

Appendix 2 Risk Register

Nos.	Raised by	Date Raised	Probability	Impact	Gross Risk Score	Proximity	Description	Mitigation	Owner	Target Date	Revised Probability	Revised Impact	Residual Risk Score
DHP001 145	PW	19/2/16	3	4	12	Short term	Those most in need of support don't receive it due to greater demand for DHPs in the second half of the year, and expenditure being too high in the 1 st half year.	Monitor expenditure monthly. Consider changing length and amount of awards during year to target those most in need	PW	31/3/18	2	3	6
	PW	22/1/15	4	3	12	Long term	Council challenged on application of policy by unsuccessful applicants.	10% check of applications carried out to ensure decision making is consistent	PW	31/3/18	2	3	6
	PW	22/1/15	2	4	8	Short term	Unintended negative impact on specific customer groups	Monitor successful and unsuccessful applications against the criteria established in the policy	PW	31/3/18	1	4	4

Appendix 3

Initial Equalities Impact Assessment

1. Within the aims and objectives of the policy or strategy which group (s) of people has been identified as being potentially disadvantaged by your proposals? What are the equality impacts?

The Discretionary Housing Payment policy is intended to support those who are disadvantaged by changes to Housing Benefit rules, specifically the under occupation rules in the social sector, the Benefit Cap and the changes to Local Housing Allowance rates. The under occupation rules disproportionately impact older customers (from 45 to pension age) and people with a disability. The Benefit Cap affects mainly households where there are lots of children (and in most cases a single parent). The Local Housing Allowance changes impact mainly on households with children. As such, if the DHP policy is not applied correctly, these groups could be disadvantaged.

In the past Citizens Advice has expressed concern at the treatment of income related to disability benefits (Disability Living Allowance, Personal Independence Payment and Attendance Allowance). They believe that taking such income into account when determining DHP applications could be discriminatory as such income is intended to meet costs related to the illness or disability concerned. The Council's view is that it is reasonable to take such income into account provided that any expenditure related to such income is also taken into account. The presence of such income prompts officers to ask specific questions related to expenditure on care costs and related items.

2. In brief, what changes are you planning to make to your current or proposed new or changed policy, strategy, procedure, project or service to minimise or eliminate the adverse equality impacts?
Please provide further details of the proposed actions, timetable for making the changes and the person(s) responsible for making the changes on the resultant action plan

In 2015/16 the DHP policy was narrowed in scope to take account of reduced government funding. This resulted in priority being given to families with children. From 2016 the government has increased the DHP grant which meant that this narrowing of priorities was removed.

The Welfare Reform team have developed strong partnerships with a wide range of support organisations. Where financial support cannot be provided, customers will be referred to appropriate organisations for support..

As the policy is discretionary people who are in groups at risk of being disadvantaged can still receive DHP awards if to do so meets the policy's broader objectives.

3. Please provide details of whom you will consult on the proposed changes and if you do not plan to consult, please provide the rationale behind that decision. Please note that you are required to involve disabled people in decisions that impact on them

We are not consulting externally on the change to the DHP policy. There is no change being proposed to the DHP policy. As such the process of consultation may raise unrealistic expectations and would be an unproductive exercise at this point, as it would not generate any information that the Council hasn't already anticipated or did not know.

4. Can the adverse impacts you identified during the initial screening be justified without making any adjustments to the existing or new policy, strategy, procedure, project or service?
Please set out the basis on which you justify making no adjustments

As this policy is discretionary, all applications will be considered on their merit. Where an application meets the aims of the policy, it is intended to provide support.

The policy is a fairly straightforward one to apply. CEB should note that, as it is a discretionary payment the Council are not intending to set out any circumstances in which we definitely wouldn't support someone. If an application meets various policy aims, it will be successful.

5. You are legally required to monitor and review the proposed changes after implementation to check they work as planned and to screen for unexpected equality impacts.
Please provide details of how you will monitor/evaluate or review your proposals and when the review will take place

A 10% check of applications will be carried out to ensure consistency of decision making. This will be done for both successful and unsuccessful applications. Monitoring will be carried out on a monthly basis, and this will also include the reason for the application being made. Regular reports have also been provided to Scrutiny Committee in the last two years. It is expected that this will continue.

This page is intentionally left blank