

Appendix 2	
Integrated Impact Assessments - Revenue Proposals 2023-24	
	Page No
Corporate	
New Commissioning Strategy	3
Digital Transformation	10
Corporate Transformation	18
Infrastructure & Environment	
Additional Fees & Charges – Parks & Environment	30
Additional Fees & Charges –Roads & Infrastructure	37
Commercial Rent Income	44
Property & Asset Portfolio	51
Facilities Management	59
Parks & Environment	67
Roads & Infrastructure	77
Waste Management	85
Passenger transport	93
Planning Services	106
Social Work & Practice	
Review of Day Care Services (Learning Disability)	113
Complex Care (Learning Disability)	122
Shared Lives	129
Safer Communities – Homelessness Service	136
Additional Fees & Charges	144
Education and Lifelong Learning	
Increased Fees & Charges – for Lets	151
Increases to Fees for non –funded Childcare	158
Central Schools	165
Resilient Communities	
Additional Fees & Charges	172
A redesigned operating model for Business Support functions through the rollout of digital services across the Council.	180
Roll out of Digital Customer Access within Customer Advice and Support	190
Management Fee Reduction to Live Borders	201
Employment Support Service	208

Finance & Corporate Governance	
Additional Fees & Charges Income across Finance & Corporate Governance	215
Finance Savings	222
Assessors & Electoral Registration Services	229
Legal Services	236
Protective Services	243
Audit & Risk	250
People, Performance & Change	
People, Performance & Change	258
Strategic Commissioning & Partnerships	
Residential Care Retendering	265
Comprehensive Review of Strategic Commissioning for H&SC	272
Increased Fees & Charges	279

Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA)

Part 1 Scoping

1 Details of the Proposal

Title of Proposal:	Strategic Commissioning Savings
What is it?	A new Policy/Strategy/Practice X A revised Policy/Strategy/Practice
Description of the proposal: (Set out a clear understanding of the purpose of the proposal being developed or reviewed (what are the aims, objectives and intended outcomes, including the context within which it will operate).)	Comprehensive review of Strategic Commissioning within Scottish Borders Council
Service Area: Department:	Strategic Commissioning & Partnerships
Lead Officer: (Name and job title)	Jen Holland, Director of Strategic Commissioning and Partnerships
Other Officers/Partners involved: (List names, job titles and organisations)	Mark Williamson, HR Business Partner
Date(s) IIA completed:	10/02/2023

--	--

2 Will there be any cumulative impacts as a result of the relationship between this proposal and other policies?

No <i>(please delete as applicable)</i>
If yes, - please state here:

3 Legislative Requirements

3.1 Relevance to the Equality Duty:	
<p>Do you believe your proposal has any relevance under the Equality Act 2010? No</p> <p><i>(If you believe that your proposal may have some relevance – however small please indicate yes. If there is no effect, please enter “No” and go to Section 3.2.)</i></p>	
Equality Duty	Reasoning:
<p>Elimination of discrimination (both direct & indirect), victimisation and harassment.</p> <p><i>(Will the proposal discriminate? Or help eliminate discrimination?)</i></p>	
<p>Promotion of equality of opportunity?</p> <p><i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the Council with this)</i></p>	
<p>Foster good relations?</p>	

(Will your proposal help or hinder the council's relationships with those who have equality characteristics?)

**3.2 Which groups of people do you think will be or potentially could be, impacted by the implementation of this proposal?
(You should consider employees, clients, customers / service users, and any other relevant groups)**

Please tick below as appropriate, outlining any potential impacts on the undernoted equality groups this proposal may have and how you know this.

	Impact			Please explain the potential impacts and how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
Age Older or younger people or a specific age grouping	X			
Disability e.g. Effects on people with mental, physical, sensory impairment, learning disability, visible/invisible, progressive or recurring	X			
Gender Reassignment/ Gender Identity anybody whose gender identity or gender expression is different to the sex assigned to them at birth	X			
Marriage or Civil Partnership people who are married or in a civil partnership	X			

Pregnancy and Maternity (refers to the period after the birth, and is linked to maternity leave in the employment context. In the non-work context, protection against maternity discrimination is for 26 weeks after giving birth),	X			
Race Groups: including colour, nationality, ethnic origins, including minorities (e.g. gypsy travellers, refugees, migrants and asylum seekers)	X			
Religion or Belief: different beliefs, customs (including atheists and those with no aligned belief)	X			
Sex women and men (girls and boys)	X			
Sexual Orientation , e.g. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Heterosexual	X			

3.3 Fairer Scotland Duty

This duty places a legal responsibility on Scottish Borders Council (SBC) to actively consider (give due regard) to how we can reduce inequalities of outcome caused by socioeconomic disadvantage when making strategic decisions.

The duty is set at a strategic level - these are the key, high level decisions that SBC will take. This would normally include strategy documents, decisions about setting priorities, allocating resources and commissioning services.

Is the proposal strategic?

Yes (please delete as applicable)

If No go to Section 4

If yes, please indicate any potential impact on the undernoted groups this proposal may have and how you know this:

	Impact			State here how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
Low and/or No Wealth – enough money to meet basic living costs and pay bills but have no savings to deal with any unexpected spends and no provision for the future.	X			Early proposals indicate that Commissioning services are to be centralised where appropriate. This would result in a change in Directorate or Line Management for employees only.
Material Deprivation – being unable to access basic goods and services i.e. financial products like life insurance, repair/replace broken electrical goods, warm home, leisure and hobbies	X			Early proposals indicate that Commissioning services are to be centralised where appropriate. This would result in a change in Directorate or Line Management for employees only.
Area Deprivation – where you live (e.g. rural areas), where you work (e.g. accessibility of transport)	X			Early proposals indicate that Commissioning services are to be centralised where appropriate. This would result in a change in Directorate or Line Management for employees only.
Socio-economic Background – social	X			Early proposals indicate that Commissioning services are

class i.e. parents' education, employment and income				to be centralised where appropriate. This would result in a change in Directorate or Line Management for employees only.
Looked after and accommodated children and young people	X			Early proposals indicate that Commissioning services are to be centralised where appropriate. This would result in a change in Directorate or Line Management for employees only.
Carers paid and unpaid including family members	X			Early proposals indicate that Commissioning services are to be centralised where appropriate. This would result in a change in Directorate or Line Management for employees only.
Homelessness	X			Early proposals indicate that Commissioning services are to be centralised where appropriate. This would result in a change in Directorate or Line Management for employees only.
Addictions and substance use	X			Early proposals indicate that Commissioning services are to be centralised where appropriate. This would result in a change in Directorate or Line Management for employees only.
Those involved within the criminal justice system	X			Early proposals indicate that Commissioning services are to be centralised where appropriate. This would result in a change in Directorate or Line

				Management for employees only.
--	--	--	--	--------------------------------

4 Full Integrated Impact Assessment Required

Select No if you have answered “No” to all of Sections 3.1 – 3.3.

Yes (please delete as applicable)

If a full impact assessment is not required briefly explain why there are no effects and provide justification for the decision.

The newly established Commissioning service has been established within Scottish Borders Council. This is a strategic function supporting services. A commissioning Board will be established which monitors needs and performance against commissioned contracts and develop new opportunities to meet needs.

Signed by Lead Officer:	Jen Holland
Designation:	Director of Strategic Commissioning and Partnerships
Date:	10/02/2023
Counter Signature Director	Jen Holland, Director of Strategic Commissioning and Partnerships
Date:	10/02/2023

Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA)

Part 1 Scoping

1 Details of the Proposal

Title of Proposal:	Digital Transformation Programme
What is it?	A new Policy/Strategy/Practice <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A revised Policy/Strategy/Practice <input type="checkbox"/>
Description of the proposal: (Set out a clear understanding of the purpose of the proposal being developed or reviewed (what are the aims, objectives and intended outcomes, including the context within which it will operate).	All SBC services will be subject to a comprehensive review based on investment in digital Technology and solutions to fundamentally modernise the way in which services are delivered. A series of heavily interlinked transformation initiatives have been identified as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enterprise Mobility • Process Re-Design and Simplification • Council Information Hub • Data Culture and Maturity
Service Area: Department:	SBC-wide
Lead Officer:	Clair Hepburn/Jen Holland/CMT Jason McDonald

(Name and job title)	
<p>Other Officers/Partners involved: (List names, job titles and organisations)</p>	<p>Bill Edwards – Programme Director – SBC</p> <p>Sean Allison – Project Manager – SBC</p> <p>Naomi Sweeney – Project Manager – SBC</p> <p>Melanie Hermiston - Project Manager – SBC</p> <p>Kelly Tait – Project Manager – SBC</p> <p>Jon Laws – Project Manager – SBC</p> <p>Various other officers will have a critical role to play, particularly those from the services subject to the transformation review and those from support services such as HR, IT, Finance and Performance & Improvement.</p> <p>CGI as Strategic IT Provider</p>
<p>Date(s) IIA completed:</p>	<p>Reviewed 10/2/2023</p>

2 Will there be any cumulative impacts as a result of the relationship between this proposal and other policies?

Yes (please delete as applicable)

If yes, - please state here: Delivery of Digital Transformation Programme directly relates to the key priorities set out in the Council Plan and the Digital Strategy. In conjunction with the Council Report of 25/08/22, ‘Digital Strategy Update and Overview of Digital Transformation Programme’, it was explained, ‘An integrated impact assessment (IIA) template has been completed for the Digital Strategy which covers this proposal (published in 21-22). This is a project underpinned by enhanced digital technology designed to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the Council’s internal deployment of staff. In itself, the project will have positive impacts on staff and clients who may have equalities characteristics and appropriate adjustments to technology and / or process will be made where required to ensure the inclusion of all staff and service users. The IIA will be revisited through the lifecycle of this project and updated if required.’

3 Legislative Requirements

3.1 Relevance to the Equality Duty:

Do you believe your proposal has any relevance under the Equality Act 2010? Yes

(If you believe that your proposal may have some relevance – however small please indicate yes. If there is no effect, please enter “No” and go to Section 3.2.)

Equality Duty

Reasoning:

Elimination of discrimination (both direct & indirect), victimisation and harassment.
(Will the proposal discriminate? Or help eliminate discrimination?)

Yes – As the digital transformation programme covers all services, and is starting with a focus on Social Work, it will have a positive impact on services targeting the elimination of discrimination, victimisation and harassment. It will further allow more accurate & realtime data

	leading to greater targeted services & resources for those with greatest needs.
Promotion of equality of opportunity? <i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the Council with this)</i>	Yes – as above
Foster good relations? <i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the council's relationships with those who have equality characteristics?)</i>	Yes – as above.

3.2 Which groups of people do you think will be or potentially could be, impacted by the implementation of this proposal? (You should consider employees, clients, customers / service users, and any other relevant groups)				
Please tick below as appropriate, outlining any potential impacts on the undernoted equality groups this proposal may have and how you know this.				
	Impact			Please explain the potential impacts and how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
Age Older or younger people or a specific age grouping		x		Greater responsiveness of services, focus on client/customer needs and effectiveness of processes.
Disability e.g. Effects on people with mental, physical, sensory impairment, learning disability, visible/invisible, progressive or recurring		x		As above
Gender Reassignment/ Gender Identity anybody whose gender identity or gender expression is		x		As above

different to the sex assigned to them at birth				
Marriage or Civil Partnership people who are married or in a civil partnership		x		As above
Pregnancy and Maternity (refers to the period after the birth, and is linked to maternity leave in the employment context. In the non-work context, protection against maternity discrimination is for 26 weeks after giving birth),		x		As above
Race Groups: including colour, nationality, ethnic origins, including minorities (e.g. gypsy travellers, refugees, migrants and asylum seekers)		x		As above
Religion or Belief: different beliefs, customs (including atheists and those with no aligned belief)		x		As above
Sex women and men (girls and boys)		x		As above
Sexual Orientation , e.g. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Heterosexual		x		As above
<p>3.3 Fairer Scotland Duty</p> <p>This duty places a legal responsibility on Scottish Borders Council (SBC) to actively consider (give due regard) to how we can reduce inequalities of outcome caused by socioeconomic disadvantage when making <u>strategic</u> decisions.</p>				

The duty is set at a strategic level - these are the key, high level decisions that SBC will take. This would normally include strategy documents, decisions about setting priorities, allocating resources and commissioning services.

Is the proposal strategic?

Yes (*please delete as applicable*)

If No go to Section 4

If yes, please indicate any potential impact on the undernoted groups this proposal may have and how you know this:

	Impact			State here how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
Low and/or No Wealth – enough money to meet basic living costs and pay bills but have no savings to deal with any unexpected spends and no provision for the future.		x		The digital transformation programme will work in harmony with and contribute to greater effectiveness of SBC’s anti-poverty work, including development of more responsive services to meet the needs of people experiencing difficulties with the cost of living.
Material Deprivation – being unable to access basic goods and services i.e. financial products like life insurance, repair/replace broken electrical goods, warm home, leisure and hobbies		x		As above.

Area Deprivation – where you live (e.g. rural areas), where you work (e.g. accessibility of transport)		x		As above. The programme should also improve remote access to services.
Socio-economic Background – social class i.e. parents' education, employment and income		x		As above.
Looked after and accommodated children and young people		x		
Carers paid and unpaid including family members		x		As above. Should also improve access to support resources.
Homelessness		x		Greater responsiveness of services, focus on client/customer needs and effectiveness of processes.
Addictions and substance use		x		As above
Those involved within the criminal justice system		x		As above

4 Full Integrated Impact Assessment Required

Select No if you have answered “No” to all of Sections 3.1 – 3.3.

Yes *(please delete as applicable)*

If a full impact assessment is not required briefly explain why there are no effects and provide justification for the decision.

--

Signed by Lead Officer:	Jason McDonald
Designation:	Senior Manager
Date:	Reviewed 10/2/2023
Counter Signature Director	Clair Hepburn
Date:	13/02/2023

Assessment (IIA)

Part 1 Scoping

1 Details of the Proposal

<p>Title of Proposal:</p>	<p>Corporate Transformation</p>
<p>What is it?</p>	<p>A new Policy/Strategy/Practice <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>A revised Policy/Strategy/Practice X<input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>Description of the proposal:</p> <p>(Set out a clear understanding of the purpose of the proposal being developed or reviewed (what are the aims, objectives and intended outcomes, including the context within which it will operate).</p>	<p>Corporate Transformation across the Council including structural changes as opportunities arise supported by People Plan.</p> <p>Structural and process re-engineering review and income generation opportunities.</p> <p>This will be undertaken in line with the following principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corporate-led, consistent single-SBC approach, external challenge • End to end processes • Reduced structures, enhanced skills, flexibility and demand-led working patterns • Demand-led & informed by evidence, customer intelligence & customer needs • Enhanced community engagement, participation & empowerment

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Best use of physical assets – including reduced estate & single SBC view • Embracing the opportunities from Digital investment • Optimised partnership resources, including better shared services • Process Improvement, productivity focus & removal of non-value adding work, duplication & ineffective effort
<p>Service Area:</p> <p>Department:</p>	Chief Executives
<p>Lead Officer:</p> <p>(Name and job title)</p>	<p>Suzy Douglas</p> <p>Interim Director Finance & Corporate Governance</p>
<p>Other Officers/Partners involved:</p> <p>(List names, job titles and organisations)</p>	<p>Iain Davidson</p> <p>Employee Relations Manager</p>
<p>Date(s) IIA completed:</p>	10/02/2023

2 Will there be any cumulative impacts as a result of the relationship between this proposal and other policies?

Yes
<p>If yes, - please state here: Departmental practices and procedures.</p>

3 Legislative Requirements

3.1 Relevance to the Equality Duty:	
<p>Do you believe your proposal has any relevance under the Equality Act 2010? Yes <i>(If you believe that your proposal may have some relevance – however small please indicate yes. If there is no effect, please enter “No” and go to Section 3.2.)</i></p>	
Equality Duty	Reasoning:
<p>Elimination of discrimination (both direct & indirect), victimisation and harassment. <i>(Will the proposal discriminate? Or help eliminate discrimination?)</i></p>	<p>Process improvement, focussing on customer intelligence and needs and enhanced community engagement will help eliminate discrimination.</p>
<p>Promotion of equality of opportunity? <i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the Council with this)</i></p>	<p>Process improvement, focussing on customer intelligence and needs and enhanced community engagement will promote opportunity for all protected groups.</p>
<p>Foster good relations? <i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the council s relationships with those who have equality characteristics?)</i></p>	<p>The focus on community engagement, participation and empowerment will help foster good relations between different groups.</p>

--	--

**3.2 Which groups of people do you think will be or potentially could be, impacted by the implementation of this proposal?
(You should consider employees, clients, customers / service users, and any other relevant groups)**

Please tick below as appropriate, outlining any potential impacts on the undernoted equality groups this proposal may have and how you know this.

	Impact			Please explain the potential impacts and how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
Age Older or younger people or a specific age grouping		X	X	<p>Increased use of digital resources and a reduced property estate may impact adversely on older people.</p> <p>This will be mitigated by consideration of these matters during the service design phase.</p> <p>Conversely, older people can benefit from increased digital access.</p> <p>A single SBC view will mean services are located in the same place, meaning less journeys are required to access services.</p> <p>Older employees may find it more difficult to adjust to a more flexible form of working and increased use of digital resources.</p> <p>The Council's HR policies and procedures will be used to mitigate the effects of any such impact and appropriate training will be provided.</p>

<p>Disability e.g. Effects on people with mental, physical, sensory impairment, learning disability, visible/invisible, progressive or recurring</p>		X	X	<p>A reduced property estate may impact adversely on people with a disability.</p> <p>This will be considered in the design phase.</p> <p>Increased digital access is a potentially positive development.</p> <p>A single SBC view will mean services are located in the same place, meaning less journeys are required to access services.</p> <p>Disabled employees may find it more difficult to adjust to a more flexible form of working.</p> <p>The Council's HR policies and procedures will be used to mitigate the effects of any such impact, appropriate training will be provided and reasonable adjustments considered.</p>
<p>Gender Reassignment/ Gender Identity anybody whose gender identity or gender expression is different to the sex assigned to them at birth</p>	X			
<p>Marriage or Civil Partnership people who are married or in a civil partnership</p>	X			
<p>Pregnancy and Maternity (refers to the period after the birth, and is linked to maternity leave in the</p>	X			

employment context. In the non-work context, protection against maternity discrimination is for 26 weeks after giving birth),				
Race Groups: including colour, nationality, ethnic origins, including minorities (e.g. gypsy travellers, refugees, migrants and asylum seekers)	X			
Religion or Belief: different beliefs, customs (including atheists and those with no aligned belief)	X			
Sex women and men (girls and boys)	X			
Sexual Orientation , e.g. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Heterosexual	X			

3.3 Fairer Scotland Duty

This duty places a legal responsibility on Scottish Borders Council (SBC) to actively consider (give due regard) to how we can reduce inequalities of outcome caused by socioeconomic disadvantage when making strategic decisions.

The duty is set at a strategic level - these are the key, high level decisions that SBC will take. This would normally include strategy documents, decisions about setting priorities, allocating resources and commissioning services.

Is the proposal strategic?

Yes

If No go to Section 4

If yes, please indicate any potential impact on the undernoted groups this proposal may have and how you know this:

	Impact			State here how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
<p>Low and/or No Wealth – enough money to meet basic living costs and pay bills but have no savings to deal with any unexpected spends and no provision for the future.</p>		X	X	<p>Property rationalisation may mean people with low/ no wealth having to travel further to access Council services.</p> <p>An increased use of digital resources can mitigate this by reducing the need to visit Council premises.</p> <p>More efficient services will benefit this group in allowing quicker and easier access.</p> <p>A single SBC view will mean services are located in the same place, meaning less journeys are required to access services.</p> <p>For current employees, a reduction in staff numbers may mean an impact on this group.</p> <p>Any reduction in posts will be managed through natural attrition, vacancy management and the</p>

				management of temporary contracts. Any actual staff impact will be managed through the appropriate application of HR policies and procedures.
Material Deprivation – being unable to access basic goods and services i.e. financial products like life insurance, repair/replace broken electrical goods, warm home, leisure and hobbies		X	X	<p>An increased use of digital resources may impact on this group.</p> <p>This will be taken into account in the service design.</p> <p>A single SBC view will mean services are located in the same place, meaning less journeys are required to access services.</p> <p>For current employees, a reduction in staff numbers may mean an impact on this group.</p> <p>Any reduction in posts will be managed through natural attrition, vacancy management and the management of temporary contracts. Any actual staff impact will be managed through the appropriate application of HR policies and procedures.</p>
Area Deprivation – where you live (e.g. rural areas), where you work (e.g. accessibility of transport)		X	X	There is a potential for property rationalisation to have a negative impact depending on the location of future properties.

				<p>This will be taken into account during the service review.</p> <p>A single SBC view will mean services are located in the same place, meaning less journeys are required to access services.</p> <p>For current employees, property rationalisation may mean an impact on this group.</p> <p>This will be managed through the appropriate application of HR policies and procedures, including the payment of disturbance allowance.</p>
<p>Socio-economic Background – social class i.e. parents' education, employment and income</p>		X	X	<p>An increased use of digital resources may impact on this group.</p> <p>This will be taken into account in the service design.</p> <p>A single SBC view will mean services are located in the same place, meaning less journeys are required to access services.</p> <p>For current employees, a reduction in staff numbers may mean an impact on this group.</p>

				<p>Any reduction in posts will be managed through natural attrition, vacancy management and the management of temporary contracts. Any actual staff impact will be managed through the appropriate application of HR policies and procedures.</p>
<p>Looked after and accommodated children and young people</p>	X			
<p>Carers paid and unpaid including family members</p>		X	X	<p>For current employees, a change to work patterns may have a negative impact on some with caring responsibilities.</p> <p>This will be managed through the appropriate application of HR policies and procedures, including the opportunity to make a request for flexible working and the ongoing promotion of agile working, allowing employees to work at times which fits in with their other commitments..</p> <p>Equally, different work patterns will benefit some with caring responsibilities.</p> <p>Different work patterns may also make working for the Council attractive and practical for those with caring responsibilities.</p>

Homelessness	X			
Addictions and substance use	X			
Those involved within the criminal justice system	X			

4 Full Integrated Impact Assessment Required

Select No if you have answered “No” to all of Sections 3.1 – 3.3.

Yes *(please delete as applicable)*

If a full impact assessment is not required briefly explain why there are no effects and provide justification for the decision.

Signed by Lead Officer:	Suzy Douglas
Designation:	Interim Director Finance & Corporate Governance
Date:	10/02/2023
Counter Signature Director	Suzy Douglas

Date:

10/02/2023

Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA)

Part 1 Scoping

1 Details of the Proposal

<p>Title of Proposal:</p>	<p>Additional Fees & Charges Parks & Environment</p>
<p>What is it?</p>	<p>A new Policy/Strategy/Practice <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>A revised Policy/Strategy/Practice <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>Description of the proposal:</p> <p>(Set out a clear understanding of the purpose of the proposal being developed or reviewed (what are the aims, objectives and intended outcomes, including the context within which it will operate).</p>	<p>Review / Increase in charges for :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Burials • Allotments • Pitch Bookings
<p>Service Area:</p> <p>Department:</p>	<p>Infrastructure & Environment,</p> <p>Parks & Environment</p>
<p>Lead Officer:</p> <p>(Name and job title)</p>	<p>Jason Hedley, Chief Officer Roads</p>
<p>Other Officers/Partners involved:</p> <p>(List names, job titles and organisations)</p>	<p>Craig Blackie, Parks & Environment Manager</p>

Date(s) IIA completed:	07/02/23
-------------------------------	----------

2 Will there be any cumulative impacts as a result of the relationship between this proposal and other policies?

No
If yes, - please state here:

3 Legislative Requirements

3.1 Relevance to the Equality Duty:

Do you believe your proposal has any relevance under the Equality Act 2010? Yes

(If you believe that your proposal may have some relevance – however small please indicate yes. If there is no effect, please enter “No” and go to Section 3.2.)

Equality Duty	Reasoning:
Elimination of discrimination (both direct & indirect), victimisation and harassment. <i>(Will the proposal discriminate? Or help eliminate discrimination?)</i>	N/A
Promotion of equality of opportunity? <i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the Council with this)</i>	In principle an increase in charges may have an effect on equality of opportunity. In practice, however, the increases are relatively small (5% typically), so the effects should be minimal.

<p>Foster good relations?</p> <p><i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the council's relationships with those who have equality characteristics?)</i></p>	<p>The increases are small and below inflation. They are also comparable with similar services in neighbouring and/or similar rural authorities. As such they are not expected to have an impact on the council's relationship with those who have equality characteristics.</p>
--	--

<p>3.2 Which groups of people do you think will be or potentially could be, impacted by the implementation of this proposal? (You should consider employees, clients, customers / service users, and any other relevant groups)</p>				
<p>Please tick below as appropriate, outlining any potential impacts on the undernoted equality groups this proposal may have and how you know this.</p>				
	Impact			Please explain the potential impacts and how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
<p>Age Older or younger people or a specific age grouping</p>			X	<p>Slight increase in charges may be less affordable. In practice, however, the increases are small.</p>
<p>Disability e.g. Effects on people with mental, physical, sensory impairment, learning disability, visible/invisible, progressive or recurring</p>	X			
<p>Gender Reassignment/ Gender Identity anybody whose gender identity or gender expression is different to the sex assigned to them at birth</p>	X			
<p>Marriage or Civil Partnership people who are married or in a civil partnership</p>	X			

Pregnancy and Maternity (refers to the period after the birth, and is linked to maternity leave in the employment context. In the non-work context, protection against maternity discrimination is for 26 weeks after giving birth),	X			
Race Groups: including colour, nationality, ethnic origins, including minorities (e.g. gypsy travellers, refugees, migrants and asylum seekers)	X			
Religion or Belief: different beliefs, customs (including atheists and those with no aligned belief)	X			
Sex women and men (girls and boys)	X			
Sexual Orientation , e.g. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Heterosexual	X			

3.3 Fairer Scotland Duty

This duty places a legal responsibility on Scottish Borders Council (SBC) to actively consider (give due regard) to how we can reduce inequalities of outcome caused by socioeconomic disadvantage when making strategic decisions.

The duty is set at a strategic level - these are the key, high level decisions that SBC will take. This would normally include strategy documents, decisions about setting priorities, allocating resources and commissioning services.

Is the proposal strategic?

Yes

If No go to Section 4

If yes, please indicate any potential impact on the undernoted groups this proposal may have and how you know this:

	Impact			State here how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
Low and/or No Wealth – enough money to meet basic living costs and pay bills but have no savings to deal with any unexpected spends and no provision for the future.			X	Slight increase in charges may be less affordable. In practice, however, the increases are small.
Material Deprivation – being unable to access basic goods and services i.e. financial products like life insurance, repair/replace broken electrical goods, warm home, leisure and hobbies			X	Slight increase in charges may be less affordable. In practice, however, the increases are small.
Area Deprivation – where you live (e.g. rural areas), where you work (e.g. accessibility of transport)			X	Slight increase in charges may be less affordable. In practice, however, the increases are small.
Socio-economic Background – social class i.e. parents'			X	Slight increase in charges may be less affordable. In practice, however, the increases are small.

education, employment and income				
Looked after and accommodated children and young people	X			
Carers paid and unpaid including family members	X			
Homelessness	X			
Addictions and substance use	X			
Those involved within the criminal justice system	X			

4 Full Integrated Impact Assessment Required

Select No if you have answered “No” to all of Sections 3.1 – 3.3.

No

If a full impact assessment is not required briefly explain why there are no effects and provide justification for the decision.

The effect of the increases has been taken into account when setting the rates, which have been established on a 3 year basis.

Signed by Lead Officer:	Craig Blackie
Designation:	Parks & Environment Manager
Date:	07/02/2023
Counter Signature Director	John Curry
Date:	13/02/2023

Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA)

Part 1 Scoping

1 Details of the Proposal

Title of Proposal:	Additional Fees & Charges Road Occupation
What is it?	A new Policy/Strategy/Practice <input type="checkbox"/> A revised Policy/Strategy/Practice <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Description of the proposal: (Set out a clear understanding of the purpose of the proposal being developed or reviewed (what are the aims, objectives and intended outcomes, including the context within which it will operate).)	Review / Increase in charges for : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Road Closures • Scaffolding Permits • Temporary Traffic Light Permits • Road Occupation Permits • Road Opening Permits
Service Area: Department:	Infrastructure & Environment, Roads
Lead Officer: (Name and job title)	Jason Hedley, Chief Officer Roads
Other Officers/Partners involved: (List names, job titles and organisations)	Brian Young, Infrastructure Manager

Date(s) IIA completed:	07/02/23

2 Will there be any cumulative impacts as a result of the relationship between this proposal and other policies?

No
If yes, - please state here:

3 Legislative Requirements

3.1 Relevance to the Equality Duty:

Do you believe your proposal has any relevance under the Equality Act 2010? Yes

(If you believe that your proposal may have some relevance – however small please indicate yes. If there is no effect, please enter “No” and go to Section 3.2.)

Equality Duty	Reasoning:
Elimination of discrimination (both direct & indirect), victimisation and harassment. <i>(Will the proposal discriminate? Or help eliminate discrimination?)</i>	N/A
Promotion of equality of opportunity?	In principle an increase in charges may have an effect on equality of opportunity.

<i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the Council with this)</i>	In practice, however, the increases are relatively small (5% typically), so the effects should be minimal.
Foster good relations? <i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the council's relationships with those who have equality characteristics?)</i>	The increases are small and below inflation. They are also comparable with similar services in neighbouring and/or similar rural authorities. As such they are not expected to have an impact on the council's relationship with those who have equality characteristics.

**3.2 Which groups of people do you think will be or potentially could be, impacted by the implementation of this proposal?
(You should consider employees, clients, customers / service users, and any other relevant groups)**

Please tick below as appropriate, outlining any potential impacts on the undernoted equality groups this proposal may have and how you know this.

	Impact			Please explain the potential impacts and how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
Age Older or younger people or a specific age grouping			X	Slight increase in charges may be less affordable. In practice, however, the increases are small.
Disability e.g. Effects on people with mental, physical, sensory impairment, learning disability, visible/invisible, progressive or recurring	X			
Gender Reassignment/ Gender Identity anybody whose gender identity or gender expression is different to the sex assigned to them at birth	X			

Marriage or Civil Partnership people who are married or in a civil partnership	X			
Pregnancy and Maternity (refers to the period after the birth, and is linked to maternity leave in the employment context. In the non-work context, protection against maternity discrimination is for 26 weeks after giving birth),	X			
Race Groups: including colour, nationality, ethnic origins, including minorities (e.g. gypsy travellers, refugees, migrants and asylum seekers)	X			
Religion or Belief: different beliefs, customs (including atheists and those with no aligned belief)	X			
Sex women and men (girls and boys)	X			
Sexual Orientation , e.g. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Heterosexual	X			
<p>3.3 Fairer Scotland Duty</p> <p>This duty places a legal responsibility on Scottish Borders Council (SBC) to actively consider (give due regard) to how we can reduce inequalities of outcome caused by socioeconomic disadvantage when making <u>strategic</u> decisions.</p>				

The duty is set at a strategic level - these are the key, high level decisions that SBC will take. This would normally include strategy documents, decisions about setting priorities, allocating resources and commissioning services.

Is the proposal strategic?

Yes

If No go to Section 4

If yes, please indicate any potential impact on the undernoted groups this proposal may have and how you know this:

	Impact			State here how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
Low and/or No Wealth – enough money to meet basic living costs and pay bills but have no savings to deal with any unexpected spends and no provision for the future.			X	Slight increase in charges may be less affordable. In practice, however, the increases are small and primarily business related.
Material Deprivation – being unable to access basic goods and services i.e. financial products like life insurance, repair/replace broken electrical goods, warm home, leisure and hobbies			X	Slight increase in charges may be less affordable. In practice, however, the increases are small and primarily business related.
Area Deprivation – where you live (e.g. rural areas), where you work			X	Slight increase in charges may be less affordable. In practice, however, the increases are small and primarily business related.

(e.g. accessibility of transport)				
Socio-economic Background – social class i.e. parents' education, employment and income			X	Slight increase in charges may be less affordable. In practice, however, the increases are small and primarily business related.
Looked after and accommodated children and young people	X			
Carers paid and unpaid including family members	X			
Homelessness	X			
Addictions and substance use	X			
Those involved within the criminal justice system	X			

4 Full Integrated Impact Assessment Required

Select No if you have answered “No” to all of Sections 3.1 – 3.3.

No

If a full impact assessment is not required briefly explain why there are no effects and provide justification for the decision.

The effect of the increases has been taken into account when setting the rates, which have been established on a 3 year basis.

Signed by Lead Officer:	Brian Young
Designation:	Infrastructure Manager
Date:	07/02/2023
Counter Signature Director	John Curry
Date:	13/02/2023

Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA)

Part 1 Scoping

1 Details of the Proposal

<p>Title of Proposal:</p>	<p>Commercial Rent Increases due to inflation in the rental market</p>
<p>What is it?</p>	<p>A new Policy/Strategy/Practice <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>A revised Policy/Strategy/Practice <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>Description of the proposal:</p> <p>(Set out a clear understanding of the purpose of the proposal being developed or reviewed (what are the aims, objectives and intended outcomes, including the context within which it will operate).</p>	<p>The Council's sublet estate has the ability to review the rents charged on a regular basis (normally every 3 years)</p> <p>It is proposed that the rent reviews due in 2021/22 are implemented and rents increased in line with market value.</p> <p>The additional income generated by the increases in the rents will support the savings identified in the Council's Corporate Plan</p>
<p>Service Area:</p> <p>Department:</p>	<p>Infrastructure & Environment, Property Services</p>

Lead Officer: (Name and job title)	Norrie Curtis, Estates Strategy Manager
Other Officers/Partners involved: (List names, job titles and organisations)	Jo Stewart, Estates Officer Donna Coltart, Estates Strategy Officer
Date(s) IIA completed:	07 th February 2023

2 Will there be any cumulative impacts as a result of the relationship between this proposal and other policies?

Yes
If yes, - please state here: This policy will support the Council's transformation programme

3 Legislative Requirements

3.1 Relevance to the Equality Duty:
Do you believe your proposal has any relevance under the Equality Act 2010? No <i>(If you believe that your proposal may have some relevance – however small please indicate yes. If there is no effect, please enter “No” and go to Section 3.2.)</i>

Equality Duty	Reasoning:
Elimination of discrimination (both direct & indirect), victimisation and harassment. <i>(Will the proposal discriminate? Or help eliminate discrimination?)</i>	
Promotion of equality of opportunity? <i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the Council with this)</i>	.
Foster good relations? <i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the council's relationships with those who have equality characteristics?)</i>	.

3.2 Which groups of people do you think will be or potentially could be, impacted by the implementation of this proposal? (You should consider employees, clients, customers / service users, and any other relevant groups)				
Please tick below as appropriate, outlining any potential impacts on the undernoted equality groups this proposal may have and how you know this.				
	Impact			Please explain the potential impacts and how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
Age Older or younger people or a specific age grouping	X			
Disability e.g. Effects on people with mental, physical, sensory impairment, learning disability,	X			

visible/invisible, progressive or recurring				
Gender Reassignment/ Gender Identity anybody whose gender identity or gender expression is different to the sex assigned to them at birth	X			
Marriage or Civil Partnership people who are married or in a civil partnership	X			
Pregnancy and Maternity (refers to the period after the birth, and is linked to maternity leave in the employment context. In the non-work context, protection against maternity discrimination is for 26 weeks after giving birth),	X			
Race Groups: including colour, nationality, ethnic origins, including minorities (e.g. gypsy travellers, refugees, migrants and asylum seekers)	X			
Religion or Belief: different beliefs, customs (including atheists and those with no aligned belief)	X			
Sex women and men (girls and boys)	X			

Sexual Orientation , e.g. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Heterosexual	X			
<p>3.3 Fairer Scotland Duty</p> <p>This duty places a legal responsibility on Scottish Borders Council (SBC) to actively consider (give due regard) to how we can reduce inequalities of outcome caused by socioeconomic disadvantage when making <u>strategic</u> decisions.</p> <p>The duty is set at a strategic level - these are the key, high level decisions that SBC will take. This would normally include strategy documents, decisions about setting priorities, allocating resources and commissioning services.</p>				
<p>Is the proposal strategic?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>If No go to Section 4</p>				
<p>If yes, please indicate any potential impact on the undernoted groups this proposal may have and how you know this:</p>				
	Impact			State here how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
Low and/or No Wealth – enough money to meet basic living costs and pay bills but have no savings to deal with any unexpected spends and no provision for the future.	X			Slight increase in charges may be less affordable. In practice, however, the increases are small and primarily business related.
Material Deprivation – being unable to access basic goods and	X			Slight increase in charges may be less affordable. In practice, however, the increases are

services i.e. financial products like life insurance, repair/replace broken electrical goods, warm home, leisure and hobbies				small and primarily business related.
Area Deprivation – where you live (e.g. rural areas), where you work (e.g. accessibility of transport)	X			Slight increase in charges may be less affordable. In practice, however, the increases are small and primarily business related.
Socio-economic Background – social class i.e. parents' education, employment and income	X			Slight increase in charges may be less affordable. In practice, however, the increases are small and primarily business related.
Looked after and accommodated children and young people	X			
Carers paid and unpaid including family members	X			
Homelessness	X			
Addictions and substance use	X			
Those involved within the criminal justice system	X			

4 Full Integrated Impact Assessment Required

Select No if you have answered “No” to all of Sections 3.1 – 3.3.

No

If a full impact assessment is not required briefly explain why there are no effects and provide justification for the decision.

--

Signed by Lead Officer:	Norrie Curtis
Designation:	Estates Strategy Manager
Date:	07/02/2023
Counter Signature Director	John Curry
Date:	13/02/2023

Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA)

Part 1 Scoping

1 Details of the Proposal

<p>Title of Proposal:</p>	<p>More efficient Property & Asset portfolio</p>
<p>What is it?</p>	<p>A new Policy/Strategy/Practice <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>A revised Policy/Strategy/Practice <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>Description of the proposal:</p> <p>(Set out a clear understanding of the purpose of the proposal being developed or reviewed (what are the aims, objectives and intended outcomes, including the context within which it will operate).)</p>	<p><i>Savings resulting from property rationalisation and implementing the Corporate Landlord model to drive efficiencies across the Council. Savings will be made from NDR, utilities, property maintenance including cleaning services. Any FTE impact is likely to be from facilities posts in affected buildings.</i></p>
<p>Service Area:</p> <p>Department:</p>	<p>Infrastructure & Environment</p> <p>Property Services and Facilities Management</p>
<p>Lead Officer:</p> <p>(Name and job title)</p>	<p>Norrie Curtis</p> <p>Estates Strategy Manager</p>

Other Officers/Partners involved: (List names, job titles and organisations)	Ray Cherry Architectural Manager
Date(s) IIA completed:	14/02/2023

2 Will there be any cumulative impacts as a result of the relationship between this proposal and other policies?

Yes
If yes, - please state here: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directorate practices and procedures. • Estates Strategy Review implementation

3 Legislative Requirements

3.1 Relevance to the Equality Duty:	
<p>Do you believe your proposal has any relevance under the Equality Act 2010?</p> <p><i>(If you believe that your proposal may have some relevance – however small please indicate yes. If there is no effect, please enter “No” and go to Section 3.2.)</i></p>	
Equality Duty	Reasoning:
Elimination of discrimination (both direct & indirect), victimisation and harassment. <i>(Will the proposal discriminate? Or help eliminate discrimination?)</i>	Process improvement, focussing on Intelligent Client/Service Property Lead and ensuring there is a corporate approach to strategic property asset

	management which will help eliminate discrimination.
Promotion of equality of opportunity? <i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the Council with this)</i>	Process improvement, focussing on Intelligent Client/Service Property Lead and ensuring there is a corporate approach to strategic property asset management which will promote equality of opportunity.
Foster good relations? <i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the council's relationships with those who have equality characteristics?)</i>	Corporate Landlord will work closely with all services within the Council including third sector partners to ensure a focussed and corporate approach to strategic property asset management providing the right property equality outcomes.

**3.2 Which groups of people do you think will be or potentially could be, impacted by the implementation of this proposal?
(You should consider employees, clients, customers / service users, and any other relevant groups)**

Please tick below as appropriate, outlining any potential impacts on the undernoted equality groups this proposal may have and how you know this.

	Impact			Please explain the potential impacts and how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
Age Older or younger people or a specific age grouping		X	X	Some employees may find it more difficult to adjust to a more flexible form of working and increased use of digital resources. Other employees may enjoy the opportunities that digital resources offer.
Disability e.g. Effects on people with mental, physical, sensory impairment, learning		X	X	Increased digital access will empower all staff allowing

disability, visible/invisible, progressive or recurring				them to self-serve within their roles. Disabled employees may find it more difficult to adjust to a more flexible form of working.
Gender Reassignment/ Gender Identity anybody whose gender identity or gender expression is different to the sex assigned to them at birth	X			
Marriage or Civil Partnership people who are married or in a civil partnership	X			
Pregnancy and Maternity (refers to the period after the birth, and is linked to maternity leave in the employment context. In the non-work context, protection against maternity discrimination is for 26 weeks after giving birth),		X		Increased digital access and agile working will be a benefit to employees who are pregnant and on maternity leave – keeping in touch days will be easier to facilitate.
Race Groups: including colour, nationality, ethnic origins, including minorities (e.g. gypsy travellers, refugees, migrants and asylum seekers)	X			
Religion or Belief: different beliefs, customs (including atheists and those with no aligned belief)	X			

Sex women and men (girls and boys)	X			
Sexual Orientation , e.g. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Heterosexual	X			
<p>3.3 Fairer Scotland Duty</p> <p>This duty places a legal responsibility on Scottish Borders Council (SBC) to actively consider (give due regard) to how we can reduce inequalities of outcome caused by socioeconomic disadvantage when making <u>strategic</u> decisions.</p> <p>The duty is set at a strategic level - these are the key, high level decisions that SBC will take. This would normally include strategy documents, decisions about setting priorities, allocating resources and commissioning services.</p>				
<p>Is the proposal strategic?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>If No go to Section 4</p>				
<p>If yes, please indicate any potential impact on the undernoted groups this proposal may have and how you know this:</p>				
	Impact			State here how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
<p>Low and/or No Wealth – enough money to meet basic living costs and pay bills but have no savings to deal with any unexpected spends and no provision for the future.</p>	X			

Material Deprivation – being unable to access basic goods and services i.e. financial products like life insurance, repair/replace broken electrical goods, warm home, leisure and hobbies		X	X	Some staff may not have the digital connectivity or the facilities to work from home as roles become more agile.
Area Deprivation – where you live (e.g. rural areas), where you work (e.g. accessibility of transport)		X	X	Allowing staff to work in an agile way using digital technology places less reliance on being in an office. Remote working, subject to sufficient connectivity will benefit those living in remote communities as commuting will become less of a daily requirement. For staff living in communities with poor digital connectivity alternative provision will need to be made.
Socio-economic Background – social class i.e. parents' education, employment and income	X			
Looked after and accommodated children and young people	X			
Carers paid and unpaid including family members		X	X	For current employees, a change to work patterns may have a negative impact on some with caring responsibilities.

				Equally, different work patterns will benefit some with caring responsibilities.
Homelessness	X			
Addictions and substance use	X			
Those involved within the criminal justice system	X			

4 Full Integrated Impact Assessment Required

Select No if you have answered “No” to all of Sections 3.1 – 3.3.

Yes

If a full impact assessment is not required briefly explain why there are no effects and provide justification for the decision.

--

Signed by Lead Officer:	Ray Cherry
Designation:	Architectural Manager
Date:	14/02/2023
	John Curry

Counter Signature Director	
Date:	14/02/2023

Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA)

Part 1 Scoping

1 Details of the Proposal

<p>Title of Proposal:</p>	<p>Facilities Management Savings</p>
<p>What is it?</p>	<p>A new Policy/Strategy/Practice <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>A revised Policy/Strategy/Practice <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>Description of the proposal:</p> <p>(Set out a clear understanding of the purpose of the proposal being developed or reviewed (what are the aims, objectives and intended outcomes, including the context within which it will operate).</p>	<p><i>Savings from further optimisation of the Facilities Management Service which is expected from the implementation of an Estates Strategy during 2023. Once the Chief Officer has been appointed and the structure is in place including review of policies, procedures, and best use of different funds.</i></p> <p><i>Other areas being explored for further savings are the continued standardisation of crossing patrol operational hours through natural turnover and redeployment, also review of service delivery models and structure to optimise efficiency</i></p> <p><i>There may be an FTE impact, number to be confirmed as proposals are developed..</i></p>

	<p>This will be undertaken in line with the following principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corporate-led, consistent single-SBC approach, external challenge • End to end processes • Reduced structures, enhanced skills, flexibility and demand-led working patterns • Demand-led & informed by evidence, customer intelligence & customer needs • Enhanced community engagement, participation & empowerment • Best use of physical assets – including reduced estate & single SBC view • Embracing the opportunities from Digital investment • Optimised partnership resources, including better shared services • Process Improvement, productivity focus & removal of non-value adding work, duplication & ineffective effort
<p>Service Area:</p> <p>Department:</p>	<p>FACILITIES – Catering & Cleaning</p>
<p>Lead Officer:</p> <p>(Name and job title)</p>	<p>John Gray, Facilities Manager</p>
<p>Other Officers/Partners involved:</p> <p>(List names, job titles and organisations)</p>	

Date(s) IIA completed:	01/02/2022
	Revised 08/02/2023

2 Will there be any cumulative impacts as a result of the relationship between this proposal and other policies?

Yes
<p>If yes, - please state here: Departmental practices and procedures.</p>

3 Legislative Requirements

3.1 Relevance to the Equality Duty:	
<p>Do you believe your proposal has any relevance under the Equality Act 2010? Yes <i>(If you believe that your proposal may have some relevance – however small please indicate yes. If there is no effect, please enter “No” and go to Section 3.2.)</i></p>	
Equality Duty	Reasoning:
<p>Elimination of discrimination (both direct & indirect), victimisation and harassment. <i>(Will the proposal discriminate? Or help eliminate discrimination?)</i></p>	<p>Process improvement, focussing on customer intelligence and needs and enhanced community engagement will help eliminate discrimination.</p>
<p>Promotion of equality of opportunity? <i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the Council with this)</i></p>	<p>Process improvement, focussing on customer intelligence and needs and enhanced community engagement will promote opportunity for all protected groups.</p>

Foster good relations? <i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the council's relationships with those who have equality characteristics?)</i>	The focus on community engagement, participation and empowerment will help foster good relations between different groups.

**3.2 Which groups of people do you think will be or potentially could be, impacted by the implementation of this proposal?
(You should consider employees, clients, customers / service users, and any other relevant groups)**

Please tick below as appropriate, outlining any potential impacts on the undernoted equality groups this proposal may have and how you know this.

	Impact			Please explain the potential impacts and how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
Age Older or younger people or a specific age grouping		X	X	Older employees may find it more difficult to adjust to different forms of working and increased use of automation.
Disability e.g. Effects on people with mental, physical, sensory impairment, learning disability, visible/invisible, progressive or recurring		X	X	Disabled employees may find it more difficult to adjust to different forms of working and increased use of automation.
Gender Reassignment/ Gender Identity anybody whose gender identity or gender expression is different to the sex assigned to them at birth	X			
Marriage or Civil Partnership people who	X			

are married or in a civil partnership				
Pregnancy and Maternity (refers to the period after the birth, and is linked to maternity leave in the employment context. In the non-work context, protection against maternity discrimination is for 26 weeks after giving birth),		X		Increased automation and consequently less physical exertion may be a benefit to pregnant employees.
Race Groups: including colour, nationality, ethnic origins, including minorities (e.g. gypsy travellers, refugees, migrants and asylum seekers)	X			
Religion or Belief: different beliefs, customs (including atheists and those with no aligned belief)	X			
Sex women and men (girls and boys)	X			
Sexual Orientation , e.g. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Heterosexual	X			

3.3 Fairer Scotland Duty

This duty places a legal responsibility on Scottish Borders Council (SBC) to actively consider (give due regard) to how we can reduce inequalities of outcome caused by socioeconomic disadvantage when making strategic decisions.

The duty is set at a strategic level - these are the key, high level decisions that SBC will take. This would normally include strategy documents, decisions about setting priorities, allocating resources and commissioning services.

Is the proposal strategic?

Yes

If No go to Section 4

If yes, please indicate any potential impact on the undernoted groups this proposal may have and how you know this:

	Impact			State here how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
Low and/or No Wealth – enough money to meet basic living costs and pay bills but have no savings to deal with any unexpected spends and no provision for the future.			X	For current employees, a reduction in staff numbers may mean an impact on this group.
Material Deprivation – being unable to access basic goods and services i.e. financial products like life insurance, repair/replace broken electrical goods, warm home, leisure and hobbies			X	For current employees, a reduction in staff numbers may mean an impact on this group.
Area Deprivation – where you live (e.g. rural areas), where you work			X	For current employees, property rationalisation may mean an impact on this group.

(e.g. accessibility of transport)				
Socio-economic Background – social class i.e. parents' education, employment and income			X	For current employees, a reduction in staff numbers may mean an impact on this group.
Looked after and accommodated children and young people	X			
Carers paid and unpaid including family members		X	X	<p>For current employees, a change to work patterns may have a negative impact on some with caring responsibilities.</p> <p>.</p> <p>Equally, different work patterns will benefit some with caring responsibilities.</p> <p>Different work patterns may also make working for the Council attractive and practical for those with caring responsibilities.</p>
Homelessness	X			
Addictions and substance use	X			
Those involved within the criminal justice system	X			

4 Full Integrated Impact Assessment Required

Select No if you have answered “No” to all of Sections 3.1 – 3.3.

Yes

If a full impact assessment is not required briefly explain why there are no effects and provide justification for the decision.

--

Signed by Lead Officer:	John Gray
Designation:	Facilities Manager
Date:	08/02/2023
Counter Signature Director	John Curry
Date:	13/02/2023

Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA)

Part 1 Scoping

1 Details of the Proposal

<p>Title of Proposal:</p>	<p>Parks & Environment</p>
<p>What is it?</p>	<p>A new Policy/Strategy/Practice <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>A revised Policy/Strategy/Practice <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>Description of the proposal:</p> <p>(Set out a clear understanding of the purpose of the proposal being developed or reviewed (what are the aims, objectives and intended outcomes, including the context within which it will operate).</p>	<p><i>The continuation of service reviews focussed on communities, reflecting the Climate Emergency as well as the Biodiversity Duty. Working to enable communities to respond to their own priorities and initiatives, e.g Food Growing Strategy. A service wide range of operational initiatives to make more efficient use of the resources and assets, including appropriate people planning, fleet replacement and review of assets to better support effective and efficient working. Review services and create flexibility across the workforce and wider I&E department will also be a significant strand of focus. There may be an FTE impact. Number to be confirmed as proposals are developed.</i></p>

Service Area: Department:	Infrastructure & Environment Parks & Environment,
Lead Officer: (Name and job title)	Jason Hedley Chief Officer Roads
Other Officers/Partners involved: (List names, job titles and organisations)	I&E Director Service Area Managers & Teams HR, Finance & IT Business Partners
Date(s) IIA completed:	31/01/2023

2 Will there be any cumulative impacts as a result of the relationship between this proposal and other policies?

Yes
If yes, - please state here: Departmental practices and procedures.

3 Legislative Requirements

3.1 Relevance to the Equality Duty:
Do you believe your proposal has any relevance under the Equality Act 2010? Yes

(If you believe that your proposal may have some relevance – however small please indicate yes. If there is no effect, please enter “No” and go to Section 3.2.)

Equality Duty	Reasoning:
Elimination of discrimination (both direct & indirect), victimisation and harassment. <i>(Will the proposal discriminate? Or help eliminate discrimination?)</i>	Process improvement, improved staff communications & engagement, focussing on customer intelligence and needs and enhanced community engagement will help eliminate discrimination.
Promotion of equality of opportunity? <i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the Council with this)</i>	Improved staff communications & engagement & process improvement, focussing on customer intelligence and needs and enhanced community engagement will promote opportunity for all protected groups.
Foster good relations? <i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the council s relationships with those who have equality characteristics?)</i>	The focus on staff engagement/communications, community engagement, participation and empowerment will help foster good relations between different groups.

3.2 Which groups of people do you think will be or potentially could be, impacted by the implementation of this proposal?
(You should consider employees, clients, customers / service users, and any other relevant groups)

Please tick below as appropriate, outlining any potential impacts on the undernoted equality groups this proposal may have and how you know this.

	Impact			Please explain the potential impacts and how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
Age Older or younger people or a specific age grouping		X	X	Increased use of digital resources and a reduced property estate may impact

				<p>adversely on older people.</p> <p>This will be mitigated by consideration of these matters during the service design phase.</p> <p>Conversely, older people can benefit from increased digital access.</p> <p>A single SBC view will mean services are located in the same place, meaning less journeys are required to access services for some customers / stakeholders.</p> <p>Older employees may find it more difficult to adjust to a more flexible form of working and increased use of digital resources however more flexible operations and processes, with development opportunities for staff during their working life, may prove beneficial to many.</p>
<p>Disability e.g. Effects on people with mental, physical, sensory impairment, learning disability, visible/invisible, progressive or recurring</p>		X	X	<p>A reduced property estate may impact adversely on people with a disability.</p> <p>This will be considered in the design phase.</p>

				<p>Increased digital access is a potentially positive development.</p> <p>A single SBC view will mean services are located in the same place, meaning less journeys are required to access services for some customers / stakeholders.</p> <p>Disabled employees may find it more difficult to adjust to a more flexible form of working however more flexible operations and processes, with development opportunities for staff during their working life, may prove beneficial to many.</p>
<p>Gender Reassignment/ Gender Identity anybody whose gender identity or gender expression is different to the sex assigned to them at birth</p>	X			
<p>Marriage or Civil Partnership people who are married or in a civil partnership</p>	X			
<p>Pregnancy and Maternity (refers to the period after the birth, and is linked to maternity leave in the employment context. In the non-work context,</p>		X		Increased digital access should be a benefit

protection against maternity discrimination is for 26 weeks after giving birth),				
Race Groups: including colour, nationality, ethnic origins, including minorities (e.g. gypsy travellers, refugees, migrants and asylum seekers)	X			
Religion or Belief: different beliefs, customs (including atheists and those with no aligned belief)	X			
Sex women and men (girls and boys)	X			
Sexual Orientation , e.g. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Heterosexual	X			

3.3 Fairer Scotland Duty

This duty places a legal responsibility on Scottish Borders Council (SBC) to actively consider (give due regard) to how we can reduce inequalities of outcome caused by socioeconomic disadvantage when making strategic decisions.

The duty is set at a strategic level - these are the key, high level decisions that SBC will take. This would normally include strategy documents, decisions about setting priorities, allocating resources and commissioning services.

Is the proposal strategic?

Yes

If No go to Section 4

If yes, please indicate any potential impact on the undernoted groups this proposal may have and how you know this:

	Impact			State here how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
<p>Low and/or No Wealth – enough money to meet basic living costs and pay bills but have no savings to deal with any unexpected spends and no provision for the future.</p>		X	X	<p>Property rationalisation may mean people with low/ no wealth having to travel further to access Council services.</p> <p>An increased use of digital resources can mitigate this by reducing the need to visit Council premises.</p> <p>More efficient services will benefit this group in allowing quicker and easier access.</p> <p>A single SBC view will mean services are located in the same place, meaning less journeys are required to access services for some customers / stakeholders.</p> <p>For current employees, any potential reduction in staff numbers may mean an impact on this group.</p>
<p>Material Deprivation – being unable to access basic goods and services i.e. financial products like life insurance, repair/replace broken electrical goods, warm home, leisure and hobbies</p>		X	X	<p>An increased use of digital resources may impact on this group. This will be taken into account in the service design.</p> <p>A single SBC view will mean services are located in the same place, meaning less journeys are required to access services for some customers / stakeholders.</p>

				For current employees, any potential reduction in staff numbers may mean an impact on this group.
Area Deprivation – where you live (e.g. rural areas), where you work (e.g. accessibility of transport)		X	X	<p>There is a potential for property rationalisation to have a negative impact depending on the location of future properties.</p> <p>This will be taken into account during the service review.</p> <p>A single SBC view will mean services are located in the same place, meaning less journeys are required to access services for some customers / stakeholders.</p> <p>For current employees, property rationalisation may mean an impact on this group.</p>
Socio-economic Background – social class i.e. parents' education, employment and income		X	X	<p>An increased use of digital resources may impact on this group.</p> <p>This will be taken into account in the service design.</p> <p>A single SBC view will mean services are located in the same place, meaning less journeys are required to access services for some customers / stakeholders.</p> <p>For current employees, any potential reduction in staff numbers may mean an impact on this group.</p>

Looked after and accommodated children and young people	X			
Carers paid and unpaid including family members		X	X	For current employees, a change to work patterns could have either a positive or negative impact on some with caring responsibilities. Different work patterns may also make working for the Council attractive and practical for those with caring responsibilities.
Homelessness	X			
Addictions and substance use	X			
Those involved within the criminal justice system	X			

4 Full Integrated Impact Assessment Required

Select No if you have answered "No" to all of Sections 3.1 – 3.3.

Yes

If a full impact assessment is not required briefly explain why there are no effects and provide justification for the decision.

--

Signed by Lead Officer:	Jason Hedley
Designation:	Chief Officer, Roads
Date:	31/01/2023
Counter Signature Director	John Curry
Date:	13/02/2023

Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA)

Part 1 Scoping

1 Details of the Proposal

Title of Proposal:	Roads & Infrastructure
What is it?	A new Policy/Strategy/Practice <input type="checkbox"/> A revised Policy/Strategy/Practice <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Description of the proposal: (Set out a clear understanding of the purpose of the proposal being developed or reviewed (what are the aims, objectives and intended outcomes, including the context within which it will operate).)	Review the roads operation to improve the quality of the roads network and build commercial opportunities. The Council will use new technology to deliver more permanent fixes and use digital opportunities to improve the efficiency of the service.
Service Area: Department:	Infrastructure & Environment Roads & Infrastructure
Lead Officer: (Name and job title)	Jason Hedley Chief Officer Roads
Other Officers/Partners involved: (List names, job titles and organisations)	I&E Director Service Area Managers & Teams HR, Finance & IT Business Partners

Date(s) IIA completed:	31/01/2023

2 Will there be any cumulative impacts as a result of the relationship between this proposal and other policies?

Yes
If yes, - please state here: Departmental practices and procedures.

3 Legislative Requirements

3.1 Relevance to the Equality Duty:	
<p>Do you believe your proposal has any relevance under the Equality Act 2010? Yes</p> <p><i>(If you believe that your proposal may have some relevance – however small please indicate yes. If there is no effect, please enter “No” and go to Section 3.2.)</i></p>	
Equality Duty	Reasoning:
Elimination of discrimination (both direct & indirect), victimisation and harassment. <i>(Will the proposal discriminate? Or help eliminate discrimination?)</i>	Process improvement, improved staff communications & engagement, focussing on customer intelligence and needs and enhanced community engagement will help eliminate discrimination.
Promotion of equality of opportunity? <i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the Council with this)</i>	Improved staff communications & engagement & process improvement, focussing on customer intelligence and needs and enhanced

	community engagement will promote opportunity for all protected groups.
Foster good relations? <i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the council s relationships with those who have equality characteristics?)</i>	The focus on staff engagement/communications, community engagement, participation and empowerment will help foster good relations between different groups.

3.2 Which groups of people do you think will be or potentially could be, impacted by the implementation of this proposal? (You should consider employees, clients, customers / service users, and any other relevant groups)				
Please tick below as appropriate, outlining any potential impacts on the undernoted equality groups this proposal may have and how you know this.				
	Impact			Please explain the potential impacts and how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
Age Older or younger people or a specific age grouping		X	X	<p>Increased use of digital resources may impact adversely on older people.</p> <p>This will be mitigated by consideration of these matters during the service design phase.</p> <p>Conversely, all age groups can benefit from increased digital access.</p> <p>Older employees may find it more difficult to adjust to a more flexible form of working and increased use of digital resources however more flexible</p>

				operations and processes, with development opportunities for staff during their working life, may prove beneficial to many.
Disability e.g. Effects on people with mental, physical, sensory impairment, learning disability, visible/invisible, progressive or recurring		X	X	Increased digital access is a potentially positive development. Disabled employees may find it more difficult to adjust to a more flexible form of working however more flexible operations and processes, with development opportunities for staff during their working life, may prove beneficial to many.
Gender Reassignment/ Gender Identity anybody whose gender identity or gender expression is different to the sex assigned to them at birth	X			
Marriage or Civil Partnership people who are married or in a civil partnership	X			
Pregnancy and Maternity (refers to the period after the birth, and is linked to maternity leave in the		X		Increased digital access should be a benefit

employment context. In the non-work context, protection against maternity discrimination is for 26 weeks after giving birth),				
Race Groups: including colour, nationality, ethnic origins, including minorities (e.g. gypsy travellers, refugees, migrants and asylum seekers)	X			
Religion or Belief: different beliefs, customs (including atheists and those with no aligned belief)	X			
Sex women and men (girls and boys)	X			
Sexual Orientation , e.g. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Heterosexual	X			
<p>3.3 Fairer Scotland Duty</p> <p>This duty places a legal responsibility on Scottish Borders Council (SBC) to actively consider (give due regard) to how we can reduce inequalities of outcome caused by socioeconomic disadvantage when making <u>strategic</u> decisions.</p> <p>The duty is set at a strategic level - these are the key, high level decisions that SBC will take. This would normally include strategy documents, decisions about setting priorities, allocating resources and commissioning services.</p>				
<p>Is the proposal strategic?</p> <p>Yes</p>				

If No go to Section 4

If yes, please indicate any potential impact on the undernoted groups this proposal may have and how you know this:

	Impact			State here how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
Low and/or No Wealth – enough money to meet basic living costs and pay bills but have no savings to deal with any unexpected spends and no provision for the future.			X	For current employees, any potential reduction in staff numbers may mean an impact on this group.
Material Deprivation – being unable to access basic goods and services i.e. financial products like life insurance, repair/replace broken electrical goods, warm home, leisure and hobbies			X	For current employees, any potential reduction in staff numbers may mean an impact on this group.
Area Deprivation – where you live (e.g. rural areas), where you work (e.g. accessibility of transport)		X		Improvement to the roads will be a benefit.
Socio-economic Background – social class i.e. parents' education, employment and income			X	For current employees, any potential reduction in staff numbers may mean an impact on this group.

Looked after and accommodated children and young people	X			
Carers paid and unpaid including family members		X	X	For current employees, a change to work patterns could have either a positive or negative impact on some with caring responsibilities. Different work patterns may also make working for the Council attractive and practical for those with caring responsibilities.
Homelessness	X			
Addictions and substance use	X			
Those involved within the criminal justice system	X			

4 Full Integrated Impact Assessment Required

Select No if you have answered “No” to all of Sections 3.1 – 3.3.

Yes

If a full impact assessment is not required briefly explain why there are no effects and provide justification for the decision.

--

Signed by Lead Officer:	<i>Brian J Young</i>
Designation:	Infrastructure Manager
Date:	30/01/2023
Counter Signature Director	John Curry
Date:	13/02/2023

Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA)

Part 1 Scoping

1 Details of the Proposal

Title of Proposal:	Waste Management
What is it?	A new Policy/Strategy/Practice <input type="checkbox"/> A revised Policy/Strategy/Practice <input type="checkbox"/> X
Description of the proposal: (Set out a clear understanding of the purpose of the proposal being developed or reviewed (what are the aims, objectives and intended outcomes, including the context within which it will operate).	Savings to be made from further optimisation of the waste service including review of working patterns. Future years' savings from implementation of national legislation including Deposit Return Scheme and Extended Producer Responsibility obligations.
Service Area: Department:	Infrastructure & Environment Waste Management
Lead Officer: (Name and job title)	Ross Sharp-Dent Waste Manager
Other Officers/Partners involved: (List names, job titles and organisations)	

Date(s) IIA completed:	03/02/22 Reviewed 10/02/23
-------------------------------	-------------------------------

2 Will there be any cumulative impacts as a result of the relationship between this proposal and other policies?

Yes
If yes, - please state here: Departmental practices and procedures.

3 Legislative Requirements

3.1 Relevance to the Equality Duty:	
<p>Do you believe your proposal has any relevance under the Equality Act 2010? Yes</p> <p><i>(If you believe that your proposal may have some relevance – however small please indicate yes. If there is no effect, please enter “No” and go to Section 3.2.)</i></p>	
Equality Duty	Reasoning:
Elimination of discrimination (both direct & indirect), victimisation and harassment. <i>(Will the proposal discriminate? Or help eliminate discrimination?)</i>	Process improvement, improved staff communications & engagement, focussing on customer intelligence and needs and enhanced community engagement will help eliminate discrimination.
Promotion of equality of opportunity? <i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the Council with this)</i>	Improved staff communications & engagement & process improvement, focussing on customer intelligence and needs and enhanced community engagement will promote opportunity for all protected groups.

<p>Foster good relations?</p> <p><i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the council's relationships with those who have equality characteristics?)</i></p>	<p>The focus on staff engagement/communications, community engagement, participation and empowerment will help foster good relations between different groups.</p>
--	--

<p>3.2 Which groups of people do you think will be or potentially could be, impacted by the implementation of this proposal? (You should consider employees, clients, customers / service users, and any other relevant groups)</p>				
<p>Please tick below as appropriate, outlining any potential impacts on the undernoted equality groups this proposal may have and how you know this.</p>				
	Impact			Please explain the potential impacts and how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
<p>Age Older or younger people or a specific age grouping</p>		X	X	<p>Changes to waste collection and disposal services has the potential to have both a positive and negative impact on older people. This will be mitigated by consideration of these matters during the service design. Communication of changes will be critical.</p>
<p>Disability e.g. Effects on people with mental, physical, sensory impairment, learning disability, visible/invisible, progressive or recurring</p>		X	X	<p>Changes to waste collection and disposal services has the potential to have both a positive and negative impact on those with a disability. This will be mitigated by consideration of these matters during the service design. Communication of changes will be critical.</p>
<p>Gender Reassignment/ Gender Identity anybody whose gender</p>	X			

identity or gender expression is different to the sex assigned to them at birth				
Marriage or Civil Partnership people who are married or in a civil partnership	X			
Pregnancy and Maternity (refers to the period after the birth, and is linked to maternity leave in the employment context. In the non-work context, protection against maternity discrimination is for 26 weeks after giving birth),	X			
Race Groups: including colour, nationality, ethnic origins, including minorities (e.g. gypsy travellers, refugees, migrants and asylum seekers)	X			
Religion or Belief: different beliefs, customs (including atheists and those with no aligned belief)	X			
Sex women and men (girls and boys)	X			
Sexual Orientation , e.g. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Heterosexual	X			

3.3 Fairer Scotland Duty

This duty places a legal responsibility on Scottish Borders Council (SBC) to actively consider (give due regard) to how we can reduce inequalities of outcome caused by socioeconomic disadvantage when making strategic decisions.

The duty is set at a strategic level - these are the key, high level decisions that SBC will take. This would normally include strategy documents, decisions about setting priorities, allocating resources and commissioning services.

Is the proposal strategic?

Yes

If No go to Section 4

If yes, please indicate any potential impact on the undernoted groups this proposal may have and how you know this:

	Impact			State here how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
Low and/or No Wealth – enough money to meet basic living costs and pay bills but have no savings to deal with any unexpected spends and no provision for the future.		X	X	Changes to waste collection and disposal services has the potential to have both a positive and negative impact. This will be mitigated by consideration of these matters during the service design. Communication of changes will be critical. More efficient services will benefit this group in allowing quicker and easier access.

				For current employees, any potential reduction in staff numbers may mean an impact on this group.
Material Deprivation – being unable to access basic goods and services i.e. financial products like life insurance, repair/replace broken electrical goods, warm home, leisure and hobbies		X	X	For current employees, any potential reduction in staff numbers may mean an impact on this group.
Area Deprivation – where you live (e.g. rural areas), where you work (e.g. accessibility of transport)		X	X	Changes to waste collection and disposal services has the potential to have both a positive and negative impact in respect of area. This will be mitigated by consideration of these matters during the service design. Communication of changes will be critical.
Socio-economic Background – social class i.e. parents' education, employment and income			X	For current employees, any potential reduction in staff numbers may mean an impact on this group.
Looked after and accommodated children and young people	X			
Carers paid and unpaid including family members		X	X	For current employees, a change to work patterns could have either a negative or positive impact on some with caring responsibilities.

				Different work patterns may also make working for the Council attractive and practical for those with caring responsibilities.
Homelessness	X			
Addictions and substance use	X			
Those involved within the criminal justice system	X			

4 Full Integrated Impact Assessment Required

Select No if you have answered “No” to all of Sections 3.1 – 3.3.

Yes

If a full impact assessment is not required briefly explain why there are no effects and provide justification for the decision.

--

Signed by Lead Officer:	Ross Sharp – Dent
Designation:	Waste Manager
Date:	03/02/22 – Reviewed 10/02/23
Counter Signature Director	John Curry
Date:	13/02/2023

Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA)

Part 1 Scoping

1 Details of the Proposal

<p>Title of Proposal:</p>	<p>Passenger Transport</p>
<p>What is it?</p>	<p>A new Policy/Strategy/Practice <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>A revised Policy/Strategy/Practice <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>Description of the proposal:</p> <p>(Set out a clear understanding of the purpose of the proposal being developed or reviewed (what are the aims, objectives and intended outcomes, including the context within which it will operate).</p>	<p>This proposal refers to the extension of the Pingo Demand Responsive Transport Trial in Berwickshire.</p> <p>The pilot is due to expire in March 2023.</p> <p>Pingo is a demand Responsive Transport service which commenced in Berwickshire in May 2022.</p> <p>The objectives of the pilot are;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce dependence on private car; • Improve access to key services; • Increase employment opportunities; • Improve access to transport for young people; and • Reduce Social Isolation. <p>Since May 2022 there have been almost 9,500 journeys made with</p>

	<p>the service being on target to exceed 12,000 trips by March 2023.</p> <p>A great deal of data has been gathered over the initial 9 months of the pilot.</p> <p>With further developments coming on stream in February 2023 including guaranteed pre booking and Pingo journey which will enable officers to better understand how demand responsive transport can integrate with the fixed bus network. The data will then be fed into the wider local transport network review.</p>
<p>Service Area:</p> <p>Department:</p>	<p>Infrastructure & Environment, Passenger Transport</p>
<p>Lead Officer:</p> <p>(Name and job title)</p>	<p>Gordon Grant – Principal Transport Officer</p>
<p>Other Officers/Partners involved:</p> <p>(List names, job titles and organisations)</p>	<p>Colin Craig – Managing Director – West Coast Motors</p> <p>Ewan Doyle – Workforce Mobility Project</p> <p>Michael Spencer – Turner and Townsend</p>
<p>Date(s) IIA completed:</p>	<p>5th February 2023</p>

2 Will there be any cumulative impacts as a result of the relationship between this proposal and other policies?

Yes
<p>If yes, - please state here: The Scottish Borders Climate Change Route Map 2021</p>

3 Legislative Requirements

3.1 Relevance to the Equality Duty:	
<p>Do you believe your proposal has any relevance under the Equality Act 2010? Yes <i>(If you believe that your proposal may have some relevance – however small please indicate yes. If there is no effect, please enter “No” and go to Section 3.2.)</i></p>	
Equality Duty	Reasoning:
<p>Elimination of discrimination (both direct & indirect), victimisation and harassment. <i>(Will the proposal discriminate? Or help eliminate discrimination?)</i></p>	N/A
<p>Promotion of equality of opportunity? <i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the Council with this)</i></p>	<p>This proposal will help the council with the promotion of equality of opportunity.</p> <p>Local bus services provide opportunities for employment, social inclusion and economic growth.</p> <p>The Pingo service is a key enabler for residents in the Berwickshire area providing increased travel opportunities for</p>

	<p>employment, healthcare, Education and Leisure</p> <p>All buses that operate public service routes are fully accessible in line with the Public Vehicle Accessibility Regulations 2000</p>
<p>Foster good relations?</p> <p><i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the council's relationships with those who have equality characteristics?)</i></p>	<p>Local bus services reduce social isolation and create opportunities for people with disabilities or older people who do not have access to a car.</p> <p>Extending the pilot will likely help the council's relationship with people with disabilities and older people who rely heavily on public transport.</p> <p>All buses that operate public service routes are fully accessible in line with the Public Vehicle Accessibility Regulations 2000</p>

<p>3.2 Which groups of people do you think will be or potentially could be, impacted by the implementation of this proposal? (You should consider employees, clients, customers / service users, and any other relevant groups)</p>				
<p>Please tick below as appropriate, outlining any potential impacts on the undernoted equality groups this proposal may have and how you know this.</p>				
	<p>Impact</p>			<p>Please explain the potential impacts and how you know this</p>
	<p>No Impact</p>	<p>Positive Impact</p>	<p>Negative Impact</p>	
<p>Age Older or younger people or a specific age grouping</p>		<p>X</p>		<p>Transport is an important facilitator of social inclusion and wellbeing which can affect social outcomes, and therefore increase inequality.</p>

			<p>Social inclusion is the ability to participate and be an active member of the local community.</p> <p>Transport plays a central role in enabling older people to come together and connect and maintaining bus services can have a positive impact on older people.</p> <p>Younger people will also benefit through the Scottish Governments under 22 free travel scheme</p> <p>Data gathered from the ticket machines has established that almost 26% of the trips are made by older people using their national entitlement card, 40% of all trips are made by young people who access the Scottish Governments under 22 free travel scheme.</p>
<p>Disability e.g. Effects on people with mental, physical, sensory impairment, learning disability, visible/invisible, progressive or recurring</p>		X	<p>There is a great overlap between social inclusion and physical and mental health wellbeing.</p> <p>Strong social connections and family relationships can foster social inclusion and wellbeing alongside accessible health and social care services.</p> <p>Bus services are a key enabler for people with disabilities</p>

			<p>supporting them with maintaining their independence and may reduce their dependence on other services such as Social Work or NHS.</p> <p>The buses used on the Pingo service are wheel chair accessible and the service can operate door to door which makes it a genuine travel option for people with disabilities.</p>
<p>Gender Reassignment/ Gender Identity anybody whose gender identity or gender expression is different to the sex assigned to them at birth</p>	X		<p>There is no evidence to suggest that the action plan would have a potential impact on this characteristic.</p>
<p>Marriage or Civil Partnership people who are married or in a civil partnership</p>	X		<p>There is no evidence to suggest that the action plan would have a potential impact on this characteristic.</p>
<p>Pregnancy and Maternity (refers to the period after the birth, and is linked to maternity leave in the employment context. In the non-work context, protection against maternity discrimination is for 26 weeks after giving birth),</p>	X		<p>There is no evidence to suggest that the action plan would have a potential impact on this characteristic.</p>
<p>Race Groups: including colour, nationality, ethnic origins, including minorities (e.g. gypsy travellers, refugees,</p>	X		<p>There is no evidence to suggest that the action plan would have a potential impact on this characteristic.</p>

migrants and asylum seekers)				
Religion or Belief: different beliefs, customs (including atheists and those with no aligned belief)	X			There is no evidence to suggest that the action plan would have a potential impact on this characteristic.
Sex women and men (girls and boys)	X			There is no evidence to suggest that the action plan would have a potential impact on this characteristic.
Sexual Orientation , e.g. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Heterosexual	X			There is no evidence to suggest that the action plan would have a potential impact on this characteristic.

3.3 Fairer Scotland Duty

This duty places a legal responsibility on Scottish Borders Council (SBC) to actively consider (give due regard) to how we can reduce inequalities of outcome caused by socioeconomic disadvantage when making strategic decisions.

The duty is set at a strategic level - these are the key, high level decisions that SBC will take. This would normally include strategy documents, decisions about setting priorities, allocating resources and commissioning services.

Is the proposal strategic?

Yes

If No go to Section 4

If yes, please indicate any potential impact on the undernoted groups this proposal may have and how you know this:

	Impact	State here how you know this
--	---------------	-------------------------------------

	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
<p>Low and/or No Wealth – enough money to meet basic living costs and pay bills but have no savings to deal with any unexpected spends and no provision for the future.</p>		X		<p>Of the 6 zones identified in the UK community renewal fund bid, Berwickshire was identified as the area which would benefit most from the introduction of a Demand Responsive Transport pilot.</p> <p>Berwickshire is predominately in the highest category of the Workforce Mobility Deprivation Index, it also has a good density of population and two key fixed bus routes (east/west) with connections into the new Reston Station.</p> <p>These factors gave it a high likelihood of success, enabling meaningful data to be collected for commercialising services or submitting a bid to the Shared Prosperity Fund.</p> <p>People who depend more on the bus network for work tend to be lower paid, live in more deprived areas, and are more likely to turn down jobs due to transport issues, than those on higher incomes, who tend to use cars and trains more often.</p> <p>Some groups can be at higher risk of poverty and transport poverty. The impacts of transport poverty are worst for poorer people in rural areas. Services are further away, incomes are often lower, and transport costs higher, partly</p>

				<p>reflecting low population density which makes it harder to run public transport.</p> <p>Maintaining transport services reduces the risk of transport poverty and enhances access to employment and other services.</p>
<p>Material Deprivation – being unable to access basic goods and services i.e. financial products like life insurance, repair/replace broken electrical goods, warm home, leisure and hobbies</p>		X		<p>Of the 6 zones identified in the UK community renewal fund bid, Berwickshire was identified as the area which would benefit most from the introduction of a Demand Responsive Transport pilot.</p> <p>Berwickshire is predominately in the highest category of the Workforce Mobility Deprivation Index, it also has a good density of population and two key fixed bus routes (east/west) with connections into the new Reston Station.</p> <p>These factors gave it a high likelihood of success, enabling meaningful data to be collected for commercialising services or submitting a bid to the Shared Prosperity Fund.</p> <p>People who depend more on the bus network for work tend to be lower paid, live in more deprived areas, and are more likely to turn down jobs due to transport issues, than those on higher incomes, who tend to use cars and trains more often.</p>

			<p>Some groups can be at higher risk of poverty and transport poverty. The impacts of transport poverty are worst for poorer people in rural areas. Services are further away, incomes are often lower, and transport costs higher, partly reflecting low population density which makes it harder to run public transport.</p> <p>Maintaining transport services reduces the risk of transport poverty and enhances access to employment and other services.</p>
<p>Area Deprivation – where you live (e.g. rural areas), where you work (e.g. accessibility of transport)</p>		X	<p>Public Transport is a key enabler for people in rural areas to access work. Maintaining bus services could have positive impact on people who reside in rural areas.</p>
<p>Socio-economic Background – social class i.e. parents' education, employment and income</p>		X	<p>Socio-economic inequality is a multi-faceted issue, and in the context of transport, can affect communities that are low-income, deprived, belong to certain social classes and/or experience existing structural and institutional disadvantages. A critical aspect of socio-economic inequality is minimising child and adult poverty, which is key for sustainable and inclusive economic growth.</p> <p>National trends indicate that income poverty disproportionately impacts groups who face existing structural disadvantages, including disabled people,</p>

			<p>women and specific ethnic groups. This can lead to poor health and wellbeing outcomes, and detrimentally affect the equality of opportunity a person experiences.</p> <p>The COVID-19 pandemic has exacerbated inequalities for socio-economically disadvantaged groups with evidence showing that inequalities in household income and wealth are anticipated to increase, as is the number of households in poverty. Unequal outcomes could potentially be increased across a range of other areas including health, employment and education outcomes, children’s wellbeing, quality of and access to public services, participation in cultural pursuits and the outdoors, and the quality of local connections and support.</p> <p>In addition to exacerbating pre-existing inequalities, the COVID-19 crisis has also created new groupings of people who are at risk of disproportionate impact (e.g. the shielding group) and groups facing particular challenges due to the social restrictions imposed in the face of the virus, for example people with learning disabilities or mental health conditions (Scottish Government, 2020)</p>
--	--	--	---

				Maintaining bus services reduces the associated risks
Looked after and accommodated children and young people	X			No associated impact on this group
Carers paid and unpaid including family members		X		Maintaining bus services could enable family members to travel to provide care for relatives
Homelessness	X			No associated impact on this group
Addictions and substance use	X			No associated impact on this group
Those involved within the criminal justice system	X			No associated impact on this group

4 Full Integrated Impact Assessment Required

Select No if you have answered “No” to all of Sections 3.1 – 3.3.

Yes

If a full impact assessment is not required briefly explain why there are no effects and provide justification for the decision.

--

Signed by Lead Officer:	Gordon Grant
Designation:	Principal Transport Officer
Date:	5th February 2023
Counter Signature Director	John Curry
Date:	13/02/2023

Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA)

Part 1 Scoping

1 Details of the Proposal

Title of Proposal:	Planning Services
What is it?	A new Policy/Strategy/Practice <input type="checkbox"/> A revised Policy/Strategy/Practice <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Description of the proposal: (Set out a clear understanding of the purpose of the proposal being developed or reviewed (what are the aims, objectives and intended outcomes, including the context within which it will operate).)	Review of internal processes and technology opportunities to drive efficiencies.
Service Area: Department:	Planning Services
Lead Officer: (Name and job title)	Ian Aikman Chief Planning & Housing Officer
Other Officers/Partners involved: (List names, job titles and organisations)	Transformation support/HR/Finance
	4/2/23

Date(s) IIA completed:	
------------------------	--

2 Will there be any cumulative impacts as a result of the relationship between this proposal and other policies?

Yes / No (please delete as applicable)

If yes, - please state here:

Departmental practices and procedures.

3 Legislative Requirements

3.1 Relevance to the Equality Duty:

Do you believe your proposal has any relevance under the Equality Act 2010?

Yes

(If you believe that your proposal may have some relevance – however small please indicate yes. If there is no effect, please enter “No” and go to Section 3.2.)

Equality Duty	Reasoning:
Elimination of discrimination (both direct & indirect), victimisation and harassment. <i>(Will the proposal discriminate? Or help eliminate discrimination?)</i>	Process improvement, focussing on customer intelligence and needs and enhanced community engagement will help eliminate discrimination.
Promotion of equality of opportunity? <i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the Council with this)</i>	Process improvement, focussing on customer intelligence and needs and enhanced community engagement will promote opportunity for all protected groups.

<p>Foster good relations?</p> <p><i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the council's relationships with those who have equality characteristics?)</i></p>	<p>The focus on community engagement, participation and empowerment will help foster good relations between different groups.</p>
--	---

**3.2 Which groups of people do you think will be or potentially could be, impacted by the implementation of this proposal?
(You should consider employees, clients, customers / service users, and any other relevant groups)**

Please tick below as appropriate, outlining any potential impacts on the undernoted equality groups this proposal may have and how you know this.

	Impact			Please explain the potential impacts and how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
<p>Age Older or younger people or a specific age grouping</p>		x	x	<p>Increased use of digital resources may impact adversely on older people.</p> <p>This will be mitigated by consideration of these matters during the service design phase.</p> <p>Conversely, older people can benefit from increased digital access.</p> <p>Older employees may find it more difficult to adjust to a more flexible form of working and increased use of digital resources.</p>
<p>Disability e.g. Effects on people with mental, physical, sensory</p>		x	x	<p>Increased digital access is a potentially positive development.</p>

impairment, learning disability, visible/invisible, progressive or recurring				Disabled employees may find it more difficult to adjust to a more flexible form of working.
Gender Reassignment/ Gender Identity anybody whose gender identity or gender expression is different to the sex assigned to them at birth	X			
Marriage or Civil Partnership people who are married or in a civil partnership	X			
Pregnancy and Maternity (refers to the period after the birth, and is linked to maternity leave in the employment context. In the non-work context, protection against maternity discrimination is for 26 weeks after giving birth),			x	Increased digital access will be a benefit
Race Groups: including colour, nationality, ethnic origins, including minorities (e.g. gypsy travellers, refugees, migrants and asylum seekers)	X			
Religion or Belief: different beliefs, customs (including atheists and	X			

those with no aligned belief)				
Sex women and men (girls and boys)	X			
Sexual Orientation , e.g. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Heterosexual	X			

3.3 Fairer Scotland Duty

This duty places a legal responsibility on Scottish Borders Council (SBC) to actively consider (give due regard) to how we can reduce inequalities of outcome caused by socioeconomic disadvantage when making strategic decisions.

The duty is set at a strategic level - these are the key, high level decisions that SBC will take. This would normally include strategy documents, decisions about setting priorities, allocating resources and commissioning services.

Is the proposal strategic?

Yes / No (*please delete as applicable*)

If No go to Section 4

If yes, please indicate any potential impact on the undernoted groups this proposal may have and how you know this:

	Impact			State here how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
Low and/or No Wealth – enough money to meet basic living costs and pay bills but have no savings to deal with any unexpected spends and		x	x	An increased use of digital resources can reduce the need to visit Council premises.

no provision for the future.				.
Material Deprivation – being unable to access basic goods and services i.e. financial products like life insurance, repair/replace broken electrical goods, warm home, leisure and hobbies		x	x	An increased use of digital resources may impact on this group. This will be taken into account in the service design.
Area Deprivation – where you live (e.g. rural areas), where you work (e.g. accessibility of transport)	X			
Socio-economic Background – social class i.e. parents' education, employment and income		x	x	An increased use of digital resources may impact on this group. This will be taken into account in the service design.
Looked after and accommodated children and young people	x			
Carers paid and unpaid including family members	X			
Homelessness	X			
Addictions and substance use	X			

Those involved within the criminal justice system	x			
---	---	--	--	--

4 Full Integrated Impact Assessment Required

Select No if you have answered “No” to all of Sections 3.1 – 3.3.

Yes / No (please delete as applicable)

If a full impact assessment is not required briefly explain why there are no effects and provide justification for the decision.

Signed by Lead Officer:	Ian Aikman
Designation:	Chief Planning & Housing Officer
Date:	04/02/23
Counter Signature Director	John Curry
Date:	14/02/2023

Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA)

Part 1 Scoping

1 Details of the Proposal

<p>Title of Proposal:</p>	<p>Review of Day Care Services (Learning Disability)</p>
<p>What is it?</p>	<p>A new Policy/Strategy/Practice <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>A revised Policy/Strategy/Practice <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>Description of the proposal:</p> <p>(Set out a clear understanding of the purpose of the proposal being developed or reviewed (what are the aims, objectives and intended outcomes, including the context within which it will operate).</p>	<p>Redesign of Scottish Borders Learning Disability Day Support Services.</p> <p>Aim - Review and re-provide day support for adults with learning disabilities. A change from purely building to a hybrid model of support, with a blend of building bases and community/outreach model of support in 5 localities.</p> <p>To support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •People to develop a sense of purpose through what they love doing and how they contribute to others in their local community. •People develop and maintain friendships •

	<p>The kinds of things people want to do:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outdoor and local opportunities for people to be part of • Opportunities for fitness and wellbeing • Opportunities around enjoying and contributing to others through food- cooking, baking sharing and growing. • Opportunities to take part in the arts, music, local history and leisure in a way that connects people with like-minded people. • Opportunities to try new things, explore existing and new hobbies, and see what is going on <p>Enablers and Support to achieve these outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People have a way of getting around • Families want personalised support • Families and people with learning disabilities get a break from one another • Personalised finance options to increase flexibility of support • A place to be and meet others- which is accessible and can be a place from which to branch out. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The place we come together, and meet is open to others in the local community, rather than a segregated closed space.
--	--

Service Area:	LDS
Department:	Health & Social Care
Lead Officer: (Name and job title)	Simon Burt – General Manager Susan Henderson – Planning & Development Officer
Other Officers/Partners involved: (List names, job titles and organisations)	Jen Holland – Director of Strategic Commissioning and Partnerships; Lisa Sansom – Service Manager SBCares; Julie Glen – Operations Director SB Cares; Elaine Firth – Service Manager, SB Cares; Andrew McInnes- Area manager – Cornerstone; Susan Henderson – Planning and Development Officer, Learning Disability Service; Douglas Ireland – Acting Group Manager Learning Disability Service; Iain Davidson, – Employee Relations Manager; Mark Williamson – HR Business Partner; various family members; Social workers from Learning Disability Service; Sue Bell – SBC Communications team; John Yallop Senior Finance Officer, SBC finance team; Vivienne Kennedy Senior Contracts officer, SBC; Claire Veitch Local Area Coordinator Manager, SB
Date(s) IIA completed:	May 2022 Reviewed 25/1/2023

2 Will there be any cumulative impacts as a result of the relationship between this proposal and other policies?

No <i>(please delete as applicable)</i>
If yes, - please state here:

3 Legislative Requirements

3.1 Relevance to the Equality Duty:	
<p>Do you believe your proposal has any relevance under the Equality Act 2010? Yes</p> <p><i>(If you believe that your proposal may have some relevance – however small please indicate yes. If there is no effect, please enter “No” and go to Section 3.2.)</i></p>	
Equality Duty	Reasoning:
<p>Elimination of discrimination (both direct & indirect), victimisation and harassment.</p> <p><i>(Will the proposal discriminate? Or help eliminate discrimination?)</i></p>	<p>Increasing social interaction and reducing social isolation will assist in eliminating discrimination.</p>
<p>Promotion of equality of opportunity?</p> <p><i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the Council with this)</i></p>	<p>Enabling service users to maximise their opportunity and independence will help with equality of opportunity.</p>
<p>Foster good relations?</p> <p><i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the council's relationships with those who have equality characteristics?)</i></p>	<p>A focus on gaining independence and increasing social interaction will help in fostering good relationships.</p>

**3.2 Which groups of people do you think will be or potentially could be, impacted by the implementation of this proposal?
(You should consider employees, clients, customers / service users, and any other relevant groups)**

Please tick below as appropriate, outlining any potential impacts on the undernoted equality groups this proposal may have and how you know this.

	Impact			Please explain the potential impacts and how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
Age Older or younger people or a specific age grouping		x		Enabling service users to maximise their opportunity and independence will aid groups of all ages.
Disability e.g. Effects on people with mental, physical, sensory impairment, learning disability, visible/invisible, progressive or recurring		x		As above
Gender Reassignment/ Gender Identity anybody whose gender identity or gender expression is different to the sex assigned to them at birth	x			
Marriage or Civil Partnership people who are married or in a civil partnership	x			
Pregnancy and Maternity (refers to the period after the birth, and is linked to maternity leave in the	x			

employment context. In the non-work context, protection against maternity discrimination is for 26 weeks after giving birth),				
Race Groups: including colour, nationality, ethnic origins, including minorities (e.g. gypsy travellers, refugees, migrants and asylum seekers)	x			
Religion or Belief: different beliefs, customs (including atheists and those with no aligned belief)	x			
Sex women and men (girls and boys)	x			
Sexual Orientation , e.g. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Heterosexual	x			

3.3 Fairer Scotland Duty

This duty places a legal responsibility on Scottish Borders Council (SBC) to actively consider (give due regard) to how we can reduce inequalities of outcome caused by socioeconomic disadvantage when making strategic decisions.

The duty is set at a strategic level - these are the key, high level decisions that SBC will take. This would normally include strategy documents, decisions about setting priorities, allocating resources and commissioning services.

Is the proposal strategic?

Yes (*please delete as applicable*)

If No go to Section 4

If yes, please indicate any potential impact on the undernoted groups this proposal may have and how you know this:

	Impact			State here how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
Low and/or No Wealth – enough money to meet basic living costs and pay bills but have no savings to deal with any unexpected spends and no provision for the future.	x			
Material Deprivation – being unable to access basic goods and services i.e. financial products like life insurance, repair/replace broken electrical goods, warm home, leisure and hobbies	x			
Area Deprivation – where you live (e.g. rural areas), where you work (e.g. accessibility of transport)	x			
Socio-economic Background – social class i.e. parents' education, employment and income	x			

Looked after and accommodated children and young people	x			
Carers paid and unpaid including family members		x		Increasing options for service users will provide greater respite opportunities.
Homelessness	x			
Addictions and substance use	x			
Those involved within the criminal justice system	x			

4 Full Integrated Impact Assessment Required

Select No if you have answered “No” to all of Sections 3.1 – 3.3.

Yes (please delete as applicable)

If a full impact assessment is not required briefly explain why there are no effects and provide justification for the decision.

--

Signed by Lead Officer:	Simon Burt
Designation:	General Manager
Date:	25/1/2023
Counter Signature Director	Chris Myers
Date:	09/02/2023

Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA)

Part 1 Scoping

1 Details of the Proposal

<p>Title of Proposal:</p>	<p>Complex Care Unit</p>
<p>What is it?</p>	<p>A new Policy/Strategy/Practice <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>A revised Policy/Strategy/Practice <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>Description of the proposal:</p> <p>(Set out a clear understanding of the purpose of the proposal being developed or reviewed (what are the aims, objectives and intended outcomes, including the context within which it will operate).</p>	<p>Service redesign; repatriation of clients from outside the Scottish Borders area.</p> <p>The proposal is to provide land to a 3rd sector provider in order to allow them to build a Complex Care Unit within the Borders for 8 – 12 adults with a Learning Disability. The provider would build and staff the service and the partnership would purchase placements as required. The service has been identified as a commissioning priority within the Learning Disabilities Commissioning Strategy. The service once available would allow the repatriation of service users outwith the Borders and provide a higher quality of local service provision. This would also likely reduce the need for</p>

	hospital placements and reduce the length of stay for hospital in patients.
Service Area: Department:	LDS
Lead Officer: (Name and job title)	Simon Burt – General Manager
Other Officers/Partners involved: (List names, job titles and organisations)	Keith Taylor – Cornerstone Marion Kimber – LDS Dr Mark Hughes – LDS Kathryn Dixon – SBC Contracts Susan Henderson – Performance and Planning Officer LDS
Date(s) IIA completed:	2/2/2022 Reviewed 23/1/2023

2 Will there be any cumulative impacts as a result of the relationship between this proposal and other policies?

No (please delete as applicable)

If yes, - please state here:

3 Legislative Requirements

3.1 Relevance to the Equality Duty:

Do you believe your proposal has any relevance under the Equality Act 2010? Yes

(If you believe that your proposal may have some relevance – however small please indicate yes. If there is no effect, please enter “No” and go to Section 3.2.)

Equality Duty	Reasoning:
Elimination of discrimination (both direct & indirect), victimisation and harassment. <i>(Will the proposal discriminate? Or help eliminate discrimination?)</i>	Yes – Providing local housing to a protected group
Promotion of equality of opportunity? <i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the Council with this)</i>	Yes – as above
Foster good relations? <i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the council's relationships with those who have equality characteristics?)</i>	Yes – as above. Reduction in out of area placements.

**3.2 Which groups of people do you think will be or potentially could be, impacted by the implementation of this proposal?
(You should consider employees, clients, customers / service users, and any other relevant groups)**

Please tick below as appropriate, outlining any potential impacts on the undernoted equality groups this proposal may have and how you know this.

	Impact			Please explain the potential impacts and how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
Age Older or younger people or a specific age grouping		x		Carers have less distance to travel to see relatives. Carers supported by having a

				suitable placement for their adult offspring.
Disability e.g. Effects on people with mental, physical, sensory impairment, learning disability, visible/invisible, progressive or recurring		x		Local placements. Higher quality. Reduced likelihood of prolonged hospital placements.
Gender Reassignment/ Gender Identity anybody whose gender identity or gender expression is different to the sex assigned to them at birth	x			
Marriage or Civil Partnership people who are married or in a civil partnership	x			
Pregnancy and Maternity (refers to the period after the birth, and is linked to maternity leave in the employment context. In the non-work context, protection against maternity discrimination is for 26 weeks after giving birth),	x			
Race Groups: including colour, nationality, ethnic origins, including minorities (e.g. gypsy travellers, refugees, migrants and asylum seekers)	x			
Religion or Belief: different beliefs, customs (including atheists and	x			

those with no aligned belief)				
Sex women and men (girls and boys)	x			
Sexual Orientation , e.g. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Heterosexual	x			

3.3 Fairer Scotland Duty

This duty places a legal responsibility on Scottish Borders Council (SBC) to actively consider (give due regard) to how we can reduce inequalities of outcome caused by socioeconomic disadvantage when making strategic decisions.

The duty is set at a strategic level - these are the key, high level decisions that SBC will take. This would normally include strategy documents, decisions about setting priorities, allocating resources and commissioning services.

Is the proposal strategic?

Yes (*please delete as applicable*)

If No go to Section 4

If yes, please indicate any potential impact on the undernoted groups this proposal may have and how you know this:

	Impact			State here how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
Low and/or No Wealth – enough money to meet basic living costs and pay bills but have no savings to deal with any unexpected spends and		x		Less travelling to see relatives. Typically people this service is designed for would fit this economic group. They will experience

no provision for the future.				a higher quality of care and support.
Material Deprivation – being unable to access basic goods and services i.e. financial products like life insurance, repair/replace broken electrical goods, warm home, leisure and hobbies		x		As above.
Area Deprivation – where you live (e.g. rural areas), where you work (e.g. accessibility of transport)		x		As above.
Socio-economic Background – social class i.e. parents' education, employment and income		x		As above.
Looked after and accommodated children and young people	x			
Carers paid and unpaid including family members		x		As above. Reduces carer stress as more readily available supported accommodation.
Homelessness	x			
Addictions and substance use	x			
Those involved within the criminal justice system	x			

4 Full Integrated Impact Assessment Required

Select No if you have answered “No” to all of Sections 3.1 – 3.3.

Yes (please delete as applicable)

If a full impact assessment is not required briefly explain why there are no effects and provide justification for the decision.

--

Signed by Lead Officer:	Simon Burt
Designation:	General Manager
Date:	Reviewed 23/1/2023
Counter Signature Director	Chris Myers
Date:	09/02/2023

Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA)

Part 1 Scoping

1 Details of the Proposal

Title of Proposal:	Shared Lives
What is it?	A revised Policy/Strategy/Practice <input type="checkbox"/>
Description of the proposal: (Set out a clear understanding of the purpose of the proposal being developed or reviewed (what are the aims, objectives and intended outcomes, including the context within which it will operate).)	The extension of the contract for 2 years of the Shared Lives Scheme in line with the tender process carried out previously to deliver 15 additional Shared Lives matches in Scottish Borders, predominantly respite care and/or day time support. Years 4 and 5 extends the scope of provision to anyone eligible for this type of support, not just people with learning disabilities.
Service Area: Department:	LDS, Social Work Social Work & Practice
Lead Officer: (Name and job title)	Simon Burt – General Manager
Other Officers/Partners involved: (List names, job titles and organisations)	Susan Henderson – Planning and Development officer

	Ryan Douglas – Contracts John Yallop – Finance SBC Cornerstone Shared Lives team Shared Lives Carers
Date(s) IIA completed:	updated 25-01-23

2 Will there be any cumulative impacts as a result of the relationship between this proposal and other policies?

No <i>(please delete as applicable)</i>
If yes, - please state here:

3 Legislative Requirements

3.1 Relevance to the Equality Duty:	
<p>Do you believe your proposal has any relevance under the Equality Act 2010? yes</p> <p><i>(If you believe that your proposal may have some relevance – however small please indicate yes. If there is no effect, please enter “No” and go to Section 3.2.)</i></p>	
Equality Duty	Reasoning:
Elimination of discrimination (both direct & indirect), victimisation and harassment.	Yes – provides suitable support for adults who are vulnerable due to disability.

<i>(Will the proposal discriminate? Or help eliminate discrimination?)</i>	
Promotion of equality of opportunity? <i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the Council with this)</i>	Yes – Provides appropriate support and enablement to allow greater opportunity
Foster good relations? <i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the council's relationships with those who have equality characteristics?)</i>	Yes – provides a high quality of support and promotes positive relationships with carers and people requiring support learning disability.

3.2 Which groups of people do you think will be or potentially could be, impacted by the implementation of this proposal? (You should consider employees, clients, customers / service users, and any other relevant groups)				
Please tick below as appropriate, outlining any potential impacts on the undernoted equality groups this proposal may have and how you know this.				
	Impact			Please explain the potential impacts and how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
Age Older or younger people or a specific age grouping		x		Supports carers
Disability e.g. Effects on people with mental, physical, sensory impairment, learning disability, visible/invisible, progressive or recurring		x		Provides appropriate support for adults to live within their local communities.
Gender Reassignment/ Gender Identity anybody whose gender	x			

identity or gender expression is different to the sex assigned to them at birth				
Marriage or Civil Partnership people who are married or in a civil partnership	x			
Pregnancy and Maternity (refers to the period after the birth, and is linked to maternity leave in the employment context. In the non-work context, protection against maternity discrimination is for 26 weeks after giving birth),	x			
Race Groups: including colour, nationality, ethnic origins, including minorities (e.g. gypsy travellers, refugees, migrants and asylum seekers)	x			
Religion or Belief: different beliefs, customs (including atheists and those with no aligned belief)	x			
Sex women and men (girls and boys)	x			
Sexual Orientation , e.g. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Heterosexual	x			

3.3 Fairer Scotland Duty

This duty places a legal responsibility on Scottish Borders Council (SBC) to actively consider (give due regard) to how we can reduce inequalities of outcome caused by socioeconomic disadvantage when making strategic decisions.

The duty is set at a strategic level - these are the key, high level decisions that SBC will take. This would normally include strategy documents, decisions about setting priorities, allocating resources and commissioning services.

Is the proposal strategic?

Yes (*please delete as applicable*)

If No go to Section 4

If yes, please indicate any potential impact on the undernoted groups this proposal may have and how you know this:

	Impact			State here how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
Low and/or No Wealth – enough money to meet basic living costs and pay bills but have no savings to deal with any unexpected spends and no provision for the future.		x		Positive impact. People with disabilities and mental health needs are over represented in this group.
Material Deprivation – being unable to access basic goods and services i.e. financial products like life insurance, repair/replace broken electrical goods,		x		As above

warm home, leisure and hobbies				
Area Deprivation – where you live (e.g. rural areas), where you work (e.g. accessibility of transport)		x		As above
Socio-economic Background – social class i.e. parents' education, employment and income		x		As above
Looked after and accommodated children and young people		x		This scheme is currently providing placements for adults currently moving from placements provided by Foster Carers and will provide future opportunities
Carers paid and unpaid including family members		x		Suitable placements will provide replacement care and respite to carers.
Homelessness		x		May present opportunities for people to prevent homelessness.
Addictions and substance use	x			
Those involved within the criminal justice system	x			

4 Full Integrated Impact Assessment Required

Select No if you have answered “No” to all of Sections 3.1 – 3.3.

Yes *(please delete as applicable)*

If a full impact assessment is not required briefly explain why there are no effects and provide justification for the decision.

--

Signed by Lead Officer:	Simon Burt
Designation:	General Manager
Date:	25/1/23
Counter Signature Director	Chris Myers
Date:	09/02/2023

Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA)

Part 1 Scoping

1 Details of the Proposal

<p>Title of Proposal:</p>	<p>Fit for 2024 – Homelessness Case Management and Reporting Database</p>
<p>What is it?</p>	<p>A new Policy/Strategy/Practice <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>A revised Policy/Strategy/Practice <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>Description of the proposal:</p> <p>(Set out a clear understanding of the purpose of the proposal being developed or reviewed (what are the aims, objectives and intended outcomes, including the context within which it will operate).</p>	<p>As part of FF24 and the Financial Plan a Service review to identify FF24 transformational savings of £14k is required. The proposal to achieve this is set out below.</p> <p>The Council is required to manage all homelessness applications and ensure accurate reporting of all homelessness applications to the Scottish Government in accordance with the Scottish Government's HL1, HL2, HL3 and Prevent1 data recording frameworks and to report to the Scottish Housing Regulator in relation to the requirements of the Scottish Social Housing Charter. Currently, these requirements are met by the use of MS Access databases provided and maintained by an external contractor, AVD.</p>

	<p>This proposal is to assess the feasibility of, to develop and to implement development of the Council's existing MOSAIC system to replace to current AVD MS Access databases..</p> <p>The intended outcomes would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a fit for purpose case management and reporting database for all homelessness applications that meets the requirements of the Scottish Government's HL1, HL2, HL3 and Prevent1 data recording frameworks and for the Annual Return on the Charter (ARC) to the Scottish Housing Regulator. • Provide permanent budget savings by ending the contract with AVD (currently valued at approx. £10k pa). • End duplication of recording on multiple Access databases and related Excel spreadsheets. • Mitigate the risk related to the potential for existing lone-trader supplier failure. <p>The savings balance of approx. £4k will be made up by making minimal value reductions across other budget headings.</p>
<p>Service Area:</p> <p>Department:</p>	<p>Safer Communities (Homelessness)</p> <p>Social Work and Practice</p>
<p>Lead Officer: (Name and job title)</p>	<p>Graham Jones, Group Manager - Safer Communities & Homelessness</p>

<p>Other Officers/Partners involved: (List names, job titles and organisations)</p>	<p>David Kemp, Homelessness Manager Fit for 2024 programme support IT</p>
<p>Date(s) IIA completed:</p>	<p>07/02/23</p>

2 Will there be any cumulative impacts as a result of the relationship between this proposal and other policies?

Yes (please delete as applicable)

If yes, - please state here:

The expectation is that this proposal may contribute to enhanced service delivery, and to safer and more effective information exchange with other relevant Social Work teams.

3 Legislative Requirements

3.1 Relevance to the Equality Duty:

Do you believe your proposal has any relevance under the Equality Act 2010?

(If you believe that your proposal may have some relevance – however small please indicate yes. If there is no effect, please enter “No” and go to Section 3.2.)

No.

Equality Duty	Reasoning:
Elimination of discrimination (both direct & indirect), victimisation and harassment. <i>(Will the proposal discriminate? Or help eliminate discrimination?)</i>	
Promotion of equality of opportunity? <i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the Council with this)</i>	
Foster good relations? <i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the council's relationships with those who have equality characteristics?)</i>	

<p>3.2 Which groups of people do you think will be or potentially could be, impacted by the implementation of this proposal? (You should consider employees, clients, customers / service users, and any other relevant groups)</p>				
<p>Please tick below as appropriate, outlining any potential impacts on the undernoted equality groups this proposal may have and how you know this.</p>				
	Impact			Please explain the potential impacts and how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
Age Older or younger people or a specific age grouping	x			
Disability e.g. Effects on people with mental, physical, sensory impairment, learning disability,	x			

visible/invisible, progressive or recurring				
Gender Reassignment/ Gender Identity anybody whose gender identity or gender expression is different to the sex assigned to them at birth	x			
Marriage or Civil Partnership people who are married or in a civil partnership	x			
Pregnancy and Maternity (refers to the period after the birth, and is linked to maternity leave in the employment context. In the non-work context, protection against maternity discrimination is for 26 weeks after giving birth),	x			
Race Groups: including colour, nationality, ethnic origins, including minorities (e.g. gypsy travellers, refugees, migrants and asylum seekers)	x			
Religion or Belief: different beliefs, customs (including atheists and those with no aligned belief)	x			
Sex women and men (girls and boys)	x			

Sexual Orientation , e.g. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Heterosexual	x			
<p>3.3 Fairer Scotland Duty</p> <p>This duty places a legal responsibility on Scottish Borders Council (SBC) to actively consider (give due regard) to how we can reduce inequalities of outcome caused by socioeconomic disadvantage when making <u>strategic</u> decisions.</p> <p>The duty is set at a strategic level - these are the key, high level decisions that SBC will take. This would normally include strategy documents, decisions about setting priorities, allocating resources and commissioning services.</p>				
<p>Is the proposal strategic?</p> <p>No (<i>please delete as applicable</i>)</p> <p>If No go to Section 4</p>				
<p>If yes, please indicate any potential impact on the undernoted groups this proposal may have and how you know this:</p>				
	Impact			State here how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
Low and/or No Wealth – enough money to meet basic living costs and pay bills but have no savings to deal with any unexpected spends and no provision for the future.				
Material Deprivation – being unable to access basic goods and				

services i.e. financial products like life insurance, repair/replace broken electrical goods, warm home, leisure and hobbies				
Area Deprivation – where you live (e.g. rural areas), where you work (e.g. accessibility of transport)				
Socio-economic Background – social class i.e. parents' education, employment and income				
Looked after and accommodated children and young people				
Carers paid and unpaid including family members				
Homelessness				
Addictions and substance use				
Those involved within the criminal justice system				

4 Full Integrated Impact Assessment Required

Select No if you have answered “No” to all of Sections 3.1 – 3.3.

No (please delete as applicable)

If a full impact assessment is not required briefly explain why there are no effects and provide justification for the decision.

The impact of the proposal would be to change and improve internal data management processes. The proposal would not impact on service delivery outcomes.

Signed by Lead Officer:	Graham Jones
Designation:	Group Manager - Safer Communities & Homelessness
Date:	7/2/23
Counter Signature Director	Stuart Easingwood
Date:	09/02/2023

Assessment (IIA)

Part 1 Scoping

1 Details of the Proposal

Title of Proposal:	Additional Fees & Charges – Health & Social Care
What is it?	A new Policy/Strategy/Practice <input type="checkbox"/> A revised Policy/Strategy/Practice x
Description of the proposal: (Set out a clear understanding of the purpose of the proposal being developed or reviewed (what are the aims, objectives and intended outcomes, including the context within which it will operate).	Increase the charges of Meals at Home from £3.50 per meal to £3.68 per meal (excl VAT), an increase of 5.14%.
Service Area: Department:	Social Work & Practice
Lead Officer: (Name and job title)	Chris Myers Chief Officer Health & Social Care
Other Officers/Partners involved: (List names, job titles and organisations)	John Yallop Finance Business Partner Hayley Megson HR Business Partner
	10/2/2023

Date(s) IIA completed:

2 Will there be any cumulative impacts as a result of the relationship between this proposal and other policies?

No (please delete as applicable)

If yes, - please state here:

3 Legislative Requirements

3.1 Relevance to the Equality Duty:

Do you believe your proposal has any relevance under the Equality Act 2010?

(If you believe that your proposal may have some relevance – however small please indicate yes. If there is no effect, please enter “No” and go to Section 3.2.)

Yes

Equality Duty

Reasoning:

Elimination of discrimination (both direct & indirect), victimisation and harassment.
(Will the proposal discriminate? Or help eliminate discrimination?)

The change will be the same for all so does not discriminate.

Promotion of equality of opportunity?
(Will your proposal help or hinder the Council with this)

The change will be the same for all but will affect some groups more.

Foster good relations?

N/A

(Will your proposal help or hinder the council's relationships with those who have equality characteristics?)

**3.2 Which groups of people do you think will be or potentially could be, impacted by the implementation of this proposal?
(You should consider employees, clients, customers / service users, and any other relevant groups)**

Please tick below as appropriate, outlining any potential impacts on the undernoted equality groups this proposal may have and how you know this.

	Impact			Please explain the potential impacts and how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
Age Older or younger people or a specific age grouping			x	<p>This will increase the cost by £65.70 per year, assuming meals are ordered over 7 days.</p> <p>This will have a larger effect on elderly people who are more likely to use this service.</p> <p>Elderly people may also have less disposable income.</p> <p>The increase is a small one and below the rate of inflation.</p>
Disability e.g. Effects on people with mental, physical, sensory impairment, learning disability, visible/invisible, progressive or recurring			x	<p>This will increase the cost by £65.70 per year, assuming meals are ordered over 7 days.</p> <p>This will have a larger effect on disabled people who are more</p>

				likely to use this service. The increase is a small one and below the rate of inflation.
Gender Reassignment/ Gender Identity anybody whose gender identity or gender expression is different to the sex assigned to them at birth	x			
Marriage or Civil Partnership people who are married or in a civil partnership	x			
Pregnancy and Maternity (refers to the period after the birth, and is linked to maternity leave in the employment context. In the non-work context, protection against maternity discrimination is for 26 weeks after giving birth),	x			
Race Groups: including colour, nationality, ethnic origins, including minorities (e.g. gypsy travellers, refugees, migrants and asylum seekers)	x			
Religion or Belief: different beliefs, customs (including atheists and those with no aligned belief)	x			

Sex women and men (girls and boys)	x			
Sexual Orientation , e.g. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Heterosexual	x			
<p>3.3 Fairer Scotland Duty</p> <p>This duty places a legal responsibility on Scottish Borders Council (SBC) to actively consider (give due regard) to how we can reduce inequalities of outcome caused by socioeconomic disadvantage when making <u>strategic</u> decisions.</p> <p>The duty is set at a strategic level - these are the key, high level decisions that SBC will take. This would normally include strategy documents, decisions about setting priorities, allocating resources and commissioning services.</p>				
<p>Is the proposal strategic?</p> <p>Yes (<i>please delete as applicable</i>)</p> <p>If No go to Section 4</p>				
<p>If yes, please indicate any potential impact on the undernoted groups this proposal may have and how you know this:</p>				
	Impact			State here how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
<p>Low and/or No Wealth – enough money to meet basic living costs and pay bills but have no savings to deal with any unexpected spends and no provision for the future.</p>			x	<p>The increase will affect those with low/ no wealth more than others.</p> <p>However, the increase is a small one and below the rate of inflation.</p>

Material Deprivation – being unable to access basic goods and services i.e. financial products like life insurance, repair/replace broken electrical goods, warm home, leisure and hobbies			x	The increase will affect those who are materially deprived more than others. Against that the increase is a small one and below the rate of inflation.
Area Deprivation – where you live (e.g. rural areas), where you work (e.g. accessibility of transport)	x			
Socio-economic Background – social class i.e. parents' education, employment and income	x			
Looked after and accommodated children and young people	x			
Carers paid and unpaid including family members	x			
Homelessness	x			
Addictions and substance use	x			
Those involved within the criminal justice system	x			

4 Full Integrated Impact Assessment Required

Select No if you have answered “No” to all of Sections 3.1 – 3.3.

Yes *(please delete as applicable)*

If a full impact assessment is not required briefly explain why there are no effects and provide justification for the decision.

--

Signed by Lead Officer:	Chris Myers
Designation:	Chief Officer Health & Social Care
Date:	13/02/2023
Counter Signature Director	Chris Myers
Date:	13/02/2023

Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA)

Part 1 Scoping

1 Details of the Proposal

<p>Title of Proposal:</p>	<p>Increased Fees & Charges – School Lets</p>
<p>What is it?</p>	<p>A new Policy/Strategy/Practice <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>A revised Policy/Strategy/Practice X</p>
<p>Description of the proposal:</p> <p>(Set out a clear understanding of the purpose of the proposal being developed or reviewed (what are the aims, objectives and intended outcomes, including the context within which it will operate).</p>	<p>Increase on School Lets of between 5.08% and 5.74%.</p> <p>(increase of between £0.35 and £1.55 per hour)</p>
<p>Service Area:</p> <p>Department:</p>	<p>Education & Lifelong Learning</p>
<p>Lead Officer:</p> <p>(Name and job title)</p>	<p>Lesley Munro</p> <p>Director – Education & Lifelong Learning</p>
<p>Other Officers/Partners involved:</p> <p>(List names, job titles and organisations)</p>	

Date(s) IIA completed:	10/02/2023

2 Will there be any cumulative impacts as a result of the relationship between this proposal and other policies?

Yes
If yes, - please state here:
Department practices and procedures

3 Legislative Requirements

3.1 Relevance to the Equality Duty:	
<p>Do you believe your proposal has any relevance under the Equality Act 2010?</p> <p><i>(If you believe that your proposal may have some relevance – however small please indicate yes. If there is no effect, please enter “No” and go to Section 3.2.)</i></p> <p>Yes</p>	
Equality Duty	Reasoning:
Elimination of discrimination (both direct & indirect), victimisation and harassment. <i>(Will the proposal discriminate? Or help eliminate discrimination?)</i>	An increase in fees could adversely impact on some groups as they may not be able to afford the fees.

<p>Promotion of equality of opportunity?</p> <p><i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the Council with this)</i></p>	It could hinder the Council as some groups may no longer be able to pay the lets fees.
<p>Foster good relations?</p> <p><i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the council s relationships with those who have equality characteristics?)</i></p>	It could hinder the Council's relationship to a certain degree with groups who can no longer afford to pay the fees.

**3.2 Which groups of people do you think will be or potentially could be, impacted by the implementation of this proposal?
(You should consider employees, clients, customers / service users, and any other relevant groups)**

Please tick below as appropriate, outlining any potential impacts on the undernoted equality groups this proposal may have and how you know this.

	Impact			Please explain the potential impacts and how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
Age Older or younger people or a specific age grouping			X	Some groups may struggle with the added cost However, the costs are below the rate of inflation.
Disability e.g. Effects on people with mental, physical, sensory impairment, learning disability, visible/invisible, progressive or recurring			X	Some groups may struggle with the added cost. However, the costs are below the rate of inflation.
Gender Reassignment/ Gender Identity anybody whose gender identity or gender expression is different to	X			

the sex assigned to them at birth				
Marriage or Civil Partnership people who are married or in a civil partnership	X			
Pregnancy and Maternity (refers to the period after the birth, and is linked to maternity leave in the employment context. In the non-work context, protection against maternity discrimination is for 26 weeks after giving birth),	X			
Race Groups: including colour, nationality, ethnic origins, including minorities (e.g. gypsy travellers, refugees, migrants and asylum seekers)	X			
Religion or Belief: different beliefs, customs (including atheists and those with no aligned belief)	X			
Sex women and men (girls and boys)	X			
Sexual Orientation , e.g. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Heterosexual	X			
<p>3.3 Fairer Scotland Duty</p> <p>This duty places a legal responsibility on Scottish Borders Council (SBC) to actively consider (give due regard) to how we can reduce inequalities of outcome caused by socioeconomic disadvantage when making <u>strategic</u> decisions.</p>				

The duty is set at a strategic level - these are the key, high level decisions that SBC will take. This would normally include strategy documents, decisions about setting priorities, allocating resources and commissioning services.

Is the proposal strategic?

Yes

If No go to Section 4

If yes, please indicate any potential impact on the undernoted groups this proposal may have and how you know this:

	Impact			State here how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
Low and/or No Wealth – enough money to meet basic living costs and pay bills but have no savings to deal with any unexpected spends and no provision for the future.			X	The increase could affect affordability for some groups However, the costs are below the rate of inflation.
Material Deprivation – being unable to access basic goods and services i.e. financial products like life insurance, repair/replace broken electrical goods, warm home, leisure and hobbies			X	As above
Area Deprivation – where you live (e.g. rural areas), where you work			X	As above

(e.g. accessibility of transport)				
Socio-economic Background – social class i.e. parents' education, employment and income			X	As above
Looked after and accommodated children and young people			X	As above
Carers paid and unpaid including family members			X	As above
Homelessness	X			
Addictions and substance use	X			
Those involved within the criminal justice system	X			

4 Full Integrated Impact Assessment Required

Select No if you have answered “No” to all of Sections 3.1 – 3.3.

Yes

If a full impact assessment is not required briefly explain why there are no effects and provide justification for the decision.

--

Signed by Lead Officer:	Lesley Munro,
Designation:	Director – Education & Lifelong Learning
Date:	10 February 2023
Counter Signature Director	Lesley Munro, Director – Education & Lifelong Learning
Date:	10 February 2023

Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA)

Part 1 Scoping

1 Details of the Proposal

<p>Title of Proposal:</p>	<p>Increased fees for non-funded childcare</p>
<p>What is it?</p>	<p>A new Policy/Strategy/Practice <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>A revised Policy/Strategy/Practice X</p>
<p>Description of the proposal:</p> <p>(Set out a clear understanding of the purpose of the proposal being developed or reviewed (what are the aims, objectives and intended outcomes, including the context within which it will operate)</p> <p>Increase the fees for non-funded childcare in the 9 Scottish Borders Childcare hubs and the Selkirk Out of School Club from 17 April 2023</p>	<p>The current hourly rate of £4.00 was set in 2022/23 and was the first increase in 14 years. It is still significantly less than the Council is currently paying partners to provide Early Learning Childcare (ELC) of £6.55 for 2 year olds and £6.21 for 3 and 4 year olds. The figures that we have from 2021/22 show that the rates payable for childcare in Scottish Borders range from £4.00 for a Childminder to £6.95 in a Private Nursery for 2 year olds and £4.00 for a Childminder to £6.40 in a Private Nursery for 3 and 4 year olds. The rate significantly undercuts our partner providers in locations where we have this provision and is detrimental to their sustainability. Based on expected hours this would be an overall increase of £20,550 in 2023/24</p>

Service Area:	Education & Lifelong Learning
Department:	Early Years
Lead Officer: (Name and job title)	Margot Black Early Years Strategy Officer
Other Officers/Partners involved: (List names, job titles and organisations)	
Date(s) IIA completed:	10/02/2023

2 Will there be any cumulative impacts as a result of the relationship between this proposal and other policies?

No
If yes, - please state here:

3 Legislative Requirements

3.1 Relevance to the Equality Duty:
<p>Do you believe your proposal has any relevance under the Equality Act 2010?</p> <p><i>(If you believe that your proposal may have some relevance – however small please indicate yes. If there is no effect, please enter “No” and go to Section 3.2.)</i></p> <p>Yes</p>

Equality Duty	Reasoning:
Elimination of discrimination (both direct & indirect), victimisation and harassment. <i>(Will the proposal discriminate? Or help eliminate discrimination?)</i>	This proposal will reduce discrimination based on where families live as that determines whether or not they can access a Council provision, thereby benefitting from lower rates than the commercial rate charged by other sectors.
Promotion of equality of opportunity? <i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the Council with this)</i>	This proposal will reduce the inequality of provision for wrap around care as only parents/carers who can access a place at a Council provision benefit. Availability of sustainable partner providers give choice to parent/carers.
Foster good relations? <i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the council's relationships with those who have equality characteristics?)</i>	This proposal will improve the relationship between the Council and its childcare partner providers as it will not have such an effect on their sustainability. This proposal will hinder the relationship between the Council and the parents/carers who use their nurseries as the cost to them will increase.

**3.2 Which groups of people do you think will be or potentially could be, impacted by the implementation of this proposal?
(You should consider employees, clients, customers / service users, and any other relevant groups)**

Please tick below as appropriate, outlining any potential impacts on the undernoted equality groups this proposal may have and how you know this.

	Impact			Please explain the potential impacts and how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
Age Older or younger people or a specific age grouping			X	Families of children paying the current rate will have to pay more for wrap around care and out of school care
Disability e.g. Effects on people with mental, physical, sensory	X			

impairment, learning disability, visible/invisible, progressive or recurring				
Gender Reassignment/ Gender Identity anybody whose gender identity or gender expression is different to the sex assigned to them at birth	X			
Marriage or Civil Partnership people who are married or in a civil partnership	X			
Pregnancy and Maternity (refers to the period after the birth, and is linked to maternity leave in the employment context. In the non-work context, protection against maternity discrimination is for 26 weeks after giving birth),	X			
Race Groups: including colour, nationality, ethnic origins, including minorities (e.g. gypsy travellers, refugees, migrants and asylum seekers)	X			
Religion or Belief: different beliefs, customs (including atheists and those with no aligned belief)	X			
Sex women and men (girls and boys)	X			

Sexual Orientation , e.g. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Heterosexual	X			
<p>3.3 Fairer Scotland Duty</p> <p>This duty places a legal responsibility on Scottish Borders Council (SBC) to actively consider (give due regard) to how we can reduce inequalities of outcome caused by socioeconomic disadvantage when making <u>strategic</u> decisions.</p> <p>The duty is set at a strategic level - these are the key, high level decisions that SBC will take. This would normally include strategy documents, decisions about setting priorities, allocating resources and commissioning services.</p>				
<p>Is the proposal strategic?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>If No go to Section 4</p>				
<p>If yes, please indicate any potential impact on the undernoted groups this proposal may have and how you know this:</p>				
	Impact			State here how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
Low and/or No Wealth – enough money to meet basic living costs and pay bills but have no savings to deal with any unexpected spends and no provision for the future.			X	Families of children paying the current rate will have to pay more for wrap around care and out of school care
Material Deprivation – being unable to access basic goods and			X	Families of children paying the current rate will have to pay

services i.e. financial products like life insurance, repair/replace broken electrical goods, warm home, leisure and hobbies				more for wrap around care and out of school care
Area Deprivation – where you live (e.g. rural areas), where you work (e.g. accessibility of transport)	X			
Socio-economic Background – social class i.e. parents’ education, employment and income	X			
Looked after and accommodated children and young people	X			
Carers paid and unpaid including family members	X			
Homelessness	X			
Addictions and substance use	X			
Those involved within the criminal justice system	X			

4 Full Integrated Impact Assessment Required

Select No if you have answered “No” to all of Sections 3.1 – 3.3.

Yes

If a full impact assessment is not required briefly explain why there are no effects and provide justification for the decision.

--

Signed by Lead Officer:	Margot Black
Designation:	Early Years Strategy Officer
Date:	10/02/2023
Counter Signature Director	Lesley Munro, Director – Education & Lifelong Learning
Date:	10 February 2023

Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA)

Part 1 Scoping

1 Details of the Proposal

<p>Title of Proposal:</p>	<p>Central Schools</p>
<p>What is it?</p>	<p>A new Policy/Strategy/Practice <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>A revised Policy/Strategy/Practice X</p>
<p>Description of the proposal:</p> <p>(Set out a clear understanding of the purpose of the proposal being developed or reviewed (what are the aims, objectives and intended outcomes, including the context within which it will operate).</p> <p>Central Schools</p>	<p>Review of departmental management, quality assurance and non-DSM structure and resources will continue in 2023/24. Intention is to create a focused and fit-for-purpose structure providing strategic leadership for the core objectives as set out in the Children & Young People Improvement Plan, identifying service delivery models that support outcomes for Children & Young People at a locality model. This may result in a change in duties and grade for a number of staff and a reduction of up to 2 FTE. The total number of employees in this area is 30.4 FTE</p>
<p>Service Area:</p> <p>Department:</p>	<p>Education & Lifelong Learning</p>

Lead Officer: (Name and job title)	Lesley Munro Director – Education & Lifelong Learning
Other Officers/Partners involved: (List names, job titles and organisations)	
Date(s) IIA completed:	10 February 2023

2 Will there be any cumulative impacts as a result of the relationship between this proposal and other policies?

Yes
If yes, - please state here: Departmental practices and procedures

3 Legislative Requirements

3.1 Relevance to the Equality Duty:
Do you believe your proposal has any relevance under the Equality Act 2010? <i>(If you believe that your proposal may have some relevance – however small please indicate yes. If there is no effect, please enter “No” and go to Section 3.2.)</i> Yes

Equality Duty	Reasoning:
Elimination of discrimination (both direct & indirect), victimisation and harassment. <i>(Will the proposal discriminate? Or help eliminate discrimination?)</i>	Improved outcomes will help eliminate discrimination
Promotion of equality of opportunity? <i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the Council with this)</i>	Improved outcomes will promote equality of opportunity
Foster good relations? <i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the council's relationships with those who have equality characteristics?)</i>	N/A

**3.2 Which groups of people do you think will be or potentially could be, impacted by the implementation of this proposal?
(You should consider employees, clients, customers / service users, and any other relevant groups)**

Please tick below as appropriate, outlining any potential impacts on the undernoted equality groups this proposal may have and how you know this.

	Impact			Please explain the potential impacts and how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
Age Older or younger people or a specific age grouping		X		Improved outcomes will benefit school age pupils
Disability e.g. Effects on people with mental, physical, sensory impairment, learning disability,		X		Improved outcomes will benefit pupils with a disability

visible/invisible, progressive or recurring				
Gender Reassignment/ Gender Identity anybody whose gender identity or gender expression is different to the sex assigned to them at birth	X			
Marriage or Civil Partnership people who are married or in a civil partnership	X			
Pregnancy and Maternity (refers to the period after the birth, and is linked to maternity leave in the employment context. In the non-work context, protection against maternity discrimination is for 26 weeks after giving birth),	X			
Race Groups: including colour, nationality, ethnic origins, including minorities (e.g. gypsy travellers, refugees, migrants and asylum seekers)		X		Improved outcomes will benefit minority racial groups
Religion or Belief: different beliefs, customs (including atheists and those with no aligned belief)	X			
Sex women and men (girls and boys)	X			

Sexual Orientation, e.g. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Heterosexual	X			
<p>3.3 Fairer Scotland Duty</p> <p>This duty places a legal responsibility on Scottish Borders Council (SBC) to actively consider (give due regard) to how we can reduce inequalities of outcome caused by socioeconomic disadvantage when making <u>strategic</u> decisions.</p> <p>The duty is set at a strategic level - these are the key, high level decisions that SBC will take. This would normally include strategy documents, decisions about setting priorities, allocating resources and commissioning services.</p>				
<p>Is the proposal strategic?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>If No go to Section 4</p>				
<p>If yes, please indicate any potential impact on the undernoted groups this proposal may have and how you know this:</p>				
	Impact			State here how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
Low and/or No Wealth – enough money to meet basic living costs and pay bills but have no savings to deal with any unexpected spends and no provision for the future.	X			
Material Deprivation – being unable to access basic goods and	X			

services i.e. financial products like life insurance, repair/replace broken electrical goods, warm home, leisure and hobbies				
Area Deprivation – where you live (e.g. rural areas), where you work (e.g. accessibility of transport)		X		The focus on a locality approach will benefit deprived areas. More responsive to local needs.
Socio-economic Background – social class i.e. parents' education, employment and income		X		Improved outcomes will benefit this group
Looked after and accommodated children and young people		X		Improved outcomes will benefit Looked After and Accommodated Children
Carers paid and unpaid including family members	X			
Homelessness	X			
Addictions and substance use	X			
Those involved within the criminal justice system	X			

4 Full Integrated Impact Assessment Required

Select No if you have answered "No" to all of Sections 3.1 – 3.3.

Yes

If a full impact assessment is not required briefly explain why there are no effects and provide justification for the decision.

--

Signed by Lead Officer:	Lesley Munro
Designation:	Director – Education & Lifelong Learning
Date:	10 February 23
Counter Signature Director	Lesley Munro, Director – Education & Lifelong Learning
Date:	10 February 23

Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA)

Part 1 Scoping

1 Details of the Proposal

Title of Proposal:	Amendment to Fees and Charges - Registrars
What is it?	A new Policy/Strategy/Practice <input type="checkbox"/> A revised Policy/Strategy/Practice x
Description of the proposal: (Set out a clear understanding of the purpose of the proposal being developed or reviewed (what are the aims, objectives and intended outcomes, including the context within which it will operate).)	Additional income from higher Fees & Charges which are related to planned NRS increases. Possible reductions in demand due to higher prices have been factored into assumptions.
Service Area: Department:	Resilient Communities – Customer Advice and Support Service
Lead Officer: (Name and job title)	Leslie Grant
Other Officers/Partners involved: (List names, job titles and organisations)	Tracey Beattie, Deliver Manager – Customer Service Hayley Megson, HR Business Partner

Date(s) IIA completed:	03/02/2022 Reviewed 8/2/2023
------------------------	---------------------------------

2 Will there be any cumulative impacts as a result of the relationship between this proposal and other policies?

No <i>(please delete as applicable)</i>
If yes, - please state here:

3 Legislative Requirements

3.1 Relevance to the Equality Duty:	
<p>Do you believe your proposal has any relevance under the Equality Act 2010?</p> <p><i>(If you believe that your proposal may have some relevance – however small please indicate yes. If there is no effect, please enter “No” and go to Section 3.2.) yes</i></p>	
Equality Duty	Reasoning:
<p>Elimination of discrimination (both direct & indirect), victimisation and harassment.</p> <p><i>(Will the proposal discriminate? Or help eliminate discrimination?)</i></p>	<p>Increases are across the board and include mandatory increases. None of the Service affected are mandatory or if so the increase is limited to increase over which SBC has no discretion. SBC Financial Support and Inclusion staff are available to assist in cases of difficulty.</p> <p>Most increases are below the rate of inflation</p>
Promotion of equality of opportunity?	Increases are across the board and include mandatory increases. None of the

<p><i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the Council with this)</i></p>	<p>Service affected are mandatory or if so the increase is limited to increase over which SBC has no discretion. SBC Financial Support and Inclusion staff are available to assist in cases of difficulty.</p> <p>Most increases are below the rate of inflation</p>
<p>Foster good relations?</p> <p><i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the council's relationships with those who have equality characteristics?)</i></p>	<p>Increases are across the board and include mandatory increases. None of the Service affected are mandatory or if so the increase is limited to increase over which SBC has no discretion. SBC Financial Support and Inclusion staff are available to assist in cases of difficulty.</p> <p>Most increases are below the rate of inflation</p>

<p>3.2 Which groups of people do you think will be or potentially could be, impacted by the implementation of this proposal? (You should consider employees, clients, customers / service users, and any other relevant groups)</p>				
<p>Please tick below as appropriate, outlining any potential impacts on the undernoted equality groups this proposal may have and how you know this.</p>				
	Impact			Please explain the potential impacts and how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
<p>Age Older or younger people or a specific age grouping</p>	x			
<p>Disability e.g. Effects on people with mental, physical, sensory impairment, learning disability,</p>	x			

visible/invisible, progressive or recurring				
Gender Reassignment/ Gender Identity anybody whose gender identity or gender expression is different to the sex assigned to them at birth	x			
Marriage or Civil Partnership people who are married or in a civil partnership			x	Civil and Marriage fee increases may affect affordability however this impacts all affected groups and the services are not compulsory. Most fee increases are below the rate of inflation.
Pregnancy and Maternity (refers to the period after the birth, and is linked to maternity leave in the employment context. In the non-work context, protection against maternity discrimination is for 26 weeks after giving birth),	x			
Race Groups: including colour, nationality, ethnic origins, including minorities (e.g. gypsy travellers, refugees, migrants and asylum seekers)	x			
Religion or Belief: different beliefs, customs (including atheists and those with no aligned belief)			x	Civil and Marriage fee increases may affect affordability however this impacts all affected groups and the services are not compulsory. Most fee increases are below the rate of inflation. Percentage fee increase to religious ceremonies is

				higher than others, however this increase is set by NRS.
Sex women and men (girls and boys)	x			
Sexual Orientation , e.g. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Heterosexual			x	Civil and Marriage fee increases may affect affordability however this impacts all affected groups and the services are not compulsory. Most fee increases are below the rate of inflation.
<p>3.3 Fairer Scotland Duty</p> <p>This duty places a legal responsibility on Scottish Borders Council (SBC) to actively consider (give due regard) to how we can reduce inequalities of outcome caused by socioeconomic disadvantage when making <u>strategic</u> decisions.</p> <p>The duty is set at a strategic level - these are the key, high level decisions that SBC will take. This would normally include strategy documents, decisions about setting priorities, allocating resources and commissioning services.</p>				
<p>Is the proposal strategic?</p> <p>Yes (<i>please delete as applicable</i>)</p> <p>If No go to Section 4</p>				
<p>If yes, please indicate any potential impact on the undernoted groups this proposal may have and how you know this:</p>				
	Impact			State here how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
Low and/or No Wealth – enough money to meet			x	Civil and Marriage fee increases may affect affordability however this impacts all affected groups

basic living costs and pay bills but have no savings to deal with any unexpected spends and no provision for the future.				and the services are not compulsory. Most fee increases are below the rate of inflation.
Material Deprivation – being unable to access basic goods and services i.e. financial products like life insurance, repair/replace broken electrical goods, warm home, leisure and hobbies			x	Civil and Marriage fee increases may affect affordability however this impacts all affected groups and the services are not compulsory. Most fee increases are below the rate of inflation.
Area Deprivation – where you live (e.g. rural areas), where you work (e.g. accessibility of transport)	x			
Socio-economic Background – social class i.e. parents' education, employment and income			x	Civil and Marriage fee increases may affect affordability however this impacts all affected groups and the services are not compulsory. Most fee increases are below the rate of inflation.
Looked after and accommodated children and young people	x			
Carers paid and unpaid including family members	x			
Homelessness	x			
Addictions and substance use	x			
Those involved within the criminal justice system	x			

4 Full Integrated Impact Assessment Required

Select No if you have answered “No” to all of Sections 3.1 – 3.3.

No (please delete as applicable)

If a full impact assessment is not required briefly explain why there are no effects and provide justification for the decision.

The effects occurs if the choice is made to use the service which is not mandatory. The service can be booked significantly in advance. The impact can either be avoided or mitigated over a prolonged period due to planning.

Signed by Lead Officer:	Leslie Grant
Designation:	Customer Advice & Support Manager
Date:	3rd February 2022 Reviewed 8th February 2023
Counter Signature Director	Jenni Craig
Date:	13/02/2023

Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA)

Part 1 Scoping

1 Details of the Proposal

<p>Title of Proposal:</p>	<p>A redesigned operating model for the Business Support functions through the rollout of digital services across the Council.</p>
<p>What is it?</p>	<p>A new Policy/Strategy/Practice <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>A revised Policy/Strategy/Practice <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>Description of the proposal:</p> <p>(Set out a clear understanding of the purpose of the proposal being developed or reviewed (what are the aims, objectives and intended outcomes, including the context within which it will operate).</p>	<p>Continue to review opportunities to combine/consolidate resources. This will involve a standardised, streamlined process, process re-engineering across the organisation, as well as a dependency on the property rationalisation programme.</p> <p>Estimated FTE reduction of 9.5 FTE from an establishment of 203.28 FTE.</p> <p>The reviews will ensure that processes are streamlined, automated and re-engineered to maximise existing and new digital solutions to ensure efficiency is maximised whilst being flexible to meet customer expectations.</p>

	Those customers who, for whatever reason, are unable to access/use digital services will also be supported to access required services. Adhere to the overall Council and Service principles of utilising technology and driving self service to increase efficiency and quality of service delivery.
Service Area:	Resilient Communities
Department:	Business Support
Lead Officer: (Name and job title)	Gillian Young Function Manager
Other Officers/Partners involved: (List names, job titles and organisations)	Transformation programme support/HR/Finance/CASS/Education/Systems Admin
Date(s) IIA completed:	01/02/2023

2 Will there be any cumulative impacts as a result of the relationship between this proposal and other policies?

<p>Yes <i>(please delete as applicable)</i></p>
<p>If yes, - please state here:</p> <p>Departmental practices and procedures.</p>

3 Legislative Requirements

<p>3.1 Relevance to the Equality Duty:</p>	
<p>Do you believe your proposal has any relevance under the Equality Act 2010?</p> <p><i>(If you believe that your proposal may have some relevance – however small please indicate yes. If there is no effect, please enter “No” and go to Section 3.2.)</i></p> <p>Yes</p>	
<p>Equality Duty</p>	<p>Reasoning:</p>
<p>Elimination of discrimination (both direct & indirect), victimisation and harassment. <i>(Will the proposal discriminate? Or help eliminate discrimination?)</i></p>	<p>Process improvement, focussing on customer intelligence and needs and enhanced community engagement will help eliminate discrimination.</p>
<p>Promotion of equality of opportunity? <i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the Council with this)</i></p>	<p>Process improvement, focussing on customer intelligence and needs and enhanced community engagement will promote opportunity for all protected groups.</p>
<p>Foster good relations?</p>	<p>The focus on community engagement, participation and empowerment will help</p>

(Will your proposal help or hinder the council's relationships with those who have equality characteristics?)	foster good relations between different groups.
---	---

**3.2 Which groups of people do you think will be or potentially could be, impacted by the implementation of this proposal?
(You should consider employees, clients, customers / service users, and any other relevant groups)**

Please tick below as appropriate, outlining any potential impacts on the undernoted equality groups this proposal may have and how you know this.

	Impact			Please explain the potential impacts and how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
Age Older or younger people or a specific age grouping		x	x	<p>Increased use of digital resources and a reduced property estate may impact adversely on older people.</p> <p>This will be mitigated by consideration of these matters during the service design phase.</p> <p>Conversely, older people can benefit from increased digital access.</p> <p>A single SBC view will mean services are located in the same place, meaning less journeys are required to access services.</p> <p>Older employees may find it more difficult to adjust to a more flexible form of working and increased use of digital resources.</p>

<p>Disability e.g. Effects on people with mental, physical, sensory impairment, learning disability, visible/invisible, progressive or recurring</p>		x	x	<p>A reduced property estate may impact adversely on people with a disability.</p> <p>This will be considered in the design phase.</p> <p>Increased digital access is a potentially positive development.</p> <p>A single SBC view will mean services are located in the same place, meaning less journeys are required to access services.</p> <p>Disabled employees may find it more difficult to adjust to a more flexible form of working.</p>
<p>Gender Reassignment/ Gender Identity anybody whose gender identity or gender expression is different to the sex assigned to them at birth</p>	x			
<p>Marriage or Civil Partnership people who are married or in a civil partnership</p>	x			
<p>Pregnancy and Maternity (refers to the period after the birth, and is linked to maternity leave in the employment context. In the non-work context,</p>		x		<p>Increased digital access will be a benefit.</p>

protection against maternity discrimination is for 26 weeks after giving birth),				
Race Groups: including colour, nationality, ethnic origins, including minorities (e.g. gypsy travellers, refugees, migrants and asylum seekers)	x			
Religion or Belief: different beliefs, customs (including atheists and those with no aligned belief)	x			
Sex women and men (girls and boys)	x			
Sexual Orientation , e.g. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Heterosexual	x			

3.3 Fairer Scotland Duty

This duty places a legal responsibility on Scottish Borders Council (SBC) to actively consider (give due regard) to how we can reduce inequalities of outcome caused by socioeconomic disadvantage when making strategic decisions.

The duty is set at a strategic level - these are the key, high level decisions that SBC will take. This would normally include strategy documents, decisions about setting priorities, allocating resources and commissioning services.

Is the proposal strategic?

Yes (*please delete as applicable*)

If No go to Section 4

If yes, please indicate any potential impact on the undernoted groups this proposal may have and how you know this:

	Impact			State here how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
<p>Low and/or No Wealth – enough money to meet basic living costs and pay bills but have no savings to deal with any unexpected spends and no provision for the future.</p>		x	x	<p>Property rationalisation may mean people with low/ no wealth having to travel further to access Council services.</p> <p>An increased use of digital resources can mitigate this by reducing the need to visit Council premises.</p> <p>More efficient services will benefit this group in allowing quicker and easier access.</p> <p>A single SBC view will mean services are located in the same place, meaning less journeys are required to access services.</p> <p>For current employees, a reduction in staff numbers may mean an impact on this group.</p>
<p>Material Deprivation – being unable to access basic goods and services i.e. financial products like life insurance, repair/replace broken electrical goods, warm home, leisure and hobbies</p>		x	x	<p>An increased use of digital resources may impact on this group.</p> <p>This will be taken into account in the service design.</p> <p>A single SBC view will mean services are located in the same place, meaning less journeys are required to access services.</p>

				<p>For current employees, a reduction in staff numbers may mean an impact on this group</p>
<p>Area Deprivation – where you live (e.g. rural areas), where you work (e.g. accessibility of transport)</p>		x	x	<p>There is a potential for property rationalisation to have a negative impact depending on the location of future properties.</p> <p>This will be taken into account during the service review.</p> <p>A single SBC view will mean services are located in the same place, meaning less journeys are required to access services.</p> <p>For current employees, property rationalisation may mean an impact on this group.</p>
<p>Socio-economic Background – social class i.e. parents' education, employment and income</p>		x	x	<p>An increased use of digital resources may impact on this group.</p> <p>This will be taken into account in the service design.</p> <p>A single SBC view will mean services are located in the same place, meaning less journeys are required to access services.</p> <p>For current employees, a reduction in staff numbers may mean an impact on this group</p>

Looked after and accommodated children and young people	x			
Carers paid and unpaid including family members		x	x	<p>For current employees, a change to work patterns may have a negative impact on some with caring responsibilities.</p> <p>Equally, different work patterns will benefit some with caring responsibilities.</p> <p>Different work patterns may also make working for the Council attractive and practical for those with caring responsibilities.</p>
Homelessness	x			
Addictions and substance use	x			
Those involved within the criminal justice system	x			

4 Full Integrated Impact Assessment Required

Select No if you have answered “No” to all of Sections 3.1 – 3.3.

Yes (please delete as applicable)

If a full impact assessment is not required briefly explain why there are no effects and provide justification for the decision.

--

Signed by Lead Officer:	Gillian Young
Designation:	Senior Business Services Manager
Date:	1st February 2023
Counter Signature Director	Jenni Craig, Service Director, Resilient Communities
Date:	13/02/2023

Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA)

Part 1 Scoping

1 Details of the Proposal

<p>Title of Proposal:</p>	<p>Savings delivery via the continued roll out of digital services across the Council for the benefit of internal and external customers including a realignment of CASS operating functions (but excluding Systems Administration and Development resources)</p>
<p>What is it?</p>	<p>A new Policy/Strategy/Practice x A revised Policy/Strategy/Practice</p>
<p>Description of the proposal:</p> <p>(Set out a clear understanding of the purpose of the proposal being developed or reviewed (what are the aims, objectives and intended outcomes, including the context within which it will operate).</p>	<p>Expand the roll out of the existing digital platform/services and roll out new digital opportunities to take advantage at a Service and Council level of the opportunities to standardise and streamline processes and procedures, increase channel shift and partial/full customer self service. This includes use by internal and external customers, third parties and partners and internally at a Council wide level. Realign CASS operational resources to deliver improved customer service and frontline experiences utilising traditional and existing and new digital opportunities. Overall Service and Council wide extract</p>

	<p>savings and make efficiency and quality of service improvements within and out with CASS and facilitate opportunities for other Services to do so.</p> <p>Those customers who, for whatever reason, are unable to access/use digital services will also be supported to access required services.</p> <p>CASS adheres to the overall Council and Service principles of utilising technology and driving self service to increase efficiency and quality of service delivery.</p> <p>(The above excludes Systems Administration and Development functions due to a separate non aligned review. Also there is a separate dependency on the property rationalisation programme.)</p> <p>Estimated FTE reduction of 2.0 FTE from an establishment of 130 FTE, to be achieved through turnover and vacancy management.</p>
<p>Service Area:</p> <p>Department:</p>	<p>Resilient & Communities</p> <p>CASS</p>
<p>Lead Officer:</p> <p>(Name and job title)</p>	<p>Jenni Craig/ /Les Grant</p>
<p>Other Officers/Partners involved:</p> <p>(List names, job titles and organisations)</p>	<p>Transformation programme support/HR/Finance</p>

Date(s) IIA completed:	14 February 2023
-------------------------------	------------------

2 Will there be any cumulative impacts as a result of the relationship between this proposal and other policies?

Yes <i>(please delete as applicable)</i>
<p>If yes, - please state here: Departmental practices and procedures.</p>

3 Legislative Requirements

3.1 Relevance to the Equality Duty:	
<p>Do you believe your proposal has any relevance under the Equality Act 2010? Yes <i>(If you believe that your proposal may have some relevance – however small please indicate yes. If there is no effect, please enter “No” and go to Section 3.2.)</i></p>	
Equality Duty	Reasoning:
<p>Elimination of discrimination (both direct & indirect), victimisation and harassment. <i>(Will the proposal discriminate? Or help eliminate discrimination?)</i></p>	<p>Process improvement, focussing on customer intelligence and needs and enhanced community engagement will help eliminate discrimination.</p>
<p>Promotion of equality of opportunity? <i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the Council with this)</i></p>	<p>Process improvement, focussing on customer intelligence and needs and enhanced community engagement will promote opportunity for all protected groups.</p>

<p>Foster good relations?</p> <p><i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the council's relationships with those who have equality characteristics?)</i></p>	<p>The focus on community engagement, participation and empowerment will help foster good relations between different groups.</p>
--	---

3.2 Which groups of people do you think will be or potentially could be, impacted by the implementation of this proposal?
(You should consider employees, clients, customers / service users, and any other relevant groups)

Please tick below as appropriate, outlining any potential impacts on the undernoted equality groups this proposal may have and how you know this.

	Impact			Please explain the potential impacts and how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
<p>Age Older or younger people or a specific age grouping</p>		x	x	<p>Increased use of digital resources and a reduced property estate may impact adversely on older people.</p> <p>This will be mitigated by consideration of these matters during the service design phase.</p> <p>Conversely, older people can benefit from increased digital access.</p> <p>A single SBC view will mean services are located in the same place, meaning less journeys are required to access services.</p>

				<p>Older employees may find it more difficult to adjust to a more flexible form of working and increased use of digital resources.</p>
<p>Disability e.g. Effects on people with mental, physical, sensory impairment, learning disability, visible/invisible, progressive or recurring</p>		x	x	<p>A reduced property estate may impact adversely on people with a disability.</p> <p>This will be considered in the design phase.</p> <p>Increased digital access is a potentially positive development.</p> <p>A single SBC view will mean services are located in the same place, meaning less journeys are required to access services.</p> <p>Disabled employees may find it more difficult to adjust to a more flexible form of working.</p>
<p>Gender Reassignment/ Gender Identity anybody whose gender identity or gender expression is different to the sex assigned to them at birth</p>	x			
<p>Marriage or Civil Partnership people who</p>	x			

are married or in a civil partnership				
Pregnancy and Maternity (refers to the period after the birth, and is linked to maternity leave in the employment context. In the non-work context, protection against maternity discrimination is for 26 weeks after giving birth),		x		Increased digital access will be a benefit.
Race Groups: including colour, nationality, ethnic origins, including minorities (e.g. gypsy travellers, refugees, migrants and asylum seekers)	x			
Religion or Belief: different beliefs, customs (including atheists and those with no aligned belief)	x			
Sex women and men (girls and boys)	x			
Sexual Orientation , e.g. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Heterosexual	x			

3.3 Fairer Scotland Duty

This duty places a legal responsibility on Scottish Borders Council (SBC) to actively consider (give due regard) to how we can reduce inequalities of outcome caused by socioeconomic disadvantage when making strategic decisions.

The duty is set at a strategic level - these are the key, high level decisions that SBC will take. This would normally include strategy documents, decisions about setting priorities, allocating resources and commissioning services.

Is the proposal strategic?

Yes (*please delete as applicable*)

If No go to Section 4

If yes, please indicate any potential impact on the undernoted groups this proposal may have and how you know this:

	Impact			State here how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
<p>Low and/or No Wealth – enough money to meet basic living costs and pay bills but have no savings to deal with any unexpected spends and no provision for the future.</p>		x	x	<p>Property rationalisation may mean people with low/ no wealth having to travel further to access Council services.</p> <p>An increased use of digital resources can mitigate this by reducing the need to visit Council premises.</p> <p>More efficient services will benefit this group in allowing quicker and easier access.</p> <p>A single SBC view will mean services are located in the same place, meaning less journeys are required to access services.</p>

				For current employees, a reduction in staff numbers may mean an impact on this group.
Material Deprivation – being unable to access basic goods and services i.e. financial products like life insurance, repair/replace broken electrical goods, warm home, leisure and hobbies		x	x	<p>An increased use of digital resources may impact on this group.</p> <p>This will be taken into account in the service design.</p> <p>A single SBC view will mean services are located in the same place, meaning less journeys are required to access services.</p> <p>For current employees, a reduction in staff numbers may mean an impact on this group.</p>
Area Deprivation – where you live (e.g. rural areas), where you work (e.g. accessibility of transport)		x	x	<p>There is a potential for property rationalisation to have a negative impact depending on the location of future properties.</p> <p>This will be taken into account during the service review.</p> <p>A single SBC view will mean services are located in the same place, meaning less journeys are required to access services.</p> <p>For current employees, property rationalisation may mean an impact on this group</p>

<p>Socio-economic Background – social class i.e. parents’ education, employment and income</p>		x	x	<p>An increased use of digital resources may impact on this group.</p> <p>This will be taken into account in the service design.</p> <p>A single SBC view will mean services are located in the same place, meaning less journeys are required to access services.</p> <p>For current employees, a reduction in staff numbers may mean an impact on this group.</p>
<p>Looked after and accommodated children and young people</p>	x			
<p>Carers paid and unpaid including family members</p>		x	x	<p>For current employees, a change to work patterns may have a negative impact on some with caring responsibilities.</p> <p>Equally, different work patterns will benefit some with caring responsibilities.</p> <p>Different work patterns may also make working for the Council attractive and practical for those with caring responsibilities.</p>
<p>Homelessness</p>	x			

Addictions and substance use	x			
Those involved within the criminal justice system	x			

4 Full Integrated Impact Assessment Required

Select No if you have answered "No" to all of Sections 3.1 – 3.3.

Yes

If a full impact assessment is not required briefly explain why there are no effects and provide justification for the decision.

--

Signed by Lead Officer:	Les Grant
Designation:	Customer Services Manager
Date:	14th February 2023
Counter Signature Director	Jenni Craig
Date:	14th February 2023

Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA)

Part 1 Scoping

1 Details of the Proposal

<p>Title of Proposal:</p>	<p>Management Fee reduction to Live Borders</p>
<p>What is it?</p>	<p>A new Policy/Strategy/Practice <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>A revised Policy/Strategy/Practice x</p>
<p>Description of the proposal:</p> <p>(Set out a clear understanding of the purpose of the proposal being developed or reviewed (what are the aims, objectives and intended outcomes, including the context within which it will operate).</p>	<p>This proposal is a reduction in the annual management fee paid to Live Borders based on a 5% reduction.</p> <p>Live Borders have been involved in discussions around this proposal and have agreed to manage budget pressures within the existing management fee.</p>
<p>Service Area:</p> <p>Department:</p>	
<p>Lead Officer:</p> <p>(Name and job title)</p>	<p>Jenni Craig, Director of Resilient Communities</p>

<p>Other Officers/Partners involved: (List names, job titles and organisations)</p>	<p>Jen Holland, Director of Strategic Commissioning and Partnerships</p>
<p>Date(s) IIA completed:</p>	<p>03/02/22 Reviewed 31/1/2023</p>

2 Will there be any cumulative impacts as a result of the relationship between this proposal and other policies?

<p>No <i>(please delete as applicable)</i></p>
<p>If yes, - please state here:</p>

3 Legislative Requirements

<p>3.1 Relevance to the Equality Duty:</p>	
<p>Do you believe your proposal has any relevance under the Equality Act 2010? <i>(If you believe that your proposal may have some relevance – however small please indicate yes. If there is no effect, please enter “No” and go to Section 3.2.) NO</i></p>	
<p>Equality Duty</p>	<p>Reasoning:</p>
<p>Elimination of discrimination (both direct & indirect), victimisation and harassment. <i>(Will the proposal discriminate? Or help eliminate discrimination?)</i></p>	<p>n/a</p>

<p>Promotion of equality of opportunity?</p> <p><i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the Council with this)</i></p>	n/a
<p>Foster good relations?</p> <p><i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the council's relationships with those who have equality characteristics?)</i></p>	n/a

**3.2 Which groups of people do you think will be or potentially could be, impacted by the implementation of this proposal?
(You should consider employees, clients, customers / service users, and any other relevant groups)**

Please tick below as appropriate, outlining any potential impacts on the undernoted equality groups this proposal may have and how you know this.

	Impact			Please explain the potential impacts and how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
Age Older or younger people or a specific age grouping	x			
Disability e.g. Effects on people with mental, physical, sensory impairment, learning disability, visible/invisible, progressive or recurring	x			
Gender Reassignment/ Gender Identity anybody whose gender identity or gender expression is different to the sex assigned to them at birth	x			

Marriage or Civil Partnership people who are married or in a civil partnership	x			
Pregnancy and Maternity (refers to the period after the birth, and is linked to maternity leave in the employment context. In the non-work context, protection against maternity discrimination is for 26 weeks after giving birth),	x			
Race Groups: including colour, nationality, ethnic origins, including minorities (e.g. gypsy travellers, refugees, migrants and asylum seekers)	x			
Religion or Belief: different beliefs, customs (including atheists and those with no aligned belief)	x			
Sex women and men (girls and boys)	x			
Sexual Orientation , e.g. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Heterosexual	x			

3.3 Fairer Scotland Duty

This duty places a legal responsibility on Scottish Borders Council (SBC) to actively consider (give due regard) to how we can reduce inequalities of outcome caused by socioeconomic disadvantage when making strategic decisions.

The duty is set at a strategic level - these are the key, high level decisions that SBC will take. This would normally include strategy documents, decisions about setting priorities, allocating resources and commissioning services.

Is the proposal strategic?

No (*please delete as applicable*)

If No go to Section 4

If yes, please indicate any potential impact on the undernoted groups this proposal may have and how you know this:

	Impact			State here how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
Low and/or No Wealth – enough money to meet basic living costs and pay bills but have no savings to deal with any unexpected spends and no provision for the future.				
Material Deprivation – being unable to access basic goods and services i.e. financial products like life insurance, repair/replace broken electrical goods, warm home, leisure and hobbies				
Area Deprivation – where you live (e.g. rural areas), where you work				

(e.g. accessibility of transport)				
Socio-economic Background – social class i.e. parents' education, employment and income				
Looked after and accommodated children and young people				
Carers paid and unpaid including family members				
Homelessness				
Addictions and substance use				
Those involved within the criminal justice system				

4 Full Integrated Impact Assessment Required

Select No if you have answered “No” to all of Sections 3.1 – 3.3.

No (please delete as applicable)

If a full impact assessment is not required briefly explain why there are no effects and provide justification for the decision.

A full impact assessment is not required as this is a reduction in a management fee only to Live Borders.

Live Borders have agreed that they will manage any budget pressures within the existing management fee, therefore there is no direct impact on their service users as a result of this proposal.

Signed by Lead Officer:	Jenni Craig
Designation:	Director of Resilient Communities
Date:	31/1/2023
Counter Signature Director	Jenni Craig
Date:	31/1/2023

Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA)

Part 1 Scoping

1 Details of the Proposal

Title of Proposal:	Employment Support Service
What is it?	A new Policy/Strategy/Practice <input type="checkbox"/> A revised Policy/Strategy/Practice x
Description of the proposal: (Set out a clear understanding of the purpose of the proposal being developed or reviewed (what are the aims, objectives and intended outcomes, including the context within which it will operate).)	Structural and process re-engineering review. Estimated FTE impact 0.2 FTE. Total number of service FTE 11.
Service Area: Department:	Economic Development Resilient Communities
Lead Officer: (Name and job title)	Samantha Smith Chief Officer – Economic Development
Other Officers/Partners involved: (List names, job titles and organisations)	Transformation support/HR/Finance

Date(s) IIA completed:	4/3/2021 Reviewed 7/2/2023

2 Will there be any cumulative impacts as a result of the relationship between this proposal and other policies?

Yes <i>(please delete as applicable)</i>
If yes, - please state here: Departmental practices and procedures.

3 Legislative Requirements

3.1 Relevance to the Equality Duty:	
<p>Do you believe your proposal has any relevance under the Equality Act 2010? No</p> <p><i>(If you believe that your proposal may have some relevance – however small please indicate yes. If there is no effect, please enter “No” and go to Section 3.2.)</i></p>	
Equality Duty	Reasoning:
<p>Elimination of discrimination (both direct & indirect), victimisation and harassment.</p> <p><i>(Will the proposal discriminate? Or help eliminate discrimination?)</i></p>	
<p>Promotion of equality of opportunity?</p> <p><i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the Council with this)</i></p>	

<p>Foster good relations?</p> <p><i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the council's relationships with those who have equality characteristics?)</i></p>	

<p>3.2 Which groups of people do you think will be or potentially could be, impacted by the implementation of this proposal? (You should consider employees, clients, customers / service users, and any other relevant groups)</p>				
<p>Please tick below as appropriate, outlining any potential impacts on the undernoted equality groups this proposal may have and how you know this.</p>				
	Impact			Please explain the potential impacts and how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
Age Older or younger people or a specific age grouping	x			
Disability e.g. Effects on people with mental, physical, sensory impairment, learning disability, visible/invisible, progressive or recurring	x			
Gender Reassignment/ Gender Identity anybody whose gender identity or gender expression is different to the sex assigned to them at birth	x			
Marriage or Civil Partnership people who	x			

are married or in a civil partnership				
Pregnancy and Maternity (refers to the period after the birth, and is linked to maternity leave in the employment context. In the non-work context, protection against maternity discrimination is for 26 weeks after giving birth),	x			
Race Groups: including colour, nationality, ethnic origins, including minorities (e.g. gypsy travellers, refugees, migrants and asylum seekers)	x			
Religion or Belief: different beliefs, customs (including atheists and those with no aligned belief)	x			
Sex women and men (girls and boys)	x			
Sexual Orientation , e.g. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Heterosexual	x			

3.3 Fairer Scotland Duty

This duty places a legal responsibility on Scottish Borders Council (SBC) to actively consider (give due regard) to how we can reduce inequalities of outcome caused by socioeconomic disadvantage when making strategic decisions.

The duty is set at a strategic level - these are the key, high level decisions that SBC will take. This would normally include strategy documents, decisions about setting priorities, allocating resources and commissioning services.

Is the proposal strategic? Yes

Yes please delete as applicable)

If No go to Section 4

If yes, please indicate any potential impact on the undernoted groups this proposal may have and how you know this:

	Impact			State here how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
Low and/or No Wealth – enough money to meet basic living costs and pay bills but have no savings to deal with any unexpected spends and no provision for the future.	x			.
Material Deprivation – being unable to access basic goods and services i.e. financial products like life insurance, repair/replace broken electrical goods, warm home, leisure and hobbies	x			.
Area Deprivation – where you live (e.g. rural areas), where you work	x			

(e.g. accessibility of transport)				
Socio-economic Background – social class i.e. parents' education, employment and income	x			
Looked after and accommodated children and young people	x			
Carers paid and unpaid including family members	x			
Homelessness	x			
Addictions and substance use	x			
Those involved within the criminal justice system	x			

4 Full Integrated Impact Assessment Required

Select No if you have answered “No” to all of Sections 3.1 – 3.3.

No (please delete as applicable)

If a full impact assessment is not required briefly explain why there are no effects and provide justification for the decision.

In practice the saving will be achieved by vacancy management.

Signed by Lead Officer:	Samantha Smith
Designation:	Chief Officer – Economic Development
Date:	Reviewed 7/2/2023
Counter Signature Director	Jenni Craig
Date:	13/02/2023

Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA)

Part 1 Scoping

1 Details of the Proposal

Title of Proposal:	Fees & Charges Income across Regulatory Services
What is it?	A new Policy/Strategy/Practice <input type="checkbox"/> A revised Policy/Strategy/Practice X
Description of the proposal: (Set out a clear understanding of the purpose of the proposal being developed or reviewed (what are the aims, objectives and intended outcomes, including the context within which it will operate).)	Extra income from higher Fees & Charges which have been increased.
Service Area: Department:	Regulatory Services
Lead Officer: (Name and job title)	Tricia Scott Protective Services Manager
Other Officers/Partners involved: (List names, job titles and organisations)	Nuala McKinlay, Chief Legal Officer (Monitoring Officer)

Date(s) IIA completed:	Revised 14/02/2023
------------------------	--------------------

2 Will there be any cumulative impacts as a result of the relationship between this proposal and other policies?

No
If yes, - please state here:

3 Legislative Requirements

3.1 Relevance to the Equality Duty:

Do you believe your proposal has any relevance under the Equality Act 2010? No

(If you believe that your proposal may have some relevance – however small please indicate yes. If there is no effect, please enter “No” and go to Section 3.2.)

Equality Duty	Reasoning:
Elimination of discrimination (both direct & indirect), victimisation and harassment. <i>(Will the proposal discriminate? Or help eliminate discrimination?)</i>	N/A
Promotion of equality of opportunity? <i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the Council with this)</i>	N/A
Foster good relations?	N/A

(Will your proposal help or hinder the council's relationships with those who have equality characteristics?)	

**3.2 Which groups of people do you think will be or potentially could be, impacted by the implementation of this proposal?
(You should consider employees, clients, customers / service users, and any other relevant groups)**

Please tick below as appropriate, outlining any potential impacts on the undernoted equality groups this proposal may have and how you know this.

	Impact			Please explain the potential impacts and how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
Age Older or younger people or a specific age grouping	X			
Disability e.g. Effects on people with mental, physical, sensory impairment, learning disability, visible/invisible, progressive or recurring	X			
Gender Reassignment/ Gender Identity anybody whose gender identity or gender expression is different to the sex assigned to them at birth	X			
Marriage or Civil Partnership people who are married or in a civil partnership	X			

Pregnancy and Maternity (refers to the period after the birth, and is linked to maternity leave in the employment context. In the non-work context, protection against maternity discrimination is for 26 weeks after giving birth),	X			
Race Groups: including colour, nationality, ethnic origins, including minorities (e.g. gypsy travellers, refugees, migrants and asylum seekers)	X			
Religion or Belief: different beliefs, customs (including atheists and those with no aligned belief)	X			
Sex women and men (girls and boys)	X			
Sexual Orientation , e.g. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Heterosexual	X			

3.3 Fairer Scotland Duty

This duty places a legal responsibility on Scottish Borders Council (SBC) to actively consider (give due regard) to how we can reduce inequalities of outcome caused by socioeconomic disadvantage when making strategic decisions.

The duty is set at a strategic level - these are the key, high level decisions that SBC will take. This would normally include strategy documents, decisions about setting priorities, allocating resources and commissioning services.

Is the proposal strategic?

Yes

If No go to Section 4

If yes, please indicate any potential impact on the undernoted groups this proposal may have and how you know this:

	Impact			State here how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
<p>Low and/or No Wealth – enough money to meet basic living costs and pay bills but have no savings to deal with any unexpected spends and no provision for the future.</p>			X	<p>The proposal covers the following charges:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Private Water Supply • Seafood Licences • Weights and Measures • Pest Control • Animal Licensing <p>Private Water Supply and Pest Control may be used by individuals with little wealth.</p> <p>The others are mainly used by businesses.</p> <p>There is a potential negative impact in that those with little wealth may be less able to deal with additional costs.</p> <p>In mitigation, the costs are relatively small (an inflationary increase of typically 5%), and there is a</p>

				<p>cap on the charge for risk assessments for private water supplies.</p> <p>In addition citizens with private water supplies do not pay a domestic water rates charge.</p>
<p>Material Deprivation – being unable to access basic goods and services i.e. financial products like life insurance, repair/replace broken electrical goods, warm home, leisure and hobbies</p>			X	As above.
<p>Area Deprivation – where you live (e.g. rural areas), where you work (e.g. accessibility of transport)</p>	X			
<p>Socio-economic Background – social class i.e. parents' education, employment and income</p>	X			
<p>Looked after and accommodated children and young people</p>	X			
<p>Carers paid and unpaid including family members</p>	X			
<p>Homelessness</p>	X			
<p>Addictions and substance use</p>	X			

Those involved within the criminal justice system	X			
---	---	--	--	--

4 Full Integrated Impact Assessment Required

Select No if you have answered “No” to all of Sections 3.1 – 3.3.

No

If a full impact assessment is not required briefly explain why there are no effects and provide justification for the decision.

As above, there are minimal impacts, with safeguards, and the increases are in line with inflation.

Signed by Lead Officer:	Tricia Scott
Designation:	Protective Services Manager
Date:	Updated 14th February 2023
Counter Signature Director	Nuala McKinlay, Chief Legal Officer (Monitoring Officer)
Date:	14th February 2023

Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA)

Part 1 Scoping

1 Details of the Proposal

Title of Proposal:	Finance Savings
What is it?	A new Policy/Strategy/Practice <input type="checkbox"/> A revised Policy/Strategy/Practice X
Description of the proposal: (Set out a clear understanding of the purpose of the proposal being developed or reviewed (what are the aims, objectives and intended outcomes, including the context within which it will operate).	Savings build on a previous significant restructure by managing vacancies to achieve medium and long term savings. Team structures within Finance will be reviewed in light of confirmed staffing changes and automation of processes. The savings equate to approximately 3 FTE. The total number of employees in this area is 65.4 FTE.
Service Area: Department:	Finance
Lead Officer: (Name and job title)	Suzy Douglas, Acting Chief Financial Officer
Other Officers/Partners involved:	Iain Davidson, Employee Relations Manager

(List names, job titles and organisations)	
Date(s) IIA completed:	03/03/2021

2 Will there be any cumulative impacts as a result of the relationship between this proposal and other policies?

No <i>(please delete as applicable)</i>
If yes, - please state here:

3 Legislative Requirements

3.1 Relevance to the Equality Duty:	
<p>Do you believe your proposal has any relevance under the Equality Act 2010? No</p> <p><i>(If you believe that your proposal may have some relevance – however small please indicate yes. If there is no effect, please enter “No” and go to Section 3.2.)</i></p>	
Equality Duty	Reasoning:
<p>Elimination of discrimination (both direct & indirect), victimisation and harassment.</p> <p><i>(Will the proposal discriminate? Or help eliminate discrimination?)</i></p>	
Promotion of equality of opportunity?	

<i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the Council with this)</i>	
Foster good relations? <i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the council's relationships with those who have equality characteristics?)</i>	

3.2 Which groups of people do you think will be or potentially could be, impacted by the implementation of this proposal? (You should consider employees, clients, customers / service users, and any other relevant groups)				
Please tick below as appropriate, outlining any potential impacts on the undernoted equality groups this proposal may have and how you know this.				
	Impact			Please explain the potential impacts and how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
Age Older or younger people or a specific age grouping	X			
Disability e.g. Effects on people with mental, physical, sensory impairment, learning disability, visible/invisible, progressive or recurring	X			
Gender Reassignment/ Gender Identity anybody whose gender identity or gender expression is different to the sex assigned to them at birth	X			

Marriage or Civil Partnership people who are married or in a civil partnership	X			
Pregnancy and Maternity (refers to the period after the birth, and is linked to maternity leave in the employment context. In the non-work context, protection against maternity discrimination is for 26 weeks after giving birth),	X			
Race Groups: including colour, nationality, ethnic origins, including minorities (e.g. gypsy travellers, refugees, migrants and asylum seekers)	X			
Religion or Belief: different beliefs, customs (including atheists and those with no aligned belief)	X			
Sex women and men (girls and boys)	X			
Sexual Orientation , e.g. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Heterosexual	X			
<p>3.3 Fairer Scotland Duty</p> <p>This duty places a legal responsibility on Scottish Borders Council (SBC) to actively consider (give due regard) to how we can reduce inequalities of outcome caused by socioeconomic disadvantage when making <u>strategic</u> decisions.</p>				

The duty is set at a strategic level - these are the key, high level decisions that SBC will take. This would normally include strategy documents, decisions about setting priorities, allocating resources and commissioning services.

Is the proposal strategic?

Yes (*please delete as applicable*)

If No go to Section 4

If yes, please indicate any potential impact on the undernoted groups this proposal may have and how you know this:

	Impact			State here how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
Low and/or No Wealth – enough money to meet basic living costs and pay bills but have no savings to deal with any unexpected spends and no provision for the future.	X			
Material Deprivation – being unable to access basic goods and services i.e. financial products like life insurance, repair/replace broken electrical goods, warm home, leisure and hobbies	X			
Area Deprivation – where you live (e.g. rural areas), where you work	X			

(e.g. accessibility of transport)				
Socio-economic Background – social class i.e. parents' education, employment and income	X			
Looked after and accommodated children and young people	X			
Carers paid and unpaid including family members	X			
Homelessness	X			
Addictions and substance use	X			
Those involved within the criminal justice system	X			

4 Full Integrated Impact Assessment Required

Select No if you have answered “No” to all of Sections 3.1 – 3.3.

No (please delete as applicable)

If a full impact assessment is not required briefly explain why there are no effects and provide justification for the decision.

As above, there are no impacts. The savings come from efficiencies and potentially not filling vacant posts.

Signed by Lead Officer:	Suzy Douglas
Designation:	Acting Chief Financial Officer
Date:	Updated 8th February 2023
Counter Signature Director	Suzy Douglas
Date:	08/02/2023

Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA)

Part 1 Scoping

1 Details of the Proposal

<p>Title of Proposal:</p>	<p>Fit for 2024 review of the service – Valuation Roll (Non -Domestic Rating), Council Tax and Electoral Registration including Election Events.</p>
<p>What is it?</p>	<p>A new Policy/Strategy/Practice <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>A revised Policy/Strategy/Practice <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>Description of the proposal:</p> <p>(Set out a clear understanding of the purpose of the proposal being developed or reviewed (what are the aims, objectives and intended outcomes, including the context within which it will operate).</p>	<p>Structural and process re-engineering review.</p> <p>£5k of the savings are estimated to have an FTE impact on temporary relief staff canvassers, who carry out a statutory function, not permanent staff.</p> <p>This will be undertaken in line with the following principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • End to end processes • Reduced resources • Demand-led & informed by evidence & elector intelligence/data matching • Enhanced community engagement

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Embracing the opportunities from alternative Digital solutions • Process Improvement, productivity focus & removal of manual work
Service Area: Department:	Finance & Corporate Governance Assessor and Electoral Registration Officer
Lead Officer: (Name and job title)	Brian Rout, ASSESSOR and ELECTORAL REGISTRATION OFFICER and Suzy Douglas/Nuala McKinlay, Directors – Finance & Corporate Governance
Other Officers/Partners involved: (List names, job titles and organisations)	Transformation support/HR/Finance - SBC
Date(s) IIA completed:	Reviewed 13/2/23

2 Will there be any cumulative impacts as a result of the relationship between this proposal and other policies?

Yes
If yes, - please state here: Electoral Registration statutory practices and procedures.

3 Legislative Requirements

3.1 Relevance to the Equality Duty:

Do you believe your proposal has any relevance under the Equality Act 2010? No

(If you believe that your proposal may have some relevance – however small please indicate yes. If there is no effect, please enter “No” and go to Section 3.2.)

Equality Duty	Reasoning:
Elimination of discrimination (both direct & indirect), victimisation and harassment. <i>(Will the proposal discriminate? Or help eliminate discrimination?)</i>	N/A
Promotion of equality of opportunity? <i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the Council with this)</i>	N/A
Foster good relations? <i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the council's relationships with those who have equality characteristics?)</i>	N/A

3.2 Which groups of people do you think will be or potentially could be, impacted by the implementation of this proposal?
(You should consider employees, clients, customers / service users, and any other relevant groups)

Please tick below as appropriate, outlining any potential impacts on the undernoted equality groups this proposal may have and how you know this.

	Impact	Please explain the potential

	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	impacts and how you know this
Age Older or younger people or a specific age grouping	X			
Disability e.g. Effects on people with mental, physical, sensory impairment, learning disability, visible/invisible, progressive or recurring	X			
Gender Reassignment/ Gender Identity anybody whose gender identity or gender expression is different to the sex assigned to them at birth	X			
Marriage or Civil Partnership people who are married or in a civil partnership	X			
Pregnancy and Maternity (refers to the period after the birth, and is linked to maternity leave in the employment context. In the non-work context, protection against maternity discrimination is for 26 weeks after giving birth),	X			
Race Groups: including colour, nationality, ethnic origins, including minorities (e.g. gypsy travellers, refugees,	X			

migrants and asylum seekers)				
Religion or Belief: different beliefs, customs (including atheists and those with no aligned belief)	X			
Sex women and men (girls and boys)	X			
Sexual Orientation , e.g. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Heterosexual	X			

3.3 Fairer Scotland Duty

This duty places a legal responsibility on Scottish Borders Council (SBC) to actively consider (give due regard) to how we can reduce inequalities of outcome caused by socioeconomic disadvantage when making strategic decisions.

The duty is set at a strategic level - these are the key, high level decisions that SBC will take. This would normally include strategy documents, decisions about setting priorities, allocating resources and commissioning services.

Is the proposal strategic?

Yes

If No go to Section 4

If yes, please indicate any potential impact on the undernoted groups this proposal may have and how you know this:

	Impact			State here how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	

Low and/or No Wealth – enough money to meet basic living costs and pay bills but have no savings to deal with any unexpected spends and no provision for the future.	X			
Material Deprivation – being unable to access basic goods and services i.e. financial products like life insurance, repair/replace broken electrical goods, warm home, leisure and hobbies	X			
Area Deprivation – where you live (e.g. rural areas), where you work (e.g. accessibility of transport)	X			
Socio-economic Background – social class i.e. parents' education, employment and income	X			
Looked after and accommodated children and young people	X			
Carers paid and unpaid including family members	X			
Homelessness	X			
Addictions and substance use	X			

Those involved within the criminal justice system	X			
---	---	--	--	--

4 Full Integrated Impact Assessment Required

Select No if you have answered “No” to all of Sections 3.1 – 3.3.

No

If a full impact assessment is not required briefly explain why there are no effects and provide justification for the decision.

The nature of the change means there will be no impact.

Signed by Lead Officer:	Brian Rout
Designation:	Assessor & Electoral Registration Officer
Date:	Reviewed 13/2/23

Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA)

Part 1 Scoping

1 Details of the Proposal

Title of Proposal:	Legal Services
What is it?	A new Policy/Strategy/Practice <input type="checkbox"/> A revised Policy/Strategy/Practice X
Description of the proposal: (Set out a clear understanding of the purpose of the proposal being developed or reviewed (what are the aims, objectives and intended outcomes, including the context within which it will operate).	Vacancies and staffing levels will continue to be managed to deliver efficiencies and savings. Other opportunities to reduce the spend on books and subscriptions will be considered. The savings will not result in the loss of any full time post, but may result in a loss of hours.
Service Area: Department:	Legal Services
Lead Officer: (Name and job title)	Nuala McKinlay, Chief Legal Officer (Monitoring Officer)
Other Officers/Partners involved: (List names, job titles and organisations)	Iain Davidson, Employee Relations Manager

Date(s) IIA completed:	09/02/2023

2 Will there be any cumulative impacts as a result of the relationship between this proposal and other policies?

No <i>(please delete as applicable)</i>
If yes, - please state here:

3 Legislative Requirements

3.1 Relevance to the Equality Duty:

Do you believe your proposal has any relevance under the Equality Act 2010? No

(If you believe that your proposal may have some relevance – however small please indicate yes. If there is no effect, please enter “No” and go to Section 3.2.)

Equality Duty	Reasoning:
Elimination of discrimination (both direct & indirect), victimisation and harassment. <i>(Will the proposal discriminate? Or help eliminate discrimination?)</i>	No impact– the proposals will not impact on any protected group. If there is a loss of hours in a particular post, they will be managed to ensure people planning objectives of the service are not detrimentally impacted. The service contains entry level, ordinary level and senior level posts – so there are career paths and employment opportunities across all age groups. This will be retained.

<p>Promotion of equality of opportunity?</p> <p><i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the Council with this)</i></p>	<p>No impact –as above</p>
<p>Foster good relations?</p> <p><i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the council's relationships with those who have equality characteristics?)</i></p>	<p>No impact –as above</p>

<p>3.2 Which groups of people do you think will be or potentially could be, impacted by the implementation of this proposal? (You should consider employees, clients, customers / service users, and any other relevant groups)</p>				
<p>Please tick below as appropriate, outlining any potential impacts on the undernoted equality groups this proposal may have and how you know this.</p>				
	Impact			Please explain the potential impacts and how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
<p>Age Older or younger people or a specific age grouping</p>	X			
<p>Disability e.g. Effects on people with mental, physical, sensory impairment, learning disability, visible/invisible, progressive or recurring</p>	X			
<p>Gender Reassignment/ Gender Identity anybody whose gender identity or gender expression is different to the sex assigned to them at birth</p>	X			

Marriage or Civil Partnership people who are married or in a civil partnership	X			
Pregnancy and Maternity (refers to the period after the birth, and is linked to maternity leave in the employment context. In the non-work context, protection against maternity discrimination is for 26 weeks after giving birth),	X			
Race Groups: including colour, nationality, ethnic origins, including minorities (e.g. gypsy travellers, refugees, migrants and asylum seekers)	X			
Religion or Belief: different beliefs, customs (including atheists and those with no aligned belief)	X			
Sex women and men (girls and boys)	X			
Sexual Orientation , e.g. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Heterosexual	X			
<p>3.3 Fairer Scotland Duty</p> <p>This duty places a legal responsibility on Scottish Borders Council (SBC) to actively consider (give due regard) to how we can reduce inequalities of outcome caused by socioeconomic disadvantage when making <u>strategic</u> decisions.</p>				

The duty is set at a strategic level - these are the key, high level decisions that SBC will take. This would normally include strategy documents, decisions about setting priorities, allocating resources and commissioning services.

Is the proposal strategic?

Yes (*please delete as applicable*)

If No go to Section 4

If yes, please indicate any potential impact on the undernoted groups this proposal may have and how you know this:

	Impact			State here how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
Low and/or No Wealth – enough money to meet basic living costs and pay bills but have no savings to deal with any unexpected spends and no provision for the future.	X			No complete post will be lost. If there is a loss of hours in a particular post, they will be managed to ensure people planning objectives of the service are not detrimentally impacted. The service contains entry level, ordinary level and senior level posts – so there are career paths and employment opportunities across all age groups. This will be retained.
Material Deprivation – being unable to access basic goods and services i.e. financial products like life insurance, repair/replace broken electrical goods, warm home, leisure and hobbies	X			

Area Deprivation – where you live (e.g. rural areas), where you work (e.g. accessibility of transport)	X			
Socio-economic Background – social class i.e. parents' education, employment and income	X			
Looked after and accommodated children and young people	X			
Carers paid and unpaid including family members	X			
Homelessness	X			
Addictions and substance use	X			
Those involved within the criminal justice system	X			

4 Full Integrated Impact Assessment Required

Select No if you have answered “No” to all of Sections 3.1 – 3.3.

No (please delete as applicable)

If a full impact assessment is not required briefly explain why there are no effects and provide justification for the decision.

As above, there are no impacts. The savings come from efficiencies and potentially not filling vacant posts.

Signed by Lead Officer:	Nuala McKinlay
Designation:	Chief Legal Officer (Monitoring Officer)
Date:	Reviewed 4th February 2022
Counter Signature Director	Nuala McKinlay
Date:	09/02/2023

Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA)

Part 1 Scoping

1 Details of the Proposal

Title of Proposal:	Protective Services
What is it?	A new Policy/Strategy/Practice <input type="checkbox"/> A revised Policy/Strategy/Practice X
Description of the proposal: (Set out a clear understanding of the purpose of the proposal being developed or reviewed (what are the aims, objectives and intended outcomes, including the context within which it will operate).)	Protective Services - Transform the service using technology which will assist in streamlining processes and in turn improve efficiency.
Service Area: Department:	Regulatory Services
Lead Officer: (Name and job title)	Tricia Scott, Protective Services Manager
Other Officers/Partners involved: (List names, job titles and organisations)	Nuala McKinlay, Chief Legal Officer (Monitoring Officer)
	03/03/2021

Date(s) IIA completed:	
-------------------------------	--

2 Will there be any cumulative impacts as a result of the relationship between this proposal and other policies?

No <i>(please delete as applicable)</i>
If yes, - please state here:

3 Legislative Requirements

3.1 Relevance to the Equality Duty:	
<p>Do you believe your proposal has any relevance under the Equality Act 2010? No</p> <p><i>(If you believe that your proposal may have some relevance – however small please indicate yes. If there is no effect, please enter “No” and go to Section 3.2.)</i></p>	
Equality Duty	Reasoning:
<p>Elimination of discrimination (both direct & indirect), victimisation and harassment.</p> <p><i>(Will the proposal discriminate? Or help eliminate discrimination?)</i></p>	
<p>Promotion of equality of opportunity?</p> <p><i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the Council with this)</i></p>	
Foster good relations?	

(Will your proposal help or hinder the council's relationships with those who have equality characteristics?)

**3.2 Which groups of people do you think will be or potentially could be, impacted by the implementation of this proposal?
(You should consider employees, clients, customers / service users, and any other relevant groups)**

Please tick below as appropriate, outlining any potential impacts on the undernoted equality groups this proposal may have and how you know this.

	Impact			Please explain the potential impacts and how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
Age Older or younger people or a specific age grouping	X			
Disability e.g. Effects on people with mental, physical, sensory impairment, learning disability, visible/invisible, progressive or recurring	X			
Gender Reassignment/ Gender Identity anybody whose gender identity or gender expression is different to the sex assigned to them at birth	X			
Marriage or Civil Partnership people who are married or in a civil partnership	X			

Pregnancy and Maternity (refers to the period after the birth, and is linked to maternity leave in the employment context. In the non-work context, protection against maternity discrimination is for 26 weeks after giving birth),	X			
Race Groups: including colour, nationality, ethnic origins, including minorities (e.g. gypsy travellers, refugees, migrants and asylum seekers)	X			
Religion or Belief: different beliefs, customs (including atheists and those with no aligned belief)	X			
Sex women and men (girls and boys)	X			
Sexual Orientation , e.g. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Heterosexual	X			

3.3 Fairer Scotland Duty

This duty places a legal responsibility on Scottish Borders Council (SBC) to actively consider (give due regard) to how we can reduce inequalities of outcome caused by socioeconomic disadvantage when making strategic decisions.

The duty is set at a strategic level - these are the key, high level decisions that SBC will take. This would normally include strategy documents, decisions about setting priorities, allocating resources and commissioning services.

Is the proposal strategic?

Yes *(please delete as applicable)*

If No go to Section 4

If yes, please indicate any potential impact on the undernoted groups this proposal may have and how you know this:

	Impact			State here how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
Low and/or No Wealth – enough money to meet basic living costs and pay bills but have no savings to deal with any unexpected spends and no provision for the future.	X			
Material Deprivation – being unable to access basic goods and services i.e. financial products like life insurance, repair/replace broken electrical goods, warm home, leisure and hobbies	X			
Area Deprivation – where you live (e.g. rural areas), where you work (e.g. accessibility of transport)	X			
Socio-economic Background – social class i.e. parents'	X			

education, employment and income				
Looked after and accommodated children and young people	X			
Carers paid and unpaid including family members	X			
Homelessness	X			
Addictions and substance use	X			
Those involved within the criminal justice system	X			

4 Full Integrated Impact Assessment Required

Select No if you have answered “No” to all of Sections 3.1 – 3.3.

No (please delete as applicable)

If a full impact assessment is not required briefly explain why there are no effects and provide justification for the decision.

There are no impacts. The savings come from efficiencies and potentially not filling vacant posts. The use of technology should in fact enhance the service we provide.

Signed by Lead Officer:	Tricia Scott
Designation:	Protective Services Manager
Date:	Reviewed 3rd February 2022
Counter Signature Director	Nuala McKinlay
Date:	09/02/2023

Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA)

Part 1 Scoping

1 Details of the Proposal

<p>Title of Proposal:</p>	<p>Change in Provision of Resources to deliver Counter Fraud Strategy 2021-2024</p>
<p>What is it?</p>	<p>A new Policy/Strategy/Practice <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>A revised Policy/Strategy/Practice <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>Description of the proposal:</p> <p>(Set out a clear understanding of the purpose of the proposal being developed or reviewed (what are the aims, objectives and intended outcomes, including the context within which it will operate).</p>	<p>The 3-year Counter Fraud Strategy 2021-2024, approved by Council on 16 December 2021, was predicated on the promotion of a counter fraud culture across the Council to improve its resilience to fraud. A shift from the provision of a specialist corporate role to Management nominating counter fraud champions and embedding fraud prevention and detection practices across Council services, supported by Integrity Group.</p> <p>The Audit & Risk cumulative Fit for 2024 savings (£22k 2021/22 and £19k 2023/24) equate to 1 FTE Corporate Fraud & Compliance Officer post, which has been vacant since December 2020 on</p>

	retirement of previous post-holder. The total number of employees in Audit & Risk is 7 FTE (5.5 FTE Internal Audit; 1.5 FTE Risk Management) which includes the leadership role for Counter Fraud through the Chief Officer.
Service Area:	Audit & Risk
Department:	Finance & Corporate Governance
Lead Officer: (Name and job title)	Jill Stacey Chief Officer Audit & Risk
Other Officers/Partners involved: (List names, job titles and organisations)	
Date(s) IIA completed:	28 October 2021 (Revised 05 January 2023 as part of budget proposals 2023/24)

2 Will there be any cumulative impacts as a result of the relationship between this proposal and other policies?

No; though this policy permeates across Council service provision so indirectly associated with other relevant Council policies.

If yes, - please state here:

3 Legislative Requirements

3.1 Relevance to the Equality Duty:

<p>Do you believe your proposal has any relevance under the Equality Act 2010? No. - Equality, diversity and socio-economic factors are accommodated by way of all alleged frauds being investigated and pursued in accordance with the appropriate legislation.</p>	
Equality Duty	Reasoning:
<p>Elimination of discrimination (both direct & indirect), victimisation and harassment. <i>(Will the proposal discriminate? Or help eliminate discrimination?)</i></p>	
<p>Promotion of equality of opportunity? <i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the Council with this)</i></p>	
<p>Foster good relations? <i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the council's relationships with those who have equality characteristics?)</i></p>	

<p>3.2 Which groups of people do you think will be or potentially could be, impacted by the implementation of this proposal? (You should consider employees, clients, customers / service users, and any other relevant groups)</p>				
<p>Please tick below as appropriate, outlining any potential impacts on the undernoted equality groups this proposal may have and how you know this.</p>				
	Impact			Please explain the potential impacts and how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
Age Older or younger people or a specific age grouping	X			

<p>Disability e.g. Effects on people with mental, physical, sensory impairment, learning disability, visible/invisible, progressive or recurring</p>	<p>X</p>			
<p>Gender Reassignment/ Gender Identity anybody whose gender identity or gender expression is different to the sex assigned to them at birth</p>	<p>X</p>			
<p>Marriage or Civil Partnership people who are married or in a civil partnership</p>	<p>X</p>			
<p>Pregnancy and Maternity (refers to the period after the birth, and is linked to maternity leave in the employment context. In the non-work context, protection against maternity discrimination is for 26 weeks after giving birth),</p>	<p>X</p>			
<p>Race Groups: including colour, nationality, ethnic origins, including minorities (e.g. gypsy travellers, refugees, migrants and asylum seekers)</p>	<p>X</p>			
<p>Religion or Belief: different beliefs, customs (including atheists and those with no aligned belief)</p>	<p>X</p>			

Sex women and men (girls and boys)	X			
Sexual Orientation , e.g. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Heterosexual	X			
<p>3.3 Fairer Scotland Duty</p> <p>This duty places a legal responsibility on Scottish Borders Council (SBC) to actively consider (give due regard) to how we can reduce inequalities of outcome caused by socioeconomic disadvantage when making <u>strategic</u> decisions.</p> <p>The duty is set at a strategic level - these are the key, high level decisions that SBC will take. This would normally include strategy documents, decisions about setting priorities, allocating resources and commissioning services.</p>				
<p>Is the proposal strategic?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>If No go to Section 4</p>				
<p>If yes, please indicate any potential impact on the undernoted groups this proposal may have and how you know this:</p>				
	Impact			State here how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
Low and/or No Wealth – enough money to meet basic living costs and pay bills but have no savings to deal with any unexpected spends and no provision for the future.	X			

Material Deprivation – being unable to access basic goods and services i.e. financial products like life insurance, repair/replace broken electrical goods, warm home, leisure and hobbies	X			
Area Deprivation – where you live (e.g. rural areas), where you work (e.g. accessibility of transport)	X			
Socio-economic Background – social class i.e. parents' education, employment and income	X			
Looked after and accommodated children and young people	X			
Carers paid and unpaid including family members	X			
Homelessness	X			
Addictions and substance use	X			
Those involved within the criminal justice system	X			

4 Full Integrated Impact Assessment Required

Select No if you have answered “No” to all of Sections 3.1 – 3.3.

No (please delete as applicable)

If a full impact assessment is not required briefly explain why there are no effects and provide justification for the decision.

There is no relevance to the Equality Duty or the Fairer Scotland Duty for this proposal. The revised Counter Fraud Policy statement and 3-year Counter Fraud Strategy 2021-2024, approved by Council on 16 December 2021, are designed to enable the Council to continue to refine its approach to tackling fraud, taking account of reducing resources, with a focus on prevention and detection and promotion of a counter fraud culture across the Council to improve its resilience to fraud.

The Fit for 2024 cumulative savings £41k for Audit & Risk come from not filling the vacant post of Corporate Fraud & Compliance Officer (1 FTE). The shift from the provision of a specialist corporate role (removal of the Corporate Fraud & Compliance Officer 1 FTE post) to Management nominating counter fraud champions and embedding fraud prevention and detection practices across Council services, supported by the Integrity Group, reflects the change in provision of resources to deliver the counter fraud policy and strategy.

Equality, diversity and socio-economic factors are accommodated by way of all alleged frauds being investigated and pursued in accordance with the appropriate legislation.

Signed by Lead Officer:	Jill Stacey
Designation:	Chief Officer Audit & Risk
Date:	05 January 2023
Counter Signature Director	Nuala McKinlay
Date:	10/02/2023

Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA)

Part 1 Scoping

1 Details of the Proposal

Title of Proposal:	People, Performance & Change
What is it?	A revised Policy/Strategy/Practice <input type="checkbox"/>
Description of the proposal: (Set out a clear understanding of the purpose of the proposal being developed or reviewed (what are the aims, objectives and intended outcomes, including the context within which it will operate).)	Service reviews over the next year including structural changes as a result of process reviews.
Service Area: Department:	People, Performance & Change People, Performance & Change
Lead Officer: (Name and job title)	Clair Hepburn Director, People, Performance & Change
Other Officers/Partners involved: (List names, job titles and organisations)	Iain Davidson Employee Relations Manager

Date(s) IIA completed:	09/02/2023

2 Will there be any cumulative impacts as a result of the relationship between this proposal and other policies?

Yes
If yes, - please state here: Departmental practices and procedures.

3 Legislative Requirements

3.1 Relevance to the Equality Duty:	
<p>Do you believe your proposal has any relevance under the Equality Act 2010? No</p> <p><i>(If you believe that your proposal may have some relevance – however small please indicate yes. If there is no effect, please enter “No” and go to Section 3.2.)</i></p>	
Equality Duty	Reasoning:
Elimination of discrimination (both direct & indirect), victimisation and harassment. <i>(Will the proposal discriminate? Or help eliminate discrimination?)</i>	
Promotion of equality of opportunity? <i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the Council with this)</i>	

<p>Foster good relations?</p> <p><i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the council's relationships with those who have equality characteristics?)</i></p>	

<p>3.2 Which groups of people do you think will be or potentially could be, impacted by the implementation of this proposal? (You should consider employees, clients, customers / service users, and any other relevant groups)</p>				
<p>Please tick below as appropriate, outlining any potential impacts on the undernoted equality groups this proposal may have and how you know this.</p>				
	Impact			Please explain the potential impacts and how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
Age Older or younger people or a specific age grouping	X			
Disability e.g. Effects on people with mental, physical, sensory impairment, learning disability, visible/invisible, progressive or recurring	X			
Gender Reassignment/ Gender Identity anybody whose gender identity or gender expression is different to the sex assigned to them at birth	X			
Marriage or Civil Partnership people who	X			

are married or in a civil partnership				
Pregnancy and Maternity (refers to the period after the birth, and is linked to maternity leave in the employment context. In the non-work context, protection against maternity discrimination is for 26 weeks after giving birth),	X			
Race Groups: including colour, nationality, ethnic origins, including minorities (e.g. gypsy travellers, refugees, migrants and asylum seekers)	X			
Religion or Belief: different beliefs, customs (including atheists and those with no aligned belief)	X			
Sex women and men (girls and boys)	X			
Sexual Orientation , e.g. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Heterosexual	X			

3.3 Fairer Scotland Duty

This duty places a legal responsibility on Scottish Borders Council (SBC) to actively consider (give due regard) to how we can reduce inequalities of outcome caused by socioeconomic disadvantage when making strategic decisions.

The duty is set at a strategic level - these are the key, high level decisions that SBC will take. This would normally include strategy documents, decisions about setting priorities, allocating resources and commissioning services.

Is the proposal strategic?

Yes

If No go to Section 4

If yes, please indicate any potential impact on the undernoted groups this proposal may have and how you know this:

	Impact			State here how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
Low and/or No Wealth – enough money to meet basic living costs and pay bills but have no savings to deal with any unexpected spends and no provision for the future.	X			
Material Deprivation – being unable to access basic goods and services i.e. financial products like life insurance, repair/replace broken electrical goods, warm home, leisure and hobbies	X			
Area Deprivation – where you live (e.g. rural areas), where you work	X			

(e.g. accessibility of transport)				
Socio-economic Background – social class i.e. parents' education, employment and income	X			
Looked after and accommodated children and young people	X			
Carers paid and unpaid including family members	X			
Homelessness	X			
Addictions and substance use	X			
Those involved within the criminal justice system	X			

4 Full Integrated Impact Assessment Required

Select No if you have answered “No” to all of Sections 3.1 – 3.3.

No (please delete as applicable)

If a full impact assessment is not required briefly explain why there are no effects and provide justification for the decision.

The service review will take into account leavers from the service and will not have a direct impact on employees.

The service provides internal support to the Council.

There will be an impact in loss of knowledge and experience.

Signed by Lead Officer:	Clair Hepburn
Designation:	Director, People, Performance & Change
Date:	09/02/2023
Counter Signature Director	Clair Hepburn
Date:	09/02/2023

Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA)

Part 1 Scoping

1 Details of the Proposal

Title of Proposal:	Residential Care Retendering
What is it?	A new Policy/Strategy/Practice <input type="checkbox"/> A revised Policy/Strategy/Practice X
Description of the proposal: (Set out a clear understanding of the purpose of the proposal being developed or reviewed (what are the aims, objectives and intended outcomes, including the context within which it will operate).)	Review of delivery arrangements for Residential Care to ensure the service delivery model provides best value in an environment of increasing service demand.
Service Area: Department:	Strategic Commissioning & Partnerships Adult Social Care
Lead Officer: (Name and job title)	Julie Glen Operations Director, Adult Social Care
Other Officers/Partners involved: (List names, job titles and organisations)	Transformation programme support/HSC

Date(s) IIA completed:	03/02/2022 Revised 10/02/2023

2 Will there be any cumulative impacts as a result of the relationship between this proposal and other policies?

Yes <i>(please delete as applicable)</i>
If yes, - please state here: Departmental practices and procedures.

3 Legislative Requirements

3.1 Relevance to the Equality Duty:	
<p>Do you believe your proposal has any relevance under the Equality Act 2010? Yes</p> <p><i>(If you believe that your proposal may have some relevance – however small please indicate yes. If there is no effect, please enter “No” and go to Section 3.2.)</i></p>	
Equality Duty	Reasoning:
Elimination of discrimination (both direct & indirect), victimisation and harassment. <i>(Will the proposal discriminate? Or help eliminate discrimination?)</i>	An improvement to the service delivery model will help eliminate discrimination.
Promotion of equality of opportunity?	The proposal will improve opportunities for older people and therefore enhance equality of opportunity.

(Will your proposal help or hinder the Council with this)	
Foster good relations? (Will your proposal help or hinder the council's relationships with those who have equality characteristics?)	N/A

3.2 Which groups of people do you think will be or potentially could be, impacted by the implementation of this proposal? (You should consider employees, clients, customers / service users, and any other relevant groups)				
Please tick below as appropriate, outlining any potential impacts on the undernoted equality groups this proposal may have and how you know this.				
	Impact			Please explain the potential impacts and how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
Age Older or younger people or a specific age grouping		X		The improvement of service delivery for residential care will have a positive impact on older people requiring such care.
Disability e.g. Effects on people with mental, physical, sensory impairment, learning disability, visible/invisible, progressive or recurring		X		The improvement of service delivery for residential care will have a positive impact on people with a disability requiring such care.
Gender Reassignment/ Gender Identity anybody whose gender identity or gender expression is different to the sex assigned to them at birth	X			

Marriage or Civil Partnership people who are married or in a civil partnership	X			
Pregnancy and Maternity (refers to the period after the birth, and is linked to maternity leave in the employment context. In the non-work context, protection against maternity discrimination is for 26 weeks after giving birth),	X			
Race Groups: including colour, nationality, ethnic origins, including minorities (e.g. gypsy travellers, refugees, migrants and asylum seekers)	X			
Religion or Belief: different beliefs, customs (including atheists and those with no aligned belief)	X			
Sex women and men (girls and boys)	X			
Sexual Orientation , e.g. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Heterosexual	X			

3.3 Fairer Scotland Duty

This duty places a legal responsibility on Scottish Borders Council (SBC) to actively consider (give due regard) to how we can reduce inequalities of outcome caused by socioeconomic disadvantage when making strategic decisions.

The duty is set at a strategic level - these are the key, high level decisions that SBC will take. This would normally include strategy documents, decisions about setting priorities, allocating resources and commissioning services.

Is the proposal strategic?

Yes (*please delete as applicable*)

If No go to Section 4

If yes, please indicate any potential impact on the undernoted groups this proposal may have and how you know this:

	Impact			State here how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
Low and/or No Wealth – enough money to meet basic living costs and pay bills but have no savings to deal with any unexpected spends and no provision for the future.		X		An increase in FTE will mean greater employment opportunities.
Material Deprivation – being unable to access basic goods and services i.e. financial products like life insurance, repair/replace broken electrical goods, warm home, leisure and hobbies		X		As above
Area Deprivation – where you live (e.g. rural areas), where you work	X			

(e.g. accessibility of transport)				
Socio-economic Background – social class i.e. parents' education, employment and income	X			
Looked after and accommodated children and young people	X			
Carers paid and unpaid including family members		X		An improvement in residential care facilities will benefit family carers.
Homelessness	X			
Addictions and substance use	X			
Those involved within the criminal justice system	X			

4 Full Integrated Impact Assessment Required

Select No if you have answered “No” to all of Sections 3.1 – 3.3.

No (please delete as applicable)

If a full impact assessment is not required briefly explain why there are no effects and provide justification for the decision.

--

Signed by Lead Officer:	Julie Glen
Designation:	Operations Director, Adult Social Care
Date:	10/02/2023
Counter Signature Director	Jen Holland, Director of Strategic Commissioning and Partnerships
Date:	10/02/2023

Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA)

Part 1 Scoping

1 Details of the Proposal

Title of Proposal:	Strategic Commissioning Savings
What is it?	A new Policy/Strategy/Practice X A revised Policy/Strategy/Practice
Description of the proposal: (Set out a clear understanding of the purpose of the proposal being developed or reviewed (what are the aims, objectives and intended outcomes, including the context within which it will operate).)	Comprehensive review of Strategic Commissioning within Scottish Borders Council
Service Area: Department:	Strategic Commissioning & Partnerships
Lead Officer: (Name and job title)	Jen Holland, Director of Strategic Commissioning and Partnerships
Other Officers/Partners involved: (List names, job titles and organisations)	Mark Williamson, HR Business Partner
Date(s) IIA completed:	10/02/2023

--	--

2 Will there be any cumulative impacts as a result of the relationship between this proposal and other policies?

No <i>(please delete as applicable)</i>
If yes, - please state here:

3 Legislative Requirements

3.1 Relevance to the Equality Duty:	
<p>Do you believe your proposal has any relevance under the Equality Act 2010? No</p> <p><i>(If you believe that your proposal may have some relevance – however small please indicate yes. If there is no effect, please enter “No” and go to Section 3.2.)</i></p>	
Equality Duty	Reasoning:
<p>Elimination of discrimination (both direct & indirect), victimisation and harassment.</p> <p><i>(Will the proposal discriminate? Or help eliminate discrimination?)</i></p>	
<p>Promotion of equality of opportunity?</p> <p><i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the Council with this)</i></p>	
<p>Foster good relations?</p>	

(Will your proposal help or hinder the council's relationships with those who have equality characteristics?)

**3.2 Which groups of people do you think will be or potentially could be, impacted by the implementation of this proposal?
(You should consider employees, clients, customers / service users, and any other relevant groups)**

Please tick below as appropriate, outlining any potential impacts on the undernoted equality groups this proposal may have and how you know this.

	Impact			Please explain the potential impacts and how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
Age Older or younger people or a specific age grouping	X			
Disability e.g. Effects on people with mental, physical, sensory impairment, learning disability, visible/invisible, progressive or recurring	X			
Gender Reassignment/ Gender Identity anybody whose gender identity or gender expression is different to the sex assigned to them at birth	X			
Marriage or Civil Partnership people who are married or in a civil partnership	X			

Pregnancy and Maternity (refers to the period after the birth, and is linked to maternity leave in the employment context. In the non-work context, protection against maternity discrimination is for 26 weeks after giving birth),	X			
Race Groups: including colour, nationality, ethnic origins, including minorities (e.g. gypsy travellers, refugees, migrants and asylum seekers)	X			
Religion or Belief: different beliefs, customs (including atheists and those with no aligned belief)	X			
Sex women and men (girls and boys)	X			
Sexual Orientation , e.g. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Heterosexual	X			

3.3 Fairer Scotland Duty

This duty places a legal responsibility on Scottish Borders Council (SBC) to actively consider (give due regard) to how we can reduce inequalities of outcome caused by socioeconomic disadvantage when making strategic decisions.

The duty is set at a strategic level - these are the key, high level decisions that SBC will take. This would normally include strategy documents, decisions about setting priorities, allocating resources and commissioning services.

Is the proposal strategic?

Yes (please delete as applicable)

If No go to Section 4

If yes, please indicate any potential impact on the undernoted groups this proposal may have and how you know this:

	Impact			State here how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
Low and/or No Wealth – enough money to meet basic living costs and pay bills but have no savings to deal with any unexpected spends and no provision for the future.	X			Early proposals indicate that Commissioning services are to be centralised where appropriate. This would result in a change in Directorate or Line Management for employees only.
Material Deprivation – being unable to access basic goods and services i.e. financial products like life insurance, repair/replace broken electrical goods, warm home, leisure and hobbies	X			Early proposals indicate that Commissioning services are to be centralised where appropriate. This would result in a change in Directorate or Line Management for employees only.
Area Deprivation – where you live (e.g. rural areas), where you work (e.g. accessibility of transport)	X			Early proposals indicate that Commissioning services are to be centralised where appropriate. This would result in a change in Directorate or Line Management for employees only.
Socio-economic Background – social	X			Early proposals indicate that Commissioning services are

class i.e. parents' education, employment and income				to be centralised where appropriate. This would result in a change in Directorate or Line Management for employees only.
Looked after and accommodated children and young people	X			Early proposals indicate that Commissioning services are to be centralised where appropriate. This would result in a change in Directorate or Line Management for employees only.
Carers paid and unpaid including family members	X			Early proposals indicate that Commissioning services are to be centralised where appropriate. This would result in a change in Directorate or Line Management for employees only.
Homelessness	X			Early proposals indicate that Commissioning services are to be centralised where appropriate. This would result in a change in Directorate or Line Management for employees only.
Addictions and substance use	X			Early proposals indicate that Commissioning services are to be centralised where appropriate. This would result in a change in Directorate or Line Management for employees only.
Those involved within the criminal justice system	X			Early proposals indicate that Commissioning services are to be centralised where appropriate. This would result in a change in Directorate or Line

				Management for employees only.
--	--	--	--	--------------------------------

4 Full Integrated Impact Assessment Required

Select No if you have answered “No” to all of Sections 3.1 – 3.3.

Yes (please delete as applicable)

If a full impact assessment is not required briefly explain why there are no effects and provide justification for the decision.

The newly established Commissioning service has been established within Scottish Borders Council. This is a strategic function supporting services. A commissioning Board will be established which monitors needs and performance against commissioned contracts and develop new opportunities to meet needs.

Signed by Lead Officer:	Jen Holland
Designation:	Director of Strategic Commissioning and Partnerships
Date:	10/02/2023
Counter Signature Director	Jen Holland, Director of Strategic Commissioning and Partnerships
Date:	10/02/2023

Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA)

Part 1 Scoping

1 Details of the Proposal

<p>Title of Proposal:</p>	<p>Border Care Alarms – Increased Income – Strategic Commissioning & Partnerships</p>
<p>What is it?</p>	<p>A new Policy/Strategy/Practice <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>A revised Policy/Strategy/Practice <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>Description of the proposal:</p> <p>(Set out a clear understanding of the purpose of the proposal being developed or reviewed (what are the aims, objectives and intended outcomes, including the context within which it will operate).</p>	<p>The proposal is to expand the market for Bordercare Alarms. This will be done through promotion of the service and the positive benefits and impacts of the service. There is also an increase in the weekly charge of the Bordercare Alarm, in line with agreed fees and charges increase</p> <p>The personal alarm service offers peace of mind and reassurance if a client has an accident, fall or illness. Help is available at the touch of a button.</p> <p>(1) Alarms are connected to a standard telephone landline and are monitored 24 hours a day.</p>

	(2) In the event where help is required, the Council will contact family, friends or the emergency services or even just provide reassurance.
Service Area: Department:	Strategic Commissioning & Partnerships
Lead Officer: (Name and job title)	Jen Holland, Director of Strategic Commissioning and Partnerships
Other Officers/Partners involved: (List names, job titles and organisations)	Derek Boyle Independent Living & Corporate Services Manager
Date(s) IIA completed:	10/02/2023

2 Will there be any cumulative impacts as a result of the relationship between this proposal and other policies?

No <i>(please delete as applicable)</i>
If yes, - please state here:

3 Legislative Requirements

3.1 Relevance to the Equality Duty:

<p>Do you believe your proposal has any relevance under the Equality Act 2010? Yes</p> <p><i>(If you believe that your proposal may have some relevance – however small please indicate yes. If there is no effect, please enter “No” and go to Section 3.2.)</i></p>	
Equality Duty	Reasoning:
<p>Elimination of discrimination (both direct & indirect), victimisation and harassment.</p> <p><i>(Will the proposal discriminate? Or help eliminate discrimination?)</i></p>	The change in the weekly charge of the Border Care alarm system will be the same for all.
<p>Promotion of equality of opportunity?</p> <p><i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the Council with this)</i></p>	The change in the weekly charge of the Border Care alarm system will be the same for to all but will affect certain groups more..
<p>Foster good relations?</p> <p><i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the council s relationships with those who have equality characteristics?)</i></p>	N/A

<p>3.2 Which groups of people do you think will be or potentially could be, impacted by the implementation of this proposal?</p> <p>(You should consider employees, clients, customers / service users, and any other relevant groups)</p>				
<p>Please tick below as appropriate, outlining any potential impacts on the undernoted equality groups this proposal may have and how you know this.</p>				
	Impact			Please explain the potential impacts and how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
Age Older or younger people or a specific age grouping			X	By changing the cost of the Border Care Alarm system, will have an impact on costs to people using the service. This will

				<p>increase the cost by £13.00 per year.</p> <p>This will have a larger effect on elderly people who are more likely to use the alarm system.</p> <p>Elderly people may also have less disposable income.</p> <p>The increase is a small one and below the rate of inflation.</p>
<p>Disability e.g. Effects on people with mental, physical, sensory impairment, learning disability, visible/invisible, progressive or recurring</p>			X	<p>By changing the cost of the Border Care Alarm system, will have an impact on costs to people using the service. This will increase the cost by £13.00 per year.</p> <p>This will have a larger effect on disabled people who are more likely to use the alarm system. People may also have less disposable income given statistically unemployment rates are higher for people with a disability.</p> <p>The increase is a small one and below the rate of inflation.</p>
<p>Gender Reassignment/ Gender Identity anybody whose gender identity or gender expression is different to the sex assigned to them at birth</p>		X		<p>By changing the cost of the Border Care Alarm system, will have an impact on costs to people using the service. This will increase the cost by £13.00 per year. This will have no different impact on clients who have had a gender reassignment or have a trans/transgender identity.</p>
<p>Marriage or Civil Partnership people who</p>		X		<p>By changing the cost of the Border Care Alarm system, will have an impact on costs to people using the service. This will increase the cost by £13.00 per</p>

are married or in a civil partnership				year. This will have no different impact on clients who are married or who are in a civil partnership.
Pregnancy and Maternity (refers to the period after the birth, and is linked to maternity leave in the employment context. In the non-work context, protection against maternity discrimination is for 26 weeks after giving birth),	X			By changing the cost of the Border Care Alarm system, will have an impact on costs to people using the service. This will increase the cost by £13.00 per year. This will have no different impact on clients who are pregnant or on maternity leave.
Race Groups: including colour, nationality, ethnic origins, including minorities (e.g. gypsy travellers, refugees, migrants and asylum seekers)	X			By changing the cost of the Border Care Alarm system, will have an impact on costs to people using the service. This will increase the cost by £13.00 per year. This will have no different impact on clients within different racial groups.
Religion or Belief: different beliefs, customs (including atheists and those with no aligned belief)	X			By changing the cost of the Border Care Alarm system, will have an impact on costs to people using the service. This will increase the cost by £13.00 per year. This will have no different impact on clients of different religions or beliefs.
Sex women and men (girls and boys)	X			By changing the cost of the Border Care Alarm system, will have an impact on costs to people using the service. This will increase the cost by £13.00 per year. This will have no different impact on clients on the basis of their sex.
Sexual Orientation , e.g. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Heterosexual	X			By changing the cost of the Border Care Alarm system, will have an impact on costs to people using the service. This will increase the cost by £13.00 per year. This will have no different impact on clients with different sexual orientation.

3.3 Fairer Scotland Duty

This duty places a legal responsibility on Scottish Borders Council (SBC) to actively consider (give due regard) to how we can reduce inequalities of outcome caused by socioeconomic disadvantage when making strategic decisions.

The duty is set at a strategic level - these are the key, high level decisions that SBC will take. This would normally include strategy documents, decisions about setting priorities, allocating resources and commissioning services.

Is the proposal strategic?

Yes *(please delete as applicable)*

If No go to Section 4

If yes, please indicate any potential impact on the undernoted groups this proposal may have and how you know this:

	Impact			State here how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
<p>Low and/or No Wealth – enough money to meet basic living costs and pay bills but have no savings to deal with any unexpected spends and no provision for the future.</p>			X	<p>The increase will affect those with low/ no wealth more than others.</p> <p>Against that the increase is a small one and below the rate of inflation.</p>
<p>Material Deprivation – being unable to access basic goods and services i.e. financial products like life insurance, repair/replace broken electrical goods,</p>			X	<p>The increase will affect those who are materially deprived more than others.</p> <p>Against that the increase is a small one and below the rate of inflation.</p>

warm home, leisure and hobbies				
Area Deprivation – where you live (e.g. rural areas), where you work (e.g. accessibility of transport)	X			
Socio-economic Background – social class i.e. parents' education, employment and income	X			
Looked after and accommodated children and young people	X			
Carers paid and unpaid including family members	X			
Homelessness	X			
Addictions and substance use	X			
Those involved within the criminal justice system	X			

4 Full Integrated Impact Assessment Required

Select No if you have answered “No” to all of Sections 3.1 – 3.3.

No (please delete as applicable)

If a full impact assessment is not required briefly explain why there are no effects and provide justification for the decision.

--

Signed by Lead Officer:	Jen Holland
Designation:	Director of Strategic Commissioning and Partnerships
Date:	10/02/2023
Counter Signature Director	Jen Holland, Director of Strategic Commissioning and Partnerships
Date:	10/02/2023

