

Equality & Poverty Impact Assessment 00925 (Version 1)

SECTION ONE: ESSENTIAL INFORMATION

Service & Division:	Social Work Adult Services None	Lead Officer Name:	Nimi Akindele
		Team:	HSCP
		Tel:	07732833021
		Email:	nimi.akindele@falkirk.gov.uk
Proposal:	This EPIA is being submitted on behalf of Gail Duncan Denny Cross Medical Practice are looking to expand boundary area to cover the FK5 area, the Practice currently covers FK4 and FK6. The FK5 area covers the Larbert and Stenhousemuir areas which have continued housing development work.		Reference No:

What is the Proposal?	Budget & Other Financial Decision	Policy (New or Change)	HR Policy & Practice	Change to Service Delivery / Service Design
	No	No	No	Yes

Who does the Proposal affect?	Service Users	Members of the Public	Employees	Job Applicants
	No	Yes	Yes	No

Other, please specify:

Identify the main aims and projected outcome of this proposal (please add date of each update):

01/01/2026	Expand boundary area of Denny Cross Medical Practice to cover the FK5 area

SECTION TWO: FINANCIAL INFORMATION

For budget changes ONLY please include information below:		Benchmark, e.g. Scottish Average	
Current spend on this service (£'0000s)	Total:		
Reduction to this service budget (£'0000s)	Per Annum:		
Increase to this service budget (£'000s)	Per Annum:		
If this is a change to a charge or concession please complete.	Current Annual Income Total:		
	Expected Annual Income Total:		
If this is a budget decision, when will the saving be achieved?	Start Date:		
	End Date (if any):		

SECTION THREE: EVIDENCE Please include any evidence or relevant information that has influenced the decisions contained in this EPIA. (This could include demographic profiles; audits; research; health needs assessments; national guidance or legislative requirements and how this relates to the protected characteristic groups.)

A - Quantitative Evidence This is evidence which is numerical and should include the number people who use the service and the number of people from the protected characteristic groups who might be affected by changes to the service.

There are approximately 12000 people in the Larbert area. At this time it is assumed that everyone in the area is registered with a Practice, the change will offer the option of a wider choice of practices to people who are new to the area.

B - Qualitative Evidence This is data which describes the effect or impact of a change on a group of people, e.g. some information provided as part of performance reporting.

Social - case studies; personal / group feedback / other

Best Judgement:

Has best judgement been used in place of data/research/evidence?	No
Who provided the best judgement and what was this based on?	
What gaps in data / information were identified?	
Is further research necessary?	No
If NO, please state why.	No further research is needed to expand the boundary area

SECTION FOUR: ENGAGEMENT

Engagement with individuals or organisations affected by the policy or proposal must take place

Has the proposal / policy / project been subject to engagement or consultation with service users taking into account their protected characteristics and socio-economic status?	No	
If YES, please state who was engagement with.		
If NO engagement has been conducted, please state why.	In expanding the Practice boundary area there is no anticipated negative effect on service users. The contractual process for a redefinition of boundary area requires that the GP subcommittee considers the impact of boundary redefinitions. The GP subcommittee gave their professional view that there would be no negative impact on patients.	
How was the engagement carried out?	What were the results from the engagement? Please list...	
Focus Group	No	
Survey	No	
Display / Exhibitions	No	
User Panels	No	
Public Event	No	
Other: please specify		
Has the proposal / policy/ project been reviewed / changed as a result of the engagement?	No	
Have the results of the engagement been fed back to the consultees?	No	
Is further engagement recommended?	No	

SECTION FIVE: ASSESSING THE IMPACT

Equality Protected Characteristics: What will the impact of implementing this proposal be on people who share characteristics protected by the Equality Act 2010 or are likely to be affected by the proposal / policy / project? This section allows you to consider other impacts, e.g. poverty, health inequalities, community justice, carers etc.

Protected Characteristic	Neutral Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	Please provide evidence of the impact on this protected characteristic.
Age	✓			Age will not impact an individuals ability to register to the practice.
Disability	✓			The practice is a slightly further distance to travel from Larbert than one that is within the area. Someone with a disability may have difficulty making the journey. In this instance the patient could register with one of the local practices that are open. If the local practices are not open to accepting new patients in the area, the Contracts Team can assign a patient to the surgery that is most convenient to them. Denny Practice does not offer any services in addition to that of which is already offered in other practices in the area.
Sex	✓			Sex will not impact an individuals ability to register to the practice.
Ethnicity	✓			Ethnicity will not impact an individuals ability to register to the practice.
Religion / Belief / non-Belief	✓			Religion or belief will not impact an individuals ability to register to the practice.
Sexual Orientation	✓			Sexual Orientation will not impact an individuals ability to register to the practice.
Transgender	✓			Transgender will not impact an individuals ability to register to the practice.
Pregnancy / Maternity	✓			Pregnancy/Maternity will not impact an individuals ability to register to the practice.
Marriage / Civil Partnership	✓			Marriage/Civil Partnership will not impact an individuals ability to register to the practice.
Poverty	✓			Any travel may be costly to a patient, if a patient is unable to travel to Denny due to costs they can register with a local Practice if they are open to accepting patients. If Practices in the area are not open to registering patients the contracts team can assign the patient to a suitable Practice. Denny Practice does not offer any services in addition to that of which is already offered in the other Practices in the area.
Care Experienced	✓			Care Experience will not impact an individuals ability to register to the practice.
Other, health, community justice, carers etc.	✓			An individual's characteristic will not impact on their ability to register to the practice.

Public Sector Equality Duty: Scottish Public Authorities must have 'due regard' to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, advance quality of opportunity and foster good relations. Scottish specific duties include:

	Evidence of Due Regard
Eliminate Unlawful Discrimination (harassment, victimisation and other prohibited conduct):	GP practices are bound by the GMS contract to accept patients in their catchment area to their list regardless of characteristics
Advance Equality of Opportunity:	
Foster Good Relations (promoting understanding and reducing prejudice):	

SECTION SIX: PARTNERS / OTHER STAKEHOLDERS

Which sectors are likely to have an interest in or be affected by the proposal / policy / project?		Describe the interest / affect.
Business	Yes	GP Practices in the FK5 area may experience less patient registrations, however these Practices have been closed to new patient registrations for a significant portion of the last three years due to being at capacity.
Councils	No	
Education Sector	No	
Fire	No	
NHS	No	
Integration Joint Board	No	
Police	No	
Third Sector	No	
Other(s): please list and describe the nature of the relationship / impact.		

SECTION SEVEN: ACTION PLANNING

Mitigating Actions: If you have identified impacts on protected characteristic groups in Section 5 please summarise these in the table below detailing the actions you are taking to mitigate or support this impact. If you are not taking any action to support or mitigate the impact you should complete the No Mitigating Actions section below instead.

Identified Impact	To Who	Action(s)	Lead Officer	Evaluation and Review Date	Strategic Reference to Corporate Plan / Service Plan / Quality Outcomes

No Mitigating Actions

Please explain why you do not need to take any action to mitigate or support the impact of your proposals.

There is already a mitigating action in place in that officers within the Health Board can ensure that patients who may experience access issues can be registered nearer their home as appropriate. In addition there is no obligation for any person to register with the Denny Practice if they do not choose to.

Are actions being reported to Members?

No

If yes when and how ?

SECTION EIGHT: ASSESSMENT OUTCOME

Only one of following statements best matches your assessment of this proposal / policy / project. Please select one and provide your reasons.

No major change required	Yes	There may be an impact with individuals who may be affected by poverty and/or have a disability. However, this is unlikely as there are other practices which will be better suited.
The proposal has to be adjusted to reduce impact on protected characteristic groups	No	
Continue with the proposal but it is not possible to remove all the risk to protected characteristic groups	No	
Stop the proposal as it is potentially in breach of equality legislation	No	

SECTION NINE: LEAD OFFICER SIGN OFF

Lead Officer:

Signature:	<i>Nimi Akindele</i>	Date:	29/11/2024
------------	----------------------	-------	------------

SECTION TEN: EPIA TASK GROUP ONLY

OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF EPIA:	Has the EPIA demonstrated the use of data, appropriate engagement, identified mitigating actions as well as ownership and appropriate review of actions to confidently demonstrate compliance with the general and public sector equality duties?	No
------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

ASSESSMENT FINDINGS	There is a lack of sufficient data available, therefore the detail in the EPIA is limited.	
If YES, use this box to highlight evidence in support of the assessment of the EPIA		
If NO, use this box to highlight actions needed to improve the EPIA		

Where adverse impact on diverse communities has been identified and it is intended to continue with the proposal / policy / project, has justification for continuing <u>without making changes been made</u>?	Yes	If YES, please describe: The impact in this case is particularly limited and as detailed in the EPIA, there are mitigating actions already in place.
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

LEVEL OF IMPACT: The EPIA Task Group has agreed the following level of impact on the protected characteristic groups highlighted within the EPIA

LEVEL		COMMENTS
HIGH	Yes / No	
MEDIUM	Yes / No	
LOW	Yes	This proposal has a very limited impact on people.

SECTION ELEVEN: CHIEF OFFICER SIGN OFF

Director / Head of Service:		
Signature:	<i>Tom Cowan</i>	Date: 18/12/2024