [NB. Alternatively, if no protected characteristic is deemed to be affected, please explain why]			
		Yes	No	
	Age	X	Younger people are the primary client group for one of the FROs (MRC React). There would only be an affect on younger people in the event of the FROs not being able to mitigate against the loss of funding resulting in a lack of volunteering and work opportunities.	
	Disability	X	People with Mental Health and/or Learning Disabilities are the primary client groups for all of the FROs. There would only be an affect on people with Mental Health and/or Learning Disabilities in the event of the FROs being unable to mitigate against the loss of funding resulting in a lack of volunteering and work opportunities.	
	Gender Reassignment		X	This protected characteristic would not be solely impacted as the services delivered by the FROs are accessible to all communities.
	Marriage and Civil Partnership		X	This protected characteristic would not be solely impacted as the services delivered by the FROs are accessible to all communities.
	Pregnancy and Maternity		X	This protected characteristic would not be solely impacted as the services delivered by the FROs are

			accessible to all communities.
Race		X	This protected characteristic would not be solely impacted as the services delivered by the FROs are accessible to all communities.
Religion or Belief		X	This protected characteristic would not be solely impacted as the services delivered by the FROs are accessible to all communities.
Sex		X	This protected characteristic would not be solely impacted as the services delivered by the FROs are accessible to all communities.
Sexual Orientation		X	This protected characteristic would not be solely impacted as the services delivered by the FROs are accessible to all communities.
Other groups e.g. rural isolation, deprivation, health inequality, carers, asylum seeker and refugee communities, looked after children, deprived or disadvantaged communities	X		<p>There would only be an affect on deprivation in the event of the FROs folding as a result of the proposal as members of the public will not be able to access discounted used furniture/baby equipment.</p> <p>As a result of A&C ceasing funding, FROs will have to charge for all of their services (including access work opportunities) to remain viable. Therefore, those service users accessing work placements who may already be adversely affected by the Welfare Reforms would be further affected.</p>
Community Cohesion	X		There would only be an affect on community cohesion in the event of the FROs not being able to mitigate against the loss of funding resulting in a lack of volunteering and work opportunities.
12.	Other comments:		
13.	Decision:		
	No Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Positive Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Neutral Impact <input type="checkbox"/> Negative Impact or Impact Not Known ¹ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Note: If ticked 'Negative Impact or Impact Not Known' box at Question 15, will need to progress to full EIA.			
14.	Proceed to full EIA?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
15.	What are your reasons for your decision? It is likely that the chance of disadvantage particularly with age and disability groups is high in the event of failure to sustain services by the FRO's. The current level of impact is not known given the current timescales of the proposal. A full EIA will be required later in the stages of A&C ceasing funding with continued monitoring to follow.		

¹ 'Impact Not Known' – tick this box if there is no up-to-date data or information to show the effects or outcomes of the function, policy, procedure or service on all of the equality strands.

1st Authorised signature (Lead Officer):

Date:

2nd Authorised Signature (Member of DMT): ...

Heather Broughton

Date: 28/04/2014

Once completed and authorised by the Departmental Equalities Group, this Equality Questionnaire will need to be published on our website.

