

Key Decision taken by an Officer

Chief Officers: Ged Curran, Chief Executive and Hannah Doody, Director of Community and Housing

Date: 18 December 2018

Agenda item: N/A

Wards: All

Subject: Strategic Partner Programme 2019-2022

Lead officer: John Dimmer, Head of Policy, Strategy and Partnerships

Lead member: Councillor Edith Macauley, Cabinet Member for Community Safety, Engagement and Equalities

Councillor Tobin Byers, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care & Health

Contact officer: Amanda Roberts, Policy, Strategy and Partnerships Officer
(020 8545 4685 / amanda.roberts@merton.gov.uk)

Recommendation:

(1) That the Chief Officer and Director agrees the allocation of funding for each of the five elements of the Strategic Partner Programme 2019-22 as set out in Appendix III and summarised in paragraphs 3.4, 3.10, 3.11, 3.14 and 3.15, and notes the further review of ASC prevention activities as set out in paragraphs 3.12 and 3.13.

(2) That the Chief Officer and Director agrees to a second funding round for Information and Advice to allocate the remaining funding as set out in paragraphs 3.6 - 3.8.

(3) That the Chief Officer and Director agrees to extend funding for 2 months until 31 May 2019 to the unsuccessful bidders for Information and Advice funding who are currently funded by the Strategic Partner Programme as set out in paragraph 3.9.

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1. This report sets out the proposed funding allocations to voluntary and community sector organisations who applied for grant funding from the Strategic Partner programme 2019-22. The Strategic Partner funding panels met on 27 and 28 November 2018 to consider bids to the Strategic Partner Programme 2019-2022. The panels recommend that 10 applications receive Strategic Partner funding totalling £3,509,859 over the 2019-22 period.

2 BACKGROUND

2.1. This report follows from the Cabinet report on 17 September 2018 on the Strategic Partner Programme 2019/22 commissioning requirements. Cabinet agreed on 17 September an expanded Strategic Partner programme comprising of five elements:

- Information and Advice provision;
 - Voluntary Sector Infrastructure Support;
 - Wellbeing Services;
 - Carers Services; and
 - Healthwatch Merton
- 2.2. Each element has a separate funding pot. Cabinet also agreed the [Strategic Partner Programme Prospectus](#) that formed the basis of the criteria used to select the strategic partners and approved the scoring methodology and weighting to assess providers, as set out at Appendix II. Organisations could bid to more than one funding pot but must submit separate applications. Consortia bids were allowed.
- 2.3. Two funding panels were established. One panel assessed applications to the Information and Advice and Infrastructure Support funding pots. The second panel considered applications to the Wellbeing, Carers and Healthwatch funding pots. In accordance with the existing arrangements for the Strategic Partner programme each panel has made recommendations to the responsible Chief Officer and Director who will take a decision on the funding allocation.

3 **DETAIL**

- 3.1. The application process for the Strategic Partner Programme was opened on 1 October 2018 with a deadline of 12 November 2018. A total of twenty-one applications were received. The following applications were received for each element.
- Information and Advice provision: 3
 - Voluntary Sector Infrastructure Support: 2
 - Wellbeing Services: 14
 - Carers Services: 1
 - Healthwatch Merton: 1
- 3.2. Two funding panels were convened on 27 and 28 November to score applications against the weighted criteria, including the key features set out in the funding prospectus. One panel assessed applications for the Information and Advice and Infrastructure support elements of the Strategic Partner programme. The other panel assessed applications for the Wellbeing, Carers and Healthwatch elements of the programme. Each funding element and the applications to that element were considered separately i.e. there were five separate and discrete processes to assess funding for each of the five elements. Applications for each element were scored and ranked. Any that were found to fall below the minimum threshold or fell outside the scope set out in the Prospectus were automatically not eligible. Funding allocations were then considered for each funding pot based on ranking.
- 3.3. Details of membership of these panels is included at Appendix I. Details of the scoring system are set out at Appendix II, along with the panels' scoring,

commentary and funding recommendations at Appendix III. An overview of the panel's recommendations is at Appendix IV and the Equality Analysis assessing the impact of the recommendations is set out at Appendix V. We have set out in Appendix III the scores against the four funding criteria and a short commentary that summarises panel assessments. These provide a snapshot but each panel has a more detailed assessment of the scoring.

INFORMATION AND ADVICE

- 3.4. Of the three applications received for the Information and Advice pot, Citizens Advice Merton and Lambeth (CAML) was the strongest bid, scored the highest and the panel recommends total funding of £710,000 for 2019-21. As agreed by Cabinet, funding for year 3 (2021/22) will be subject to a further Cabinet decision in 2020/21.
- 3.5. The two other applications were both eligible for funding but received the same lower score. As the funding requested overall was more than the funding remaining in the pot there is not enough funding available to fund these applications.
- 3.6. The panel is therefore proposing to re-open the Information and Advice element of the programme for a second round fund in January, which will be subject to a further Key Decision. This bidding round would only be open to existing unsuccessful bidders to this funding pot.
- 3.7. The CAML application met most of the key features outlined in the funding prospectus. The panel is therefore proposing that the second round of funding should focus on the more specialist requirements set out in the prospectus. The highest priority identified for the remaining funding relates to the provision of specialist/legal representation (Tier 4). An additional priority identified relates to outreach support for residents with some of the most challenging needs who may be less likely to approach an advice organisation for information and advice or are more likely to go where they feel most comfortable.
- 3.8. Given that the remaining funding available is relatively small (£177k per annum over two years) and the requirements are specific, we propose to seek applications from individual organisations only. It should be noted that membership of the panel will remain the same.
- 3.9. In order to give current Information and Advice funded organisations three months' notice it is proposed that existing arrangements are extended for currently funded unsuccessful applicants to this funding stream for a further two months to 31 May 2019.

VOLUNTARY SECTOR INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT

- 3.10. There were two bids to this funding pot and both met the minimum threshold for funding. This panel recommends a total allocation of £370,000 for 2019-21 from the Voluntary Sector Infrastructure Support funding pot – see Appendix III for funding amounts. As agreed by Cabinet, funding for year 3 (2021/22) will be subject to a further Cabinet decision in 2020/21.

WELLBEING SERVICES

- 3.11. There were fourteen applications for funding to the Wellbeing Services funding pot. The funding panel recommends a total allocation of £1,226,202 for 2019-22 from the Wellbeing Services pot. The detailed funding recommendations and amounts are set out in Appendix III.
- 3.12. Four organisations that are currently funded via the Ageing Well Grants Programme and one provider currently funded via the Strategic Partner Programme have not been successful in their application to the Wellbeing Services grants. The activities of these groups are covered by reviews due to commence in the New Year.
- 3.13. The Adult Services Target Operating Model (TOM) and Service Plan for 2019/20 identifies the need to refresh the prevention offer with voluntary sector partners, including day activities for older people. The TOM and Service Plan also identify the need to review transport arrangements, which closely relate to access to daytime activities. We will therefore provide support to these groups while those reviews take place.

CARERS SERVICES

- 3.14. There was one application to the funding pot for Carers Services and the panel recommends a total allocation of £828,657 for 2019-22 from this funding pot. The detailed funding recommendations and amounts are set out in Appendix III.

HEALTHWATCH MERTON

- 3.15. There was one application to the funding pot for Healthwatch Merton and the panel recommends a total allocation of £375,000 for 2019-22 from this funding pot. The detailed funding recommendations and amounts are set out in Appendix III.

RIGHT TO REVIEW

- 3.16. All voluntary and community sector organisations that submitted an application to the Strategic Partner Programme 2019 will be offered the opportunity to request a review of the panel recommendations set out in this report. A Right to Review form has been developed, along with supporting procedure and guidance. In this form, organisations can set out their reasons for requesting a review, focussing on the misinterpretation, incorrect weighting or failure to consider information that organisations submitted in their applications.
- 3.17. Any responses received will be reviewed by a different panel to the one that made the original assessment and the views of this panel along with copies of the Right to Review form will be submitted for consideration to the Chief Executive by 18 December, alongside this report.

4 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

- 4.1. The Chief Executive and Director could choose to fund other organisations instead of those recommended by the panel. However, this action would be

in conflict with the evaluation and judgement process that was followed by the panel in coming to their recommendations in line with the Cabinet Report of 17 September 2018.

- 4.2. The Chief Executive and Director could request a further review of the recommendations, although the delay could mean that we may not be able to take the decision in time for organisations to be notified by 31 December 2018, therefore not giving three months notice and acting in breach of the expectations outlined in the Merton Compact.
- 4.3. The Chief Executive and Director could choose to roll over funding solely for those organisations currently commissioned in 2018-19 at a similar or alternative level. However, this would conflict with Cabinet's decision to apply a competitive process against the criteria for this funding, which was subject to extensive consultation with the VCS.

5 CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN OR PROPOSED

- 5.1. In developing the Strategic Partner funding scheme extensive consultation has taken place through a Collaborative Working Group of voluntary sector representatives and service commissioners, which met a total of five times.
- 5.2. A workshop took place in November 2017 that included approximately 50 representatives from the voluntary sector. This workshop formed the basis of much of the discussion moving forward.
- 5.3. Two surveys were developed which gathered the views of voluntary sector organisations and its service users over the past two years. These were distributed in both digital and physical form, and were promoted by Merton Council and organisations across the voluntary sector.
- 5.4. Conversations with commissioners within the Council and beyond (the CCG, housing providers) took place throughout this process. An initial mapping exercise involved a number of commissioning managers in Merton, and a further 'Commissioners meeting' took place in June 2018.
- 5.5. The formal consultation on the draft funding prospectus opened on 16 July 2018 and ended on 27 August (six weeks). The launch event for this draft prospectus took place at MVSC's INVOLVE meeting on 17 July 2018, with over 50 individuals attending and a drop in session for voluntary and community sector organisations was held on 14 August 2018. Presentations and discussions also took place with the Merton Compact Board and Merton Partnership Executive Board. Four responses were received via a consultation survey. The consultation findings were reported to Cabinet on 17 September 2018 and the prospectus was updated in line with the feedback received.

6 TIMETABLE

- 6.1. The timetable for the application and consideration of bids is set out below:

Deadline for Strategic Partner Funding bids	12 November 2018
Panel meets to consider bids and make recommendations	27 and 28 November 2018

Decision taken by the Chief Executive	18 December 2018
Notification of funding decision	21 December 2018
Funding commences for successful applicants	1 April 2019

6.2. New funding agreements for the Strategic Partner Programme will begin on 1 April 2019, for all allocated funding.

6.3. The outline timetable for the application and consideration of bids for round two of the Information and Advice funding stream is set out below:

Round 2 Information and Advice funding bids open	21 December 2018
Deadline for Round 2 funding bids	5pm, 14 January 2019
Panel meets to consider bids and make recommendations	22 January 2019
Decision taken by the Chief Executive	11 February 2019
Notification of funding decision	By 28 February 2019
Funding commences for successful applicants	1 June 2019

7 FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND PROPERTY IMPLICATIONS

7.1. The cost of the Information and Advice element proposed in this report is £1.06 million over two years 2019-21 (excluding notional funding). This can be met within the current core budget. The second funding round will open for existing unsuccessful bidders in January 2019 and funding will commence for successful applicants in June 2019. In order to give current Information and Advice funded organisations three months' notice, it is proposed that current funding arrangements are extended for currently funded unsuccessful applicants to this funding stream for a further two months to 31 May 2019. This can be met within the current core budget.

7.2. The cost of the Voluntary Sector Infrastructure Support element proposed in this report is £370k over two years 2019-21 (excluding notional funding). This can be met within the current core budget.

7.3. It is proposed to award contracts for Information and Advice and Voluntary Sector Infrastructure Support over a three year period with funding agreed for the first two years as set out in 7.1 and 7.2. We would notify providers of the level of funding to be allocated in 2021/22 for these two elements in 2020/21.

7.4. The total grants allocation for Wellbeing Services 2019-22 is £1.2 million and Carers Services is £829,000 over the same funding period. The grant funding for these services is from the Adult Social Care core budget and the Better Care Fund budget.

- 7.5. The grant funding available for Healthwatch Merton is £375k over the three years 2019-22. This is met predominately from Corporate Services budget (£100,000 per annum) with the remainder met from the Department of Health Local Reform and Community Voices grant.
- 7.6. While there is no reduction in overall funding up to 2021/22, as set out in the funding recommendations, some organisations will lose funding and others will gain funding. There is no provision in the Strategic Partner budget for any transitional arrangements for organisations who will no longer be funded. The overall budget will be kept under review as part of the approach to balancing the budget over the medium-term.

8 LEGAL AND STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1. Under the Care Act 2014 (Part 1 Section 4) a local authority must establish and maintain a service for providing people in its area with information and advice relating to care and support for adults and support for carers.
- 8.2. Under the Homelessness Reduction Act 2017 (Section 2) local housing authorities are required to provide advisory services, free of charge, which provide information and advice on preventing homelessness and securing accommodation when homeless.
- 8.3. The Care Act 2014 states that local authorities must actively promote wellbeing and should have different types of support, services, facilities and resources that help a person avoid developing needs for health and social care support. This includes supporting carers and provision of information and advice.
- 8.4. Merton Council has a legal duty set out in the Health and Social Care Act 2012 to commission a local Healthwatch organisation that is independent of the Council and the NHS.
- 8.5. The Council has the power under the Localism Act 2011 (known as the general power of competence) to do anything an individual may do, unless specifically prohibited. This includes the power to make grants.
- 8.6. In adopting an outcomes-focused commissioned grants approach, care must be taken to ensure that the outcomes identified are not such that a funding agreement is in reality a contract, which would be subject to the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 and the Council's Contract Standing Orders.
- 8.7. Care should also be taken that the giving of a grant does not amount to State Aid. As such the Council should ensure that prior to award of grant a declaration is made by the organisation.

9 HUMAN RIGHTS, EQUALITIES AND COMMUNITY COHESION IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1. When decisions are made as to which voluntary organisations will continue to be funded and which are not to be funded, regard will need to be had to the public sector equality duties and decision-making will be informed by equality analysis. This is attached at Appendix V.

9.2. In summary:

- The proposals for funding will ensure that there is robust support for the voluntary and community sector in the borough to provide broad reaching information and advice, infrastructure support, wellbeing, carers and Healthwatch Merton services to residents.
- Any potential negative impacts identified for customers who are supported by currently funded organisations who have not been successful in their applications to the Wellbeing Programme will be mitigated through the actions outlined in the attached Equality Analysis Improvement Action Plan.

10 CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

10.1. None specific to this report. The proposals in this report do not have a direct crime and disorder impact, however, they will contribute to an inclusive and cohesive society and improve the resilience of vulnerable residents. Overall, this should have a positive impact on the factors that contribute to crime and disorder and reduce the likelihood of vulnerable residents becoming victims of criminal behaviour.

11 RISK MANAGEMENT AND HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS

11.1. Two of the council's key risks relate to equalities and to partnership working. The proposals set out in this report will mitigate risks in relation to both of these.

12 APPENDICES – THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTS ARE TO BE PUBLISHED WITH THIS REPORT AND FORM PART OF THE REPORT

- Appendix I – Strategic Partner Programme 2019 - Panel membership
- Appendix II – Strategic Partner Programme 2019 - Scoring criteria
- Appendix III – Strategic Partner Programme 2019 - Scoring, commentary and recommended funding
- Appendix IV – Overview of panel recommendations
- Appendix V – Equality Analysis

13 BACKGROUND PAPERS

1. Cabinet report – Strategic Partner Programme 2019/22 – commissioning requirements 17/09/2018 - <https://democracy.merton.gov.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?ID=629>

2. Cabinet report – Future Funding of the Strategic Partner Programme – 03/07/2017 - <https://democracy.merton.gov.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?ID=477>

3. CMT paper – Strategic Partner Programme Progress Update – 08/05/2018

4. CMT Paper – Future commissioning arrangements for Healthwatch Merton – Item 5 – 03/10/2017

5. CMT Monthly Health Slot – 14/11/2017

6. Community and Housing Target Operating Model 2018-23

<https://sharepoint.merton.gov.uk/teams/ci/TOM/PublishingImages/Pages/default/Overarching%20departmental%20TOM.pdf>

Strategic Partner Programme 2019 – Panel membership

The first grants panel was convened on 27 November 2018 to score the applications against the weighted criteria for the ‘information and advice provision’ and ‘voluntary sector infrastructure support’ funding streams. The panel was made up of three council officers and a voluntary sector observer:

John Dimmer	Head of Policy, Strategy and Partnerships, Merton Council
Richard Ellis	Head of Community and Housing Strategy and Partnerships, Merton Council
Amanda Roberts	Policy, Strategy and Partnerships Officer, Merton Council
Khadiru Mahdi (observer)	Chief Executive, Merton Voluntary Service Council (Information and Advice only)

A second grants panel was convened on 28 November 2018 for the ‘wellbeing programme’, ‘carers service’, and ‘Healthwatch Merton’ streams.

The panel was made up of the following officers:

Annette Bunka	Senior Commissioning Manager, Merton CCG
Phil Howell	Head of Older People and Disabilities, Merton Council
Anthony Hopkins	Head of Library, Heritage & Adult Education Service, Merton Council
Daniel Butler	Senior Public Health Principal, Merton Council
Kris Witherington	Consultation and Community Engagement Manager, Merton Council (Healthwatch only)

All panel members signed a Conflict of Interest Disclosure form. No interests were declared by the council officers. The voluntary sector observer left the room during the discussion and scoring for the infrastructure bids.

Appendix II

Strategic Partner Programme 2019 – Scoring criteria

The scoring criteria for funding have been identified and weighted below:

Criteria	Demonstrates	Weighting
Track record	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivery / impact • Fundraising / income generation • Partnership and collaborative working / constructive relationships 	20%
Meets requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alignment with key features set out in the funding prospectus 	40%
Value for money	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence based methodology • Outputs and impact • Prevents / delays public sector costs 	20%
Bridging the gap	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meets demonstrable needs • Helps deliver LBM equalities duties • Reaches priority client group • Involves service users in design 	20%

Each criteria is to be given a score between 0 – 5 where:

Score	Meaning	Description
0	Inadequate	There was no response to the question / there is no supporting evidence demonstrated
1	Poor	There is a significant lack of evidence / it fails to meet the required standard / there are serious shortcomings
2	Weak	There is a lack of evidence / there are some shortcomings
3	Acceptable	The response is robust and there is an acceptable level of evidence / any concerns may be of a relatively minor nature
4	Excellent	A very well-evidenced response / very few if any shortcomings / demonstrates a full understanding of the required standard
5	Exceptional	Outstandingly well-evidenced / goes above and beyond what is required / very few if any shortcomings

The minimum score required to be eligible for funding is a 3 in each category, with one score of 2 being acceptable. Any application scoring 0-1 in any criteria will not be eligible for funding.

Strategic Partner Programme 2019 – Scoring, commentary and recommended funding

The funding panels recommend that the Chief Executive approves the funding allocations for each funding pot as set out in the tables below. Please note weighted scores are out of 100.

Information and advice provision scores

Organisation	Summary of Service	Score	Panel Commentary	Funding amount 2019-21
Citizens Advice Merton & Lambeth	Continue to provide a range of information, advice, casework and specialist support services to people across the borough relating to social welfare law. Additionally provide a Specialist Support Partnership Service and Merton Advice Forum.	Track record: 4 Meets requirements: 4 Value for money: 4 Bridging the gap: 3 Weighted score: 76	Track record: Evidence of strong track record and strong brand. Evidently a long history in terms of impact and reach into Merton communities. Fundraising and income generation could be stronger. Needed to show further evidence of financial planning and consider alternative sources of funding and sustainability. Meets requirements: Clear that they provide services across the four information and advice tiers. It is clear how they propose to run the Advice Forum. The breadth of the service offer is a strength. Opening hours for advice line queried, although noted the web service is 24/7. Value for money: Strength in the number of clients served. Good conversion rate for clients accessing the service. Panel felt that there was not enough detail included on the Specialist Partnership Service Programme and is not proposing to fund this element of the bid. Bridging the gap: Evidence of need is strong and organisation reaches priority groups in the east of borough. A lack of involvement of service users in the design of service was identified as a shortcoming to be addressed and has been scored accordingly. Overall: The panel felt that this was a strong, well evidenced application, which met many of the key features outlined in the prospectus, although would not look to fund the Specialist Partnership Service programme.	£710,000
Merton Accord ★	Provide a pan-disability and complex crisis added value information, advice casework and representation	Track record: 3 Meets requirements: 3 Value for money: 3	Track record: Mainly groups with a strong track record in borough individually and one organisation with a national track record. Income generation is strong. Some strengths and weaknesses in terms of collaborative working and partnerships. Meets requirements: Whilst individual services are well targeted, overall their reach across the tiers is uneven. There is a gap around lower level	£0

Organisation	Summary of Service	Score	Panel Commentary	Funding amount 2019-21
	service. Service will include secondee embedded within Commonsides and APF and delivery of Merton Advice Forum.	Bridging the gap: 4 Weighted score: 64	preventative work and provision of general information and advice. Value for money: Whilst it was seen as positive that the partners have come together, the bid does not bring out the strengths of what more they can do together as a partnership. Organisations collectively have a big impact but with a small number of users. Some concerns about accessibility and capacity. Bridging the gap: Commitment to equality is strong/evidenced. Clearly a strong ethos around justice. Have demonstrated demand but evidence of meeting demonstrable need is weaker. Some particularly strong practice around involving service users. Overall: The panel felt that whilst this was a positive example of partners coming together with some very strong elements, the bid did not adequately bring out the strengths of the partnership, or looks to address gaps around provision of general information and advice.	
Age UK Merton	Provide an enhanced 'Ask Us Anything' information and advice service across multiple channels for older people in Merton, including information, advice and casework and outreach and partnership working.	Track record: 3 Meets requirements: 3 Value for money: 3 Bridging the gap: 4 Weighted score: 64	Track record: Acceptable but limited evidence of track record in the application, although strong brand was acknowledged. Ability to generate resources is strong. Meets requirements: Meets the information and advice tiers. Meets tiers 1 and 2 strongly but is weak on casework and beyond. Value for money: Evidence and outputs provided but no breakdown given for the Merton funded service element, so difficult to assess value for money. Outreach element of the bid is strong. Bridging the gap: Reaches a priority client group and gender issues have been highlighted well. For a relatively small organisation they appear to be targeting a real area of need. Overall: The panel felt that whilst this demonstrated a good service which met the lower information and advice tiers outlined in the prospectus, there was not enough information included in the bid on what the Merton funded service would deliver.	£0

★ Consortium bid led by Merton Centre for Independent Living with the following partners: South West London Law Centres, Springfield Advice and Law Centre, deafPLUS, Association of Polish Family, Commonsides Community Development Trust. Merton Accord is brings together Merton voluntary groups to deliver services in partnership. Membership of a consortia will vary according to the nature of the service being commissioned.

Voluntary sector infrastructure support scores

Organisation	Summary of Service	Score	Panel Commentary	Funding amount 2019-21
Merton Voluntary Service Council (MVSC)	Continue to provide a one stop shop infrastructure, strategic representation and volunteering support service for the voluntary, community, faith and social enterprise sector and volunteers and potential volunteers in Merton.	Track record: 3 Meets requirements: 3 Value for money: 2 Bridging the gap: 3 Weighted score: 56	Track record: Some evidence of track record but more recent examples needed. Partnerships and collaboration acceptable. Meets requirements: Appear to deliver across the breadth of the key features of the programme but the bid is light on detail. Value for money: Bid does not demonstrate a clear link between activity and impact. Numbers appear low for some proposed services. Outcomes are not clearly demonstrated. Bridging the gap: Bid does mention secondary impact on residents, but there is limited reference to particular targeted support for VCS organisations. Overall: The panel felt that this application was sufficient to award funding and delivers across the key features of the programme. However, further work will be needed to strengthen the outputs and make a clearer link between activity and impact.	£350,000
BAME Voice	Continue to provide support and voice for BAME organisations and communities in Merton. Introduction of a new peer mentoring and buddying scheme.	Track record: 3 Meets requirements: 3 Value for money: 2 Bridging the gap: 4 Weighted score: 60	Track record: Does not demonstrate a long track record but progress in setting up the organisation acknowledged. Meets requirements: Covers part of the key features of the programme, specifically training, representation and voice. Some elements of the bid are outside the remit of this fund. Value for money: Weakest element of the bid is around demonstrating impact. Bridging the gap: Bid is strongest around this element. Demonstrates clear need but within limited scope of voice. Overall: The panel felt that this is a good bid with a strong focus on bridging the gap, but there needs to be stronger demonstration of impact.	£20,000

Wellbeing Services Scores

** Some groups/activities included in marked bids are subject to a separate review – paras 3.12/3.13 refer

Organisation	Summary of Service	Score	Panel Commentary	Funding amount 2019-22
Age UK Merton	Living Well service aims to provide support to older adults in Merton to enable them to continue to live independently. The service supports people to improve their independence, connection, health and wellbeing.	Track record: 4 Meets requirements: 4 Value for money: 4 Bridging the gap: 4 Weighted score: 80	Track Record: Very well established organisation. Strong resource generation and clear evidence of what has been achieved from funding. Meets Requirements: Lots of examples of how key features are being met, particularly around active ageing, reducing social isolation and improving independence. Value for Money: Evidenced how metrics are used to measure outputs and outcomes and how these will be used for future funding applications. Bridging the Gap: Clearly recorded how the organisation meets the LBM equalities duties and reach priority groups. Overall: The panel felt that this application was a well evidenced response and met many of the key features outlined in the prospectus and demonstrated how outcomes would be measured.	£265,350
Merton Mencap	My Life, My Community-provides the resources that people with a learning disability need to live full lives, connected and mainstream community life. Supported by a facilitator and 2 community hub sessions each week.	Track record: 4 Meets requirements: 4 Value for money: 4 Bridging the gap: 4 Weighted score: 80	Track record: Provides a large range of services for PLD, with lots of collaborative working and good use of volunteers. Meets Requirements: Strong response in prevention and early intervention and supporting people through transition. Value for Money: Identified clear outputs and good description of services and how they plan deliver new services. Evidence of how proposed services will delay public sector costs and use of evidence based tools for measuring outcomes. Bridging the Gap: Recorded how service would seek to address health inequalities, strong references to working with BAME groups and reach across borough. Overall: The panel felt that the application was a very detailed and well evidenced application.	£145,707
Imagine Independence	Provide range of services and support in Peer Support, Inclusion and Health Living and Vocational support	Track record: 4 Meets requirements: 4 Value for money: 3	Track record: Strong experience in MH and LD and have successfully adapted current service delivery model. Good examples of resource funding. Meets Requirements: key focus on prevention and reducing social isolation. Peer support scheme model very successful and demonstrates success,. Concern that vocational support scheme would duplicate other	£360,000

Organisation	Summary of Service	Score	Panel Commentary	Funding amount 2019-22
	through 3 tiers: specialist, early intervention and universal.	Bridging the gap: 4 Weighted score: 76	wellbeing services in the Borough so would not look to fund this. Value for Money: Demonstrates evidence based methodology and prevents and delays public sector costs. However, numbers seem low for peer support. Bridging the Gap: Good equalities section and strong borough reach. Peer support model involves services users in design of the service. Overall: The panel felt that this was a strong application which was well evidenced, although would not look to fund the vocational support service.	
Wimbledon Guild	Develop 3 new activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing emotional and practical support for people 60+ with complex needs, • provision of a Sunday Lunch Service and • expansion of emotional support groups for bereavement, older adults and continuity of concern for people with complex mental health needs. 	Track record: 4 Meets requirements: 3 Value for money: 4 Bridging the gap: 4 Weighted score: 72	Track record: Well established quality organisation with reasonable access to other partner organisations. Have a range of funding streams to access additional income. Meets Requirements: Meets most of key features of prospectus, including work around promoting independence, community connecting, falls prevention and bereavement support. OP MH services are encouraged and the panel welcome that the organisation is moving to work in different ways which have a broad reach. Would not seek to fund the Sunday Lunch service as the panel felt there could be other ways to support 10 people interested in scheme. Value for Money: Ability to match fund would provide significant resources for the programme and organisation has demonstrated clear outputs and impact. Bridging the Gap: Strong Borough wide reach and evidence public transport connectivity. Overall: The panel felt that this was a well-structured application and has demonstrated a good understanding of the required features. The panel would not look to fund the Sunday Lunch Service.	£291,000
Merton Vision	Provide support and services to people who are newly visually impaired, to people who have lived with sight loss	Track record: 4 Meets requirements: 3 Value for money: 3	Track record: Good evidence of income generation and well linked to other organisations. Strong relationships with local hospitals to support people in Merton who receive Certificates of Visual impairment. Meets Requirements: Meet requirements regarding prevention and social interaction, from independent self-care to supporting someone straight after losing their sight. Limited information on other key features.	£164,145

Organisation	Summary of Service	Score	Panel Commentary	Funding amount 2019-22
	for some time. Outreach team promote independence to assist reduction in social care dependency.	Bridging the gap: 4 Weighted score: 68	Value for Money: Cost per contact very low and have a large client base, demonstrating funding can go a long way and value for money. Need to work on sourcing other funding. Bridging the Gap: Reaching specific client group and involved services users in service, where 70% of trustees are service users. Overall: The panel felt that there was a good level of evidence in the application to support the key features in the prospectus and demonstrates a full understanding of the priority client group.	
Merton Accord ★	Create a linked network of supported community wellbeing hubs in East Merton. The hubs will provide a focal point for regular wellbeing activities for adult residents living predominantly in the East of the Borough. This will be complimented by services offered by 2 satellite centres, namely Merton and Morden Guild and Friends in St Helier.	Track record: 3 Meets requirements:3 Value for money:2 Bridging the gap: 3 Weighted score: 56	Track record: Strong on fundraising and partnership working, not as specific on impact. Brings together a range of organisations in a more supportive model. Meets Requirements: Key focus on older people and mental health. Has a broad range of activities and demonstrates strength of collaboration. Some services are not specific enough about how they will meet outcomes and key features of the programme and some services out of the scope of the prospectus. Value for Money: Large amount of money requested for 300+, not clear what the + means. Finance section is not clear on how funds will be spent (large amounts on food and transport with no customer contribution included) and very limited information on outcomes and impact. Bridging the Gap: Focussed on the East partnerships with range of communities to contribute to East Merton model of Health and Wellbeing, although does not have borough wide reach, and limited information on how 'beneficiaries will be placed in more advantageous position'. Overall: Whilst the panel felt that the Merton Accord wellbeing hub model was a really positive and welcome example of partnership working, the application lacked enough evidence and examples to meet the key features described in the prospectus. There was very limited information on how outputs would be monitored to demonstrate positive impacts for people that would use the service.	£0**
Positive Network	Services which enhance the health, wellbeing and independence of residents, with	Track record: 3 Meets requirements: 3	Track record: Grant funding, government funding and housing association funding mentioned, but could be more comprehensive. Partnership working good across a number of organisations, especially BAME groups. Meets Requirements: Interventions around physical activity, social isolation and intergenerational working acceptable. Unclear about	£0**

Organisation	Summary of Service	Score	Panel Commentary	Funding amount 2019-22
	particular focus on the BAME community in the east side of the Borough. Services would include exercise classes, therapies and workshops.	Value for money: 2 Bridging the gap: 3 Weighted score: 56	workshops linking to outcomes and how outcomes will be measured and achieved. Value for Money: Strong reliance on membership fees for 1/2 of funding required-real concerns whether this is sustainable. Not clear on how many of the 3000 who visit benefit from low level preventative services that Positive Network provides. Bridging the Gap: Reaching BAME groups and East Merton model stating how will reach low income communities, however equalities section could be more detailed. Overall: The panel felt that whilst this demonstrated a good service, there was not enough information on the outputs and how they would be monitored. The panel had concerns whether the membership contribution could be achieved.	
CDARS	Service to provide a range of health and wellbeing activities from premises in Wimbledon Chase, which includes a café. Using targeted outreach to identify and connect with people in the community who would not ordinarily access community based services.	Track record: 3 Meets requirements: 2 Value for money: 2 Bridging the gap: 3 Weighted score: 48	Track record: Good track record, already delivering preventative services and good partnership working, limited range of funding sources Meets Requirements: Recovery café already good working model reducing attendance at primary MH services/hospital. Not clear what other activities would be aligned with features of wellbeing programme. Mainly building based model with some outreach offer. Value for Money: Not enough evidence to demonstrate additionality. Very costly model for what is being offered. Not clear on what is already being funded for crisis support and what is the Wellbeing Service. Bridging the Gap: Good evidence of working with priority client groups but not clear what is existing service and what would be new service as part of grants programme. Overall: The panel felt that whilst this seems a good service, it does not adhere enough to the key features of the Adult Social Care Wellbeing Programme.	£0
Merton Community Transport	To provide a Wellbeing Accessible Transport Assist Service, focussed on alleviating isolation by offering transport	Track record: 3 Meets requirements: 2 Value for money: 2 Bridging the gap: 2	Track record: Well established organisation with good track record, but limited information on other funding sources. Meets Requirements: Concerns regarding how the service applying for would complement other existing travel options. Would look to health providers to provide transport for health appointments and not to fund via the Adult Social Care Wellbeing Programme Value for Money: No clear costs or volumes in the document to assess	£0**

Organisation	Summary of Service	Score	Panel Commentary	Funding amount 2019-22
	to individuals who haven't got access to suitable, accessible and affordable transport options.	Weighted score: 44	value for money. Not clear on outcomes and how the service improves isolation and health and wellbeing improvements. Bridging the Gap: Application does not state how the service will address bridging the gap in Merton. Overall: The panel felt that this type of service could be accessed directly by customers and other organisations, and would not seek to fund this type of service.	
Friends in St Helier	7 friendly social groups (including healthy 2 course lunch) in 5 locations for people over the age of 50. The service will provide an accessible platform for social interaction and expand connections in the local community.	Track record: 3 Meets requirements:2 Value for money: 2 Bridging the gap: 2 Weighted score: 44	Track record: good working relationships with housing associations and other organisations. Evidence of generating income through donations, but no other larger grants Meets Requirements: Demonstrates how clubs support people to tackle loneliness but lack of evidence in enablement. Limited information on how would support other key features in the prospectus. Value for Money: Lack of clarity in finance section how funds would be used. Confusing section on holiday fund-would not be able to support this financially as would be out of scope. Bridging the Gap: Meets some needs in terms of loneliness, but insufficient evidence in reaching priority groups. Overall: The panel felt that there was not enough information in the application to demonstrate how other key features would be met and outputs monitored.	£0**
Asian Elderly Group of Merton	The group aims to provide activities to promote healthy and independent living. This would include yoga exercise, talks, advisory service, environment for multicultural communities and promotion of good neighbourhood.	Track record: 1 Meets requirements: 2 Value for money: 1 Bridging the gap: 2 Weighted score: 32	Track record: Details a few partners, but doesn't state how they engage with partners more widely. Poor response to track record and income generation. Meets Requirements: Minimal alignment to key features of Wellbeing-Active ageing and social connecting. Lack of evidence about how the service aligned to the other key features in the prospectus. Value for Money: No mention of how outcomes will be measured and very limited information on impact of service. No plans for sustainability. Bridging the Gap: Multi faith organisation and highlight issues around ethnicity and disability and cultures although limited information about how to bridge the gap. Overall: The panel felt that there was a lack of evidence about how the service aligned to the key features in the prospectus and no information about the outputs of the service and how these will be monitored.	£0**

Organisation	Summary of Service	Score	Panel Commentary	Funding amount 2019-22
Home-Start Merton	Support to parents to help improve parenting skills through telephone support, cook and eat programmes, money for life project, big hopes big future programme and bumps to babies project.	Did not score as out of scope of Adult Social Care Wellbeing Programme	Out of Scope of Wellbeing services that actively promote wellbeing and have different types of support, services, facilities and resources that help a person avoid developing needs for adult social care support.	£0
Mitcham Town Community Trust	Provide a play and art therapy service for children with social-emotional difficulties who are in transition to secondary school.	Did not score as out of scope of Adult Social Care Wellbeing Programme	Out of Scope of Wellbeing services that actively promote wellbeing and have different types of support, services, facilities and resources that help a person avoid developing needs for adult social care support.	£0
Morden Little League	To provide free organised football for local children aged 6 to 14 years in Morden and the surrounding area.	Did not score as out of scope of Adult Social Care Wellbeing Programme	Out of Scope of Wellbeing services that actively promote wellbeing and have different types of support, services, facilities and resources that help a person avoid developing needs for adult social care support.	£0

- ★ Consortium bid led by Merton Voluntary Service Council (MVSC) with the following partners: Association for the Polish Family; Commonsides Community Development Trust; Ethnic Minority Centre; Focus 41; Friends in St. Helier; Happy Family Club; Inner Strength Network; May Project Garden; Merton Community Transport; Merton Goan Senior Citizen Association; Mitcham & Morden Guild; North East Mitcham Community Association; South London Tamil Welfare Group; South Mitcham Community Association. Merton Accord is brings together Merton voluntary groups to deliver services in partnership. Membership of a consortia will vary according to the nature of the service being commissioned.

Carers Service Scores

Organisation	Summary of Service	Score	Panel Commentary	Funding amount 2019-22
Carers Support Merton and Merton Mencap	To continue to provide a one stop shop for unpaid Carers in Merton via the Carers Hub. The Hub will use a model of comprehensive, holistic carers support developed by the Carers Trust.	Track record: 4 Meets requirements: 4 Value for money: 4 Bridging the gap: 4 Weighted score: 80	Track Record: Demonstrates strong record of working with Carers in Merton, working partnerships and very encouraged by winning best business award and charity of the year. Meets Requirements: Meets requirements of all key features and evidence alternative ways of supporting carers throughout their caring journey. Value for Money: Well researched and evidence based approach to supporting carers and fits well with prevention agenda. Bridging the Gap: Strong understanding of the specific issues that carers face from different priority groups and meets needs of carers. Overall: The panel felt that this application was a well evidenced response and met all of the key features outlined in the prospectus and demonstrated how outcomes would be measured.	£828,657

Healthwatch Merton Service Scores

Organisation	Summary of Service	Score	Panel Commentary	Funding amount 2019-22
MVSC	To continue to provide a Healthwatch Merton, providing an effective voice for local people in Merton, influencing and shaping Health and Social Care services to meet the needs of children, young people and adults.	Track record: 4 Meets requirements: 3 Value for money: 2 Bridging the gap: 3 Weighted score: 60	Track Record: Currently delivering service well and demonstrable record in the borough. Have evidenced externally generated resources for MVSC and have shown they work with other agencies. Concern that fundraising is short term, small grants which could leave organisation vulnerable. Meets Requirements: Have listed adequate alignment with key features, although should have demonstrate more details. Value for Money: Can achieve service within given budget, but limited creativity in developing model and limited data to evidence impact of service. Bridging the Gap: Involved in East Merton Model of Health and Wellbeing although limited information on how. Involve service users in design. Sufficient evidence of reaching priority groups. Overall: The panel felt that this application was sufficient to award funding, however further work will be needed to confirm how the impact of the service will be evidenced and how the service will be developed going forward.	£375,000

Strategic Partner Funding – Overview of panel recommendations

Information and advice provision

RECOMMENDED AWARDS	Citizens Advice Merton and Lambeth	
	Applied	Awarded
YEAR 1	358,550	355,000
YEAR 2	367,752	355,000
YEAR 3	378,239	0
TOTAL	1,104,541	710,000

Organisations not recommended for funding

ORGANISATIONS NOT RECOMMENDED	Merton Accord		Age UK Merton	
	Applied	Awarded	Applied	Awarded
YEAR 1	261,593	0	45,000	0
YEAR 2	274,441	0	45,000	0
YEAR 3	277,524	0	45,000	0
TOTAL	813,558	0	135,000	0

Infrastructure Support

RECOMMENDED AWARDS	Merton Voluntary Service Council		BAME Voice	
	Applied	Awarded	Applied	Awarded
YEAR 1	185,000	175,000	23,680	10,000
YEAR 2	185,000	175,000	23,680	10,000
YEAR 3	185,000	0	23,680	0
TOTAL	555,000	350,000	71,040	20,000

Wellbeing Services

RECOMMENDED AWARDS	Age UK Merton		Merton Mencap		Imagine Independence		Wimbledon Guild		Merton Vision	
	Applied	Awarded	Applied	Awarded	Applied	Awarded	Applied	Awarded	Applied	Awarded
YEAR 1	97,543	88,450	48,258	48,569	175,082	120,000	118,521	97,000	54,715	54,715
YEAR 2	98,518	88,450	48,567	48,569	178,583	120,000	115,545	97,000	54,715	54,715
YEAR 3	102,514	88,450	48,881	48,569	182,155	120,000	119,112	97,000	54,715	54,715
TOTAL	298,575	265,350	145,707	145,707	535,820	360,000	353,178	291,000	164,145	164,145

Organisations not recommended for funding

ORGANISATIONS NOT RECOMMENDED	Merton Accord		Positive Network		Friends in St Helier		Merton Community Transport		Asian Elderly Group of Merton	
	Applied	Awarded	Applied	Awarded	Applied	Awarded	Applied	Awarded	Applied	Awarded
YEAR 1	190,000	0	80,520	0	42,030	0	53,132	0	31,500	0
YEAR 2	195,000	0	88,572	0	52,630	0	73,317	0	31,500	0
YEAR 3	204,975	0	97,429	0	53,830	0	51,500	0	31,500	0
TOTAL	589,975	0	266,521	0	148,490	0	177,949	0	94,500	0

ORGANISATIONS NOT RECOMMENDED	Community Drug and Alcohol Service (CDARS)		Mitcham Town Community Trust		Morden Little League		Home-Start Merton	
	Applied	Awarded	Applied	Awarded	Applied	Awarded	Applied	Awarded
YEAR 1	124,522	0	38,320	0	5300	0	52,958	0
YEAR 2	123,964	0	35,920	0	5300	0	53,918	0
YEAR 3	129,731	0	33,520	0	5300	0	54,898	0
TOTAL	378,217	0	107,760	0	15,900	0	161,774	0

Carers Service

RECOMMENDED AWARDS	Carers Support Merton and Merton Mencap	
	Applied	Awarded
YEAR 1	269,838	276,219
YEAR 2	275,358	276,219
YEAR 3	283,619	276,219
TOTAL	828,657	828,657

Healthwatch Merton

RECOMMENDED AWARDS	MVSC	
	Applied	Awarded
YEAR 1	125,000	125,000
YEAR 2	125,000	125,000
YEAR 3	125,000	125,000
TOTAL	375,000	375,000

Appendix V - Equality Analysis



What are the proposals being assessed?	Proposals submitted to the Chief Executive on 18 December 2018 regarding the allocation of the Strategic Partner funding 2019-2022
Which Department/ Division has the responsibility for this?	Lead for delivery: Corporate Services, Customers, Policy and Improvement Division

Stage 1: Overview	
Name and job title of lead officer	John Dimmer, Head of Policy, Strategy and Partnerships
1. What are the aims, objectives and desired outcomes of your proposal? (Also explain proposals e.g. reduction/removal of service, deletion of posts, changing criteria etc)	The purpose of this report is to commission services for Information and Advice, Voluntary Sector Infrastructure Support, Wellbeing, Carers and Healthwatch Merton. The specific requirements and objectives are set out in the Strategic Partner Programme Prospectus agreed by Cabinet on 17 September 2018.
2. How does this contribute to the council's corporate priorities?	<p>The Council's overarching policy priority is to bridge the gap in terms of outcomes between the east and west of the borough and between different communities. Funded organisations will be required to 'Support the delivery of Merton's Community Plan, actively contributing to 'bridging the gap' between the east and the west of the borough.'</p> <p>The Strategic Partner Programme also contributes to the Healthy and Fulfilling Life and Contributing to your Community priorities in the Community Plan as specific programmes in particular will help to promote wellbeing and independence and volunteering support.</p> <p>In addition, one of the key priorities set out in the Council's Business Plan relates to protecting vulnerable people, particularly those most affected by the government's austerity measures.</p> <p>The Strategic Partner programme also supports the Council's prevention agenda linked to a priority around prevention in the Health and Wellbeing Strategy.</p>
3. Who will be affected by this proposal? For example who are the external/internal customers,	<p>Key identified customers: existing and potential voluntary and community sector organisations; existing and potential service users; other internal/external commissioners.</p> <p>A brief summary of each proposal is included in Appendix III. The users of the services covered by the</p>

communities, partners, stakeholders, the workforce etc.

applications for funding include, but are not limited to:

Information and Advice:

- Local residents, including older people, people from BAME communities, disabled people and people with long term health conditions, people with poor mental health, disadvantaged and vulnerable people in need of support with benefits, housing and debt and people in the disadvantaged east of the borough.
- Individuals seeking advice and advocacy and legal advice and representation across the various areas of social welfare law, including: deaf and disabled people, people from BAME communities including Eastern Europe, mental health service users.
- Older adults aged 60 plus living with complex health, care and other needs, older men, carers and families, people from BAME communities, people with mobility or access issues which could prevent them from leaving the home.

Infrastructure Support:

- Small and medium sized voluntary and community sector organisations, including organisations representing BAME, older people, young adult, disabled, mental health and faith groups and organisations serving communities in the disadvantaged east of the borough;
- BAME organisations and communities, in particular those in the disadvantaged east of the borough.

Wellbeing:

- Adults over 18 whose mental health is at risk of escalating into a crisis.
- Older individuals who are 50+, older residents of Goan, Tamil and South Asian heritage. People who do not engage in physical activities. Individuals with enduring mental ill health. People in abusive relationships. People who are lonely and isolated.
- Individuals living with sight loss in the borough.
- All adults aged over 50 living in the borough.
- Adults with any learning disability/autism living across Merton, particularly those living at home with their families.
- People with mental health issues accessing support through primary or secondary care services or known to voluntary and other services.
- Individuals with complex mental health issues, older adults, anyone over 18 who has experienced loss and people over 50 who are socially isolated.
- Members of the community who are isolated and excluded from traditional activities, with a focus on young, elderly, unemployed, disabled and those on a low income. Users predominantly from BAME communities.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individuals, organisations and groups that provide wellbeing services and projects. • Vulnerable, lonely and isolated people over 50 who live in Merton. • Asian people over the age of 50 <p>Carers: Unpaid carers over the age of 18 living in the borough of Merton.</p> <p>Healthwatch Merton: People living or working in Merton who is legally entitled to access publicly funded health or social care services in Merton or anyone who carers for or represents anyone who has access to these services. This includes children and young people and their parents/carers.</p> <p>General:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indirect services users may include staff who access these services; departments and partners that refer individuals to these services; • Statutory and non-statutory partner organisations. <p>How the proposal will benefit the council: The redesigned programme aims to ensure more targeted use of the council's limited resources. In the current financial climate, we will be looking to support services that prevent, reduce or delay the need for more expensive interventions. The council will benefit through the contribution these services make to the council's corporate priorities and the priorities set out in the community plan.</p>
<p>4. Is the responsibility shared with another department, authority or organisation? If so, who are the partners and who has overall responsibility?</p>	<p>Programme Sponsor: Director of Community and Housing, LB Merton</p> <p>Responsibility for co-ordinating the engagement work, development of the funding prospectus and administration of the front end of the funding process sits within Corporate Services. Divisions within Community and Housing have responsibility for the wellbeing services and carers' service strands of the programme and the direct commissioning of these services.</p>

Stage 2: Collecting evidence/ data

5. What evidence have you considered as part of this assessment?

Provide details of the information you have reviewed to determine the impact your proposal would have on the protected characteristics (equality groups).

Evidence gathered:

An extensive engagement and data gathering exercise was conducted as part of the recommissioning process, launched in November 2017. This included a needs analysis, a survey of service users, a survey of community organisations providing, two workshops and a drop in session. This informed the final Strategic Partner Funding prospectus, which formed the basis of the criteria used to decide the strategic partners. Further details are included in the EA included in the Cabinet report dated 17 September 2018. This included an action plan to mitigate any potential negative impacts.

The evidence considered as part of this assessment consisted of the information provided in Strategic Partner Funding applications and supporting accounts. Monitoring evidence of the current Strategic Grants programme and the Ageing Well Programme was also considered to identify impact on equality groups.

Evidence included in the funding bids has indicated that residents from the groups with Protected Characteristics have higher needs and are over-represented in terms of take-up of advice and support from the voluntary sector.

Impact of evidence on proposals:

'Bridging the Gap' was included as one of the four key scoring criteria for this Programme. This accounted for 20% of the overall scoring. Panel members were asked to assess how well each bid demonstrated that it meets demonstrable needs, helps deliver LBM equalities duties, reaches priority client group and involves service users in design. Applicant organisations were also required to demonstrate a track record; meet the requirements set out in the key features sections of the prospectus and demonstrate value for money.

The applications for funding received far exceeded the funding available for the Information and Advice and Wellbeing Programmes and also exceeded the funding for the Infrastructure Support Programme. The funding panels have tried to ensure the services commissioned most effectively reach and have a positive impact on priority groups across the borough. In addition to meeting the criteria for their respective funding streams, successful bids had the most reach, demonstrated value for money and were strongest at bridging the gap between the east and west of the borough. Unsuccessful bids either did not meet the key features of the fund and/or scored lower on these wider criteria.

The aim of the proposal for Wellbeing Services is to support the voluntary sector to improve the wellbeing of people who use or might be at risk of using adult social care services. Adult social care, by its nature, supports people who might be vulnerable and/or have disability. It is therefore likely that they will have one or more protected characteristics. The proposal is designed to have a positive impact on the wellbeing of those that use preventative services.

The grant programme was an open process based on a prospectus. That prospectus was designed in consultation with the sector through a task group and workshops. The funds are inevitably limited, and therefore the process was designed to try select those that best met the key features set out in the prospectus. The range of projects supported reflect the bids received and their relative merits and qualities. The grants awarded will have a positive impact on those who use those services, but it is not possible to support all of the bids received as this exceeded the funds available by some way.

It should be noted that as funding has not yet been allocated for the Information and Advice funding stream, a further funding round will be run. No negative impact has therefore been identified in relation to this funding stream, but a separate EA will be undertaken for the second round of funding.

Stage 3: Assessing impact and analysis

6. From the evidence you have considered, what areas of concern have you identified regarding the potential negative and positive impact on one or more protected characteristics (equality groups)?

Protected characteristic (equality group)	Tick which applies		Tick which applies		Reason Briefly explain what positive or negative impact has been identified
	Positive impact		Potential negative impact		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	
Age	✓		✓		Generally a positive impact identified. Any investment in Information and Advice services will have a positive impact on the equality groups who are over-represented as service users. Potentially there may be some organisations not funded through this pot going forward, but we aim to target key unmet priority areas through Round 2 of the fund and will undertake a separate EA for this round. A broad reach of support for older people has been achieved in the Wellbeing Programme; however, there is potentially a negative impact for voluntary and community sector organisations who support predominantly older people that have been

					unsuccessful in their grant applications to the Adult Social Care Wellbeing Programme. This will potentially have a negative impact on older residents who could access these services.
Disability	✓		✓		Generally a positive impact identified. Any investment in Information and Advice services will have a positive impact on the equality groups who are over-represented as service users. Potentially there may be some organisations not funded through this pot going forward, but we aim to target key unmet priority areas through Round 2 of the fund and will undertake a separate EA for this round. A broad reach of support for people with disabilities has been achieved in the Wellbeing Programme; however, there is potentially a negative impact for voluntary and community sector organisations who support people with disabilities that have been unsuccessful in their grant applications to the Adult Social Care Wellbeing Programme. This will potentially have a negative impact on residents with a disability who could access these services.
Gender Reassignment	✓				Generally a positive impact identified. Any investment in Information and Advice services will have a positive impact on the equality groups who are over-represented as service users. Potentially there may be some organisations not funded through this pot going forward, but we aim to target key unmet priority areas through Round 2 of the fund and will undertake a separate EA for this round. There is a broad reach of support for all residents accessing wellbeing services via the Wellbeing programme including people undergoing gender reassignment.
Marriage and Civil Partnership	✓				Generally a positive impact identified. Any investment in Information and Advice services will have a positive impact on the equality groups who are over-represented as service users. Potentially there may be some organisations not funded through this pot going forward, but we aim to target key unmet priority areas through Round 2 of the fund and will undertake a separate EA for this round. There is a broad reach of support for all residents accessing wellbeing services via the Wellbeing programme.
Pregnancy and Maternity	✓				Generally a positive impact identified. Any investment in Information and Advice services will have a positive impact on the equality groups who are over-represented as service users. Potentially there may be some organisations not funded through this pot going forward, but we aim to target key unmet priority areas through Round 2 of the fund and will

					undertake a separate EA for this round. There is a broad reach of support for all residents accessing wellbeing services via the Wellbeing programme.
Race	✓		✓		Generally a positive impact identified. Any investment in Information and Advice services will have a positive impact on the equality groups who are over-represented as service users. Potentially there may be some organisations not funded through this pot going forward, but we aim to target key unmet priority areas through Round 2 of the fund and will undertake a separate EA for this round. A broad reach of support for people from BAME communities has been achieved in the Wellbeing Programme. However, there is potentially a negative impact for voluntary and community sector organisations who support predominantly BAME groups that have been unsuccessful in their grant applications to the Adult Social Care Wellbeing Programme. This will potentially have a negative impact on BAME residents who could access these services.
Religion/ belief	✓				Generally a positive impact identified. Any investment in Information and Advice services will have a positive impact on the equality groups who are over-represented as service users. Potentially there may be some organisations not funded through this pot going forward, but we aim to target key unmet priority areas through Round 2 of the fund and will undertake a separate EA for this round. There is a broad reach of support for all residents irrespective of their religion or belief accessing wellbeing services via the Wellbeing programme.
Sex (Gender)	✓				Generally a positive impact identified. Any investment in Information and Advice services will have a positive impact on the equality groups who are over-represented as service users. Potentially there may be some organisations not funded through this pot going forward, but we aim to target key unmet priority areas through Round 2 of the fund and will undertake a separate EA for this round. There is a broad reach of support for all residents with key strategic focus on engaging more men within the services and support on offer via the Wellbeing programme.
Sexual orientation	✓				Generally a positive impact identified. Any investment in Information and Advice services will have a positive impact on the equality groups who are over-represented as service users. Potentially there may be some organisations not funded through this pot going forward, but we aim to target key unmet priority areas through Round 2 of the fund and will

					undertake a separate EA for this round. There is a broad reach of support for all residents accessing wellbeing services via the Wellbeing programme.
Socio-economic status	✓		✓		Generally a positive impact identified. Any investment in Information and Advice services will have a positive impact on the equality groups who are over-represented as service users. Potentially there may be some organisations not funded through this pot going forward, but we aim to target key unmet priority areas through Round 2 of the fund and will undertake a separate EA for this round. Service users for wellbeing services and VCS groups are significantly higher for the east of the borough as users with lower economic status have higher needs and therefore are over-represented in terms of service demand. Therefore, all wellbeing services recommended for funding have a borough wide reach, however some organisation that have not been successful for Wellbeing services have more of a specific focus in supporting residents from the east of the borough.

7. If you have identified a negative impact, how do you plan to mitigate it?

Under funding for Information and Advice only one provider, Citizens Advice, is recommended for funding. If this were the only provider funded there would be a gap in provision for specialist/legal representation (Tier 4) and a potential gap around outreach support for residents with some of the most challenging needs who may be less likely to approach an advice organisation for information and advice or are more likely to go where they feel most comfortable. However, not all funding has been allocated and we will invite unsuccessful bidders to reapply for funding in a second funding round specifically for to these two requirements. A further update to this Equality Analysis will be made to support the decision for round two of the funding process for Information and Advice. To ensure there is not a negative impact we will extend funding to the currently funded Information and Advice providers who applied to this funding pot.

There is a potential negative impact identified for the customers who are supported by currently funded organisations who have not been successful in their applications to the Wellbeing Programme. These services currently provide community based support and services predominantly for older people, who may have a disability or be living with a long term condition and may be more likely to live in the east of the borough. In addition, some of these services may support predominantly BAME residents. All successful applicants of Wellbeing services have a borough wide reach. Adult Social Care will work with the relevant groups that have been unsuccessful in their applications to the Wellbeing Services and currently receive funding via the Ageing Well Programme and the Strategic Partner Programme to sustain their services.

To help mitigate the potential negative impact relating to people from BAME communities, older people and disabled people that could be affected by services that have been unsuccessful in the grants programme, the information and advice services can support to help identify

alternative support and services to meet service user needs.

Sufficient notice will be given to unsuccessful organisations to be able to seek alternative resources and/or to reconfigure their offer within the other resources they have and/or to direct users to alternative services. Some users of these services may no longer receive a service or would receive a lesser service or could seek opportunities elsewhere within the wider voluntary sector as what the council funds is only a small part of what the voluntary sector offers.

Stage 4: Conclusion of the Equality Analysis

8. Which of the following statements best describe the outcome of the EA (Tick one box only)

Please refer to the guidance for carrying out Equality Impact Assessments is available on the intranet for further information about these outcomes and what they mean for your proposal

- Outcome 1** – The EA has not identified any potential for discrimination or negative impact and all opportunities to promote equality are being addressed.
- Outcome 2** – The EA has identified adjustments to remove negative impact or to better promote equality.
- Outcome 3** – The EA has identified some potential for negative impact or some missed opportunities to promote equality and it may not be possible to mitigate this fully.
- Outcome 4** – The EA shows actual or potential unlawful discrimination. Stop and rethink your proposals.

Stage 5: Improvement Action Plan

9. Equality Analysis Improvement Action Plan template – Making adjustments for negative impact

This action plan should be completed after the analysis and should outline action(s) to be taken to mitigate the potential negative impact identified (expanding on information provided in Section 7 above).

Negative impact/ gap in information identified in the Equality Analysis	Action required to mitigate	How will you know this is achieved? e.g. performance measure/ target)	By when	Existing or additional resources?	Lead Officer	Action added to divisional/ team plan?
Potentially a negative impact for the customers who are supported by currently funded organisations who have not been successful in their applications to the Information and Advice programme	Extend funding to these organisation until 31 May 2019 by which time a second round of the Information and Advice programme will have taken place to allocate the remaining funding.	Organisations recommended for funding in round 2 ensure that all the requirements set out in the Funding Prospectus are met.	28 Feb 2019	Existing	John Dimmer	Yes
Potentially a negative impact for the customers who are supported by currently funded organisations who have not been successful in their applications to the Wellbeing programme.	Adult Social Care will work with the relevant groups that have been unsuccessful in their applications to the Wellbeing Services and currently receive funding via the Ageing Well Programme and the Strategic Partner Programme to help sustain their services.	Groups are able to continue to provide current services	2019	Existing	Phil Howell	Not required
Potentially a negative impact for the customers who are supported by currently funded organisations who have not been successful in their applications to the Wellbeing programme.	As part of the Strategic Grants Programme, information and advice services can support service users to help identify alternative support and services to meet their needs.	Service users are able to either continue to attend current services, or find alternatives to meet their needs.	2019	Existing	Phil Howell	Not required

<p>Potentially a negative impact for the customers who are supported by currently funded organisations who have not been successful in their applications to the Wellbeing programme.</p>	<p>Sufficient notice to be given to unsuccessful organisations to be able to seek alternative resources and/or to reconfigure their offer within the other resources they have and/or to direct users to alternative services. As part of the Strategic Grants Programme, organisations to be supported by the provider/s of Infrastructure Support.</p>	<p>Alternative funding identified</p>	<p>2019</p>	<p>Existing</p>	<p>Phil Howell</p>	<p>Not required</p>
---	--	---------------------------------------	-------------	-----------------	--------------------	---------------------

Note that the full impact of the decision may only be known after the proposals have been implemented; therefore it is important the effective monitoring is in place to assess the impact.

Stage 6: Reporting outcomes

10. Summary of the equality analysis

This section can also be used in your decision making reports (CMT/Cabinet/etc) but you must also attach the assessment to the report, or provide a hyperlink

This Equality Analysis has resulted in an Outcome 3 Assessment

Key impacts:

Positive: the range of services recommended for funding will ensure equal access to all members of the community, and can be targeted at those people and areas with the highest levels of need.

Negative: there is potentially a negative impact for the customers who currently are supported by organisations who have not been successful in their applications. These services currently provide community based support and services predominantly for older people who live certain areas of the borough.

To mitigate the negative impact, we have ensured all successful applicants of Wellbeing services have a borough wide reach. Adult Social Care will work with the relevant groups that have been unsuccessful in their applications to the Wellbeing Services and currently receive funding via the Ageing Well Programme and the Strategic Partner Programme to sustain their services.

Sufficient notice will be given to unsuccessful organisations to be able to seek alternative resources and/or to reconfigure their offer within the other resources they have and/or to direct users to alternative services. Some users of these services may no longer receive a service or would receive a lesser service or could seek opportunities elsewhere within the wider voluntary sector as what the council funds is only a small part of what the voluntary sector offers.

Stage 7: Sign off by Director/ Head of Service			
Assessment completed by	Amanda Roberts, Policy Strategy and Partnerships Officer Heather Begg, Business Process Lead, Community and Housing John Dimmer, Head of Policy Strategy and Partnerships	Signature: Amanda Roberts Heather Begg John Dimmer	Date: 05/12/2018
Improvement action plan signed off by Director/ Head of Service	John Dimmer, Head Of Policy, Strategy and Partnerships	Signature: John Dimmer	Date: 05/12/2018