

quality Impact Assessment	Please enter responses below in the right hand columns
TEMPLATE UPDATED SEPT 2015 Date	Monday 4 th March 2019
<p>Sign-off path for EIA (please add/delete as applicable) If you are conducting an EIA on a Cabinet decision, it should come to Corporate EIA panel for sign off.</p> <p>There is no corporately set sign off path for EIAs. It is up to you to decide the level of risk (legal, community, political, equalities) and to think about the appropriate level of scrutiny and challenge. If you are not sure email equalities@lambeth.gov.uk Places where an EIA can be signed off are listed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Head of Equalities (email equalities@lambeth.gov.uk) • Director (this must be a director not responsible for the service/policy subject to EIA) • Strategic Director or Chief Exec • Directorate Management Team (Children, Health and Adults, Corporate Resources, Neighbourhoods and Growth) • Procurement Board • Corporate EIA Panel • Cabinet
Title of Project, business area, policy/strategy	LB Lambeth Redress Scheme
Author	David Orekoya
Job title, directorate	Lead Commissioner-Health Improvement
Contact email and telephone	DOrekoya@lambeth.gov.uk 0207 926 0477
Strategic Director Sponsor	Fiona Connolly, Strategic Director, Adults and Health

London Borough of Lambeth Equality Impact Assessment

Please enter responses below in the right hand columns.

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Business activity aims and intentions

In brief explain the aims of your proposal/project/service, why is it needed? Who is it aimed at? What is the intended outcome? What are the links to the political vision, and outcomes?

In January 2018 Lambeth Council established the Lambeth Children's Homes Redress Scheme to compensate survivors of sexual, physical and psychological abuse suffered at homes managed by the Council open from the 1930s until the 1980s and 1990s. The scheme is the first of its kind in England and was established in response to evidence of widespread mistreatment or abuse to which many individuals were subject to over the period in question.

The Council approved the establishment of the scheme in September 2017 which is intended to give survivors swift and compassionate redress without having to go through the courts. By simplifying the redress process, the scheme means far more of the compensation goes to survivors of abuse, rather than being taken up by legal fees. It also means no survivor will have to restate their experience of abuse in court.

An initial EIA based on the principle of establishing a Redress Scheme was conducted in September 2017. Following review by the Council's Corporate Equalities Panel the recommendation from the assessment was that the such a scheme would -by mitigating the need for potentially drawn out litigation- be clearly in line with and beneficial for the Council's duties under Equalities and Human Rights legislation.

Following ratification of the proposed Redress Scheme Policy by Cabinet and full Council in December 2017, the Lambeth Redress Scheme was launched formally on 2nd January 2018. As part of the implementation plan the Council committed to undertake a further Equalities Impact Assessment (EIA) on the first 6 months operation of the scheme. This EIA was completed and reviewed by the Corporate Equalities Panel in September 2018. This EIA concluded that during the first 6 months the implementation of the scheme was broadly beneficial for all equalities characteristics whilst also making

recommendations regarding communication and engagement to maximise the promotion of the scheme amongst key groups of people may have been entitled to register a claim. These recommendations were that the Council continued to use a multi-channel approach to advertise the scheme both locally and nationally, which encompassed:

- Advertising the scheme in the national press in recognition that many affected individuals live outside London in other parts of the UK
- Piloting targeted advertising at media more likely to be used by particular communities, some of whom may have returned to their home countries, such as individuals of African Caribbean and Irish ethnicity.
- Ensuring organisations that represent victims and survivors have up to date information about the scheme
- Advertising with a range of national and local voluntary sector, advocacy and advice agencies and media outlets including those that represent and/or work with a range of potentially vulnerable groups including: older people; people with physical and/or learning disabilities; carers organisation; and welfare and legal advice agencies (including in the legal press); and offenders.
- Providing information in easy read and audio file format for individuals who may need support with literacy or have a visual impairment.
- Distributing information to local partners and providers who deliver care on behalf of the Council in case they may identify individuals who may be entitled to claim but due to incapacity or ill health are unable to do so without assistance
- Checking the Council's social care database to see whether there are any vulnerable individuals –including those who lack capacity- currently in receipt of social care or other support from the Council, who may come under the auspices of the scheme.

Aims and Objectives of Equalities Impact Assessment

The Council also committed to refreshing the EIA at the end of first year of the scheme and every subsequent year thereafter for the lifetime of the scheme. The aim of this EIA is to assist understanding of the reach and impact at the end of the first year based on applications received and settlement of claims from 2nd January 2018 to 31st December 2018. As such it consists of 2 interrelated sections.

Section 1

- A. Brief overview of the equalities characteristics of the potential cohort of applicants
- B. Analysis of the Equalities characteristics of those have a lodged a claim

Section 2

1. Analysis of the equalities characteristics of those who have had a claim settled and who have received or been offered a Harms Way or Individual Redress Payment under the scheme.

As with the previous EIA's there are number of caveats regarding availability of equalities data including:

- Changes in legislative and policy for equalities monitoring for key 'protected characteristics' including ethnicity, disability and sexual orientation.
- Differences in information governance standards that prevailed during the period in question which means that the local authority only has partial information on the denominator population - i.e. all children who were accommodated in and/or in the care of children's home managed by the Council at the time.
- Ongoing evolution of our understanding of issues pertaining to health and disability compared to the available knowledge at the time.
- The fact that we cannot and should not require individuals who are making an application to the Redress Scheme or associated elements (i.e. Subject Access Requests) to divulge equalities information. As a result the Council only has partial equalities information on those who have accessed the scheme, and many applicants who have provided equalities information have not done so for all equalities fields.

1. Potential Cohort of Redress Applicants

Based on available information it is estimated that up to 15,000 children were accommodated in Shirley Oaks and other homes managed by the Council up until the early 1990's.

- Admissions registers for the Shirley Oaks School and residential complex from 1936-1973 record some 8589 admissions by a total of 6472 individual children. Of these 3670(57%) were boys and 2749 (43%) were girls. Data regarding ethnicity and disability was not recorded and cannot be surmised from available paper records.
- Admissions data from Southvale residential group homes from 1967-1995 show 3519 individual records. Of these 1609 (46%) were girls and 1905 (54%) were boys. Age on admission for the vast majority of children was between 2-15 years old although significant numbers were under 2 and over 15. Of the children admitted 1424 (41%) are identified as potentially of black or ethnic minority heritage. However the general categorisations assigned to children at the time render meaningful disaggregation virtually impossible. However given the likely changes in the composition of the population of Lambeth and neighbouring boroughs during this time, it is highly probable that many of these individuals would have been of mixed black and white and black African Caribbean ethnicity. This is supported by national evidence that suggest over representation of children of African Caribbean heritage received into care during the time that these homes were open.
- Approximately 200 individuals had records indicating that admission to Southvale was for assessment of behavioural, physical or learning disability which encompasses 60 recorded as having Extra Special Needs (ESN); 123 as 'maladjusted' and 23 as having a physical disability. Subsequently at least some 120 children and young people were moved on to establishments including remand home, approved schools and homes for behavioural and/or adjustment disorder. This suggests that some of these individuals may have been vulnerable and had further contact with mental health, learning disability, criminal justice and related services.
- From 1936-1964 based on composition of both the Lambeth and London population these individuals would have been mainly white British or white Irish, many of whom are now over 60 with a significant number aged over 70.

- From 1965 to the mid 1990's children received into care or accommodated in these homes would have been from an increasingly diverse background principally but not exclusively Black African Caribbean, Black African and multi-ethnic Anglo-Caribbean and Anglo-African descent.

Many of these individuals would have experienced socio-economic and racial disadvantage including:

- being from families with lower socio-economic status as measured by parental educational, housing, occupation and income status
- experiencing (familial) neglect or abuse which may have led to the reception into care
- vulnerability due to physical, learning disability, mental health or conduct (behavioural) disorder
- Experiencing stigma linked to both to specific characteristics-i.e. ethnicity, gender, disability or health status- as well for being accommodated or received into care of the local authority.

2. Equalities Characteristics of Lambeth Redress Scheme Applicants

From 2nd January 2018-31st December 2018 there were 1002 applications for compensation and redress under the Council's scheme of whom 537 provided some equalities information, though not all respondents completed all equalities fields. In consequence this means it is not possible to cross match equalities data to understand if there are any specific trends regarding the intersection of different equalities characteristics. Nevertheless summary of the available information indicates that:

- Gender: of 456 respondents who stated their gender 236 (49%) applications were from men and 245 (51%) were from women
- Ethnicity: of 516 respondents 353 (70%) identified as White or White English, Scottish or Northern Irish; 8 (2%) identified as Irish; 99 (20%) as Black or Black Caribbean or Black African; and 29 (6%) identified as Anglo-African or Anglo Caribbean ethnicity. Further analysis based on record of when individuals stated they were in care shows that of claims by those identifying as White or White English, Scottish or Northern Irish some 210 (59%) were in care prior to 1965 indicating that majority of these applicants were in their mid-50's and over which

is in line with understanding of demographics at the time. In comparison just over half (52%) of applicants stating they were of Black or Black Caribbean or Black African descent were in care post 1965 which appears consistent with demographic data as well as evidence of the overrepresentation of Black Caribbean and African children in care during the 1970's and 80's given that these communities have never made up more than 25% of the overall Lambeth population.

- Disability: of 464 respondents, 222 (48%) reported having no disability; 105 (22%) stated they had a disability that limited their daily activities a little; and 137 (30%) said they had a disability which limited their daily activities a lot. These responses reflected their current health and/or disability status not necessarily that when they would have been in care. Based on the age and population profile of applicants it is likely that some of these issues may be related to physical health conditions. For some individuals it may reflect psychological and mental health conditions, although we are unable to determine any causal relationship between experience in care and mental health outcomes based on these responses. However based on testimony and national evidence we know that victims of trauma and abuse have higher expressed levels of prevalence of poor mental health including substance misuse, offending and mental health conditions including depression, PTSD and self-harm.
- Age: the ages of Scheme applicants ranges from early mid 30's up to the those who are over 70 which reflects the period of time when people may have been exposed to harm or abuse. It is estimated that approximately 170 (17%) applicants (17%) to date are over 70, with an estimated 300 individuals aged between 55-70 (30%)
- Religion: of 477 respondents 272 (57%) identified as Christian; 110 (23%) of no religious affiliation ; and 19 as Jewish (4%). Once again this appears to be substantially in line with changing demographics over the time in question.

	<p>3. Summary of Redress Payment Equalities Data</p> <p>To date the Council has made offers of either Harms Way Payments to 851 Individuals during the the first year of the scheme with a further 68 applicants receiving Individual Redress Payments. Section 2 below provides a summary based on available equalities information. Key points to note are that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determination of claims will relate to the individual circumstances with respect to each claim which means that comparisons regarding outcomes by equalities characteristics are not straightforward. • At this stage there have been a relatively small number of finalised offers so it is not possible to establish any specific trends at this point. <p>Therefore Section 2 of this EIA provides the update of the current position based on the available equalities information provided by applicants to the scheme.</p>
<p>2.0 Analysing your equalities evidence</p>	
<p>2.1 Evidence</p> <p><i>Any proposed business activity, new policy or strategy, service change, or procurement must be informed by carrying out an assessment of the likely impact that it may have. In this section please include both data and analysis which shows that you understand how this decision is likely to affect residents that fall under the protected characteristics enshrined in law and the local characteristics which we consider to be important in Lambeth (language, health and socio-economic factors).</i></p> <p>IF YOUR PROPOSAL ALSO IMPACTS ON LAMBETH COUNCIL STAFF YOU NEED TO COMPLETE A STAFFING EIA.</p>	
<p>Protected characteristics and local equality characteristics</p>	<p>Impact analysis</p> <p>For each characteristic please indicate the type of impact (i.e. positive, negative, positive and negative, none, or unknown), and:</p>

*Please explain how you justify your claims around impacts.
Please include any data and evidence that you have collected including from surveys, performance data or complaints to support your proposed changes.
Please indicate sources of data and the date it relates to/was produced (e.g. 'Residents Survey, wave 10, April 12' or 'Lambeth Business Survey 2012' etc.)*

Race

Of those applicants who provided information 99 identified (21%) identified as Black, Black Caribbean or Black African and a further 29 (6%) identified as dual heritage (Anglo African or Anglo Caribbean). Ethnicity data is available for 85 individuals who have had claims for a Harms Way payment settled to date. As set out in Table 1 below 18 (21%) are Black, Black African or Black Caribbean and a further 3 (3%) are of multi-ethnic heritage.

Table 1

	Column Labels	
	Harm's Way Payment Only	
Row Labels	Count of Ethnic origin	Sum of HWP
Asian/Asian British	1	2500
Black/African/Caribbean/Black British	18	170000
Mixed/multiple ethnic groups	3	30000
Not completed	3	30000
White	60	487500
Grand Total	85	720000

HWP and IRP

The following chart does not show only the final payment figures in Table 2, but also those where an HWP has been paid and the IRP is under consideration or has been offered. Those applications that were rejected from the scheme or did not meet the criteria have not been included. Of 400 offers 65 (16%) were Black/African/Caribbean and a further 42(10%) are of multi-ethnic heritage. These are broadly in line with what might be anticipated given the cohort of individuals who might be eligible to claim.

All HWP and IRP:

Table 2

Column Labels	HWP and IRP			
Row Labels	Count of Ethnic origin	Sum of HWP	Sum of Interim IRP	Sum of Final IRP
Asian/Asian British	1	10000		
Black/African/Caribbean/Black British	65	557500		1258
Mixed/multiple ethnic groups	42	388500		430
Not completed	16	160000		
Other ethnic group	1	10000		
White	275	2415000	28500	4462
Grand Total	400	3541000	28500	6150



HWP and IRP where full/final payment has been made:

The following chart Table 3, shows applications for both HWP and IRP where a final payment has been made. It is worth noting that this can include those where the final IRP has been made, as well as those where the HWP has been made then the IRP withdrawn, and those where the IRP was valued at less than the HWP and no further payment was made to the applicant. Of these 13 (13%) have been made to Black/African/Caribbean applicants and 12 (12%) have been to applicants of multi-ethnic heritage. Based on the small numbers it would be premature to draw any conclusions to date.

Table 3

Column Labels	HWP and IRP			
Row Labels	Count of Ethnic origin	Sum of HWP	Sum of Interim IRP	Sum of Final IRP
Black/African/Caribbean/Black British	13	112500		1258
Mixed/multiple ethnic groups	12	103500		430
Not completed	1	10000		
White	70	625000	6000	4462
Grand Total	96	851000	6000	6150



Gender	Available information indicates that of Harms Way payments made and IRPs under consideration 182 have been to men and 145 to women which is broadly in line with the gender balance of those in care and overall applicants to the scheme. The Council will continue to monitor the scheme to ensure that applications from both women and men are settled appropriately.
Gender re-assignment	Information regarding this equalities characteristic has not been previously captured either formerly or informally during the period in question. Despite this there is no evidence to suggest that the operation of the Redress Scheme to date will have any negative impact on people with this equality characteristic.
Disability	<p><u>Payment breakdown by disability</u></p> <p>HWP only:</p> <p>This chart shows the HWP payments actually made, it excludes those where a HWP offer has been made or is under consideration. It also omits those applications that have been rejected or not accepted into the scheme. Of the 85 people who have received a Harm's Way Payment 16 (18%) stated that they had a health condition or disability that had a considerable impact on their daily living and a further 13 (15%) stated they had a disability or health condition that impacted on them much less significantly. The responses reflect the current situation for these individuals not their health status or any disability whilst they were in care. Further details are not available regarding the specific health condition or disability that individuals have reported.</p> <p>Table 1</p>

Column Labels 		
Harm's Way Payment Only		
Row Labels 	Count of Disability	Sum of HWP
No	49	410000
Yes, limited a little	13	120000
Yes, limited a lot	16	140000
Not completed	7	50000
Grand Total	85	720000

HWP and IRP

Table 2 shows not only final payment figures, but also those where a HWP has been paid and the IRP is under consideration or has been offered. Those applications that were rejected from the scheme or did not meet the criteria have not been included. Based on this data 99 of 392 (25%), declared they had a disability or health condition that limited their daily functioning a lot and a further 84 (21%) felt that they had a condition or disability that limited them a little.

Table 2

Column Labels 				
HWP and IRP				
Row Labels 	Count of Disability	Sum of HWP	Sum of Interim IRP	Sum of Final IRP
No	149	1365000		309080
Yes, limited a little	84	721000	12500	131500
Yes, limited a lot	99	912500	16000	113000
Not completed	60	542500		61500
Grand Total	392	3541000	28500	615080

HWP and IRP where final payment has been made:

Table 3 shows applications for both HWP and IRP where a final payment has been made. It is worth noting that this can include those where the final IRP has been made, as well as those where the HWP has been made then the IRP withdrawn, and those where the IRP was valued at less than the HWP and no further payment was made to the applicant. Of 96 final settlements to date 19(20%) and have been to individuals who have stated they have a disability or health condition that limits them a lot and 21(22%) stated they were limited a little by a disability or health condition. As previously stated further details regarding the nature of any disability or health condition was not available.

Table 3

Column Labels <input type="button" value="v"/>				
HWP and IRP				
Row Labels <input type="button" value="v"/>	Count of Disability	Sum of HWP	Sum of Interim IRP	Sum of Final IRP
No	41	365000		309080
Yes, limited a little	21	166000		131500
Yes, limited a lot	19	182500	6000	113000
Not completed	15	137500		61500
Grand Total	96	851000	6000	615080

Age

Of 117 Harms Way only Payments offered in Table 1 47 (40%) were to individuals aged 55-64; 35 (30%) to people those 65-74; and a further 11 (9%) to those aged 75-84 which reflects when these events will have occurred.

Table 1

Row Labels	Count of Age bracket	Sum of HWP payment
35-44	1	10000
45-54	22	182500
55-64	47	430000
65-74	35	276000
75-84	11	87500
85+	1	10000
Grand Total	117	996000

Where a Harms Way Payment has been settled and or IRP offered the comparable figures are set out in Table 2.

HWP and IRP

This chart does not show only the final payment figures, but also those where a HWP has been paid and the IRP is under consideration or has been offered. Those applications that were rejected from the scheme or did not meet the criteria have not been included. Of these 165 (28%) are 45-54; 232(39%) 55-64; and 144(24%) are 65-74.

Table 2

Row Labels	Count of Age bracket	Sum of HWP payment	Sum of Interim IRP	Sum of Final IRP
25-34	3	30000		
35-44	27	257500	5000	
45-54	165	1470000	12500	100
55-64	232	2172500	31000	205
65-74	144	1328500	15000	65
75-84	21	202500		
85+	3	20000	10000	
Grand Total	595	5481000	73500	370

HWP & IRP with final payments

Table 3 shows applications for both HWP and IRP where a final payment has been made. It is worth noting that this can include those where the final IRP has been made, as well as those where the HWP has been made then the IRP withdrawn, and those where the IRP was valued at less than the HWP and no further payment was made to the applicant. Of these 29(17%) are aged 45-54; 53(32%) are 55-64; and 69(42%) are 65-74.

Table 3

Row Labels	Count of Age bracket	Sum of HWP payment	Sum of Interim IRP	Sum of Final IRP
25-34	1	5000		
35-44	7	65000		
45-54	29	260000		2801
55-64	53	483500	6000	3278
65-74	69	617500	5000	2817
75-84	7	57500		265
Grand Total	166	1488500	11000	9161

Sexual orientation

Information regarding this equalities characteristic has not been previously captured either formally or informally during the period in question.

Despite this there is no evidence to suggest that the operation of the Redress Scheme to date will have any negative impact on people with this equality characteristic.

Religion and belief

Data on offers of Harms Way or IRP payments has not been broken down by faith or religious belief.

	<p>Despite this there is no evidence to suggest that the operation of the Redress Scheme to date will have any negative impact on people with this equality characteristic</p>
Pregnancy and maternity	<p>Information regarding this equalities characteristic has not been previously captured either formerly or informally during the period in question.</p> <p>Despite this there is no evidence to suggest that the operation of the Redress Scheme to date will have any negative impact on people with this equality characteristic.</p>
Marriage and civil partnership	<p>Information regarding this equalities characteristic has not been previously captured either formerly or informally during the period in question.</p> <p>Despite this there is no evidence to suggest that the operation of the Redress Scheme to date will have any negative impact on people with this equality characteristic.</p>
Socio-economic factors	<p>Data on the socioeconomic status of applicants to the scheme is not captured. However the national and local policy evidence is that the majority of children received into care are more likely to have come from lower socio-economic backgrounds. These individuals are more likely to experience persistently worse outcomes across all life domains including education, income and health as a result of being in care which may have been compound by exposure to and/or fear of abuse. This means they may be more likely to be in poor housing and on low incomes including benefits. To this as part of the scheme we have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advised all applicants, family members or carers submitting applications on behalf of an individual to get appropriate legal advice which is paid for by the Council. • Made sure that there is practical advice and support (including with completing forms, accessing documents and records) available to those accessing the scheme.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Signposted individuals who may be awarded compensation whilst in receipt of benefits to appropriate advice regarding how they might manage the impact of any award on their benefit claim. <p>These all form part of the overall Redress Scheme and are available to all applicants for the duration of the scheme. In addition implementation of the scheme should reduce the financial, administrative, emotional and psychological burden of already vulnerable individuals seeking compensation.</p>
Language	<p>Information regarding language barriers is not collated as part of the scheme. However as part of the overall scheme design the Council has recognised that some individuals may need support to a language issue (i.e. English is not their first language or they have difficulties with literacy or communication difficulty linked to a learning disability, cognitive disability i.e. dementia or linked to dyslexia for instance). To address this the Council has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advised all applicants, family members or carers submitting applications on behalf of an individual to get appropriate legal advice which is paid for by the Council. • Made sure that there is practical advice and support (including with completing forms, accessing documents and records) available to those accessing the scheme • Signposted individuals who may be awarded compensation whilst in receipt of benefits to appropriate advice regarding how they might manage the impact of any award on their benefit claim.
Health	<p>The Council knows that some individuals will have been placed in care in one of the specialist units managed by the Lambeth, due to a learning disability, physical or mental health condition for which they would have required support. Therefore the Council has instituted a project to cross check the adult social care database with records of those in</p>

	<p>the affected children’s homes to identify if any current beneficiaries of care services may be eligible for compensation. To date this has yielded data regarding 40 people who may be entitled to seek compensation.</p> <p>We are now reviewing the records and information about these individuals so that we can better understand the current circumstances and care needs of these individuals. This is in order to help the Council decide how best to engage with them or their families and carers and provide information about the scheme. This will include providing assistance to them to make an application where necessary.</p> <p>Where it is established that an individual who was in one of the specialist units lacks capacity the Council will adopt the legal framework pertaining to mental capacity to work with their family, carers and legal representatives in order to make a Harms Way payment to them in their best interest.</p>
<p>2.2 Gaps in evidence base <i>What gaps in information have you identified from your analysis? In your response please identify areas where more information is required and how you intend to fill in the gaps. If you are unable to fill in the gaps please state this clearly with justification.</i></p>	<p>The Council is aware that we do not have information on several of the equalities characteristics and have only partial information for race, gender, disability and health. This reflects the fact that the Council cannot make it a requirement of the Scheme that applicants must supply equalities information. Therefore we are reliant on that information that they are willing to volunteer. Moreover in order to maintain a proportionate approach the Council has requested applicants provide data on race, gender, disability, health religion and age as it is felt that these are relevant for the purposes of the scheme whilst other areas might be considered more intrusive.</p>
<p>3.0 Consultation, Involvement and Coproduction</p>	
<p>3.1 Coproduction, involvement and consultation <i>Who are your key stakeholders and how have you consulted, coproduced or</i></p>	<p>The Redress Scheme has been developed with extensive input from a range of stakeholders incorporating Shirley Oaks Survivors Association and their legal advisor; Cabinet and Members; and senior officers. This has been to ensure that the scheme is in line with the principles espoused and recognises the council’s ethical and moral duty whilst remaining within the boundaries of the authority’s constitutional and financial</p>

<p><i>involved them? What difference did this make?</i></p>	<p>authority. The Council continues to take on stakeholder insight and feedback to refine the operation of the scheme where appropriate within the bounds of the Council’s legal and constitutional obligations.</p> <p>The Council has also engaged a consultant to garner feedback from applicants regarding their experience of accessing the scheme. Engagement is currently ongoing.</p>
<p>3.2 Gaps in coproduction, consultation and involvement <i>What gaps in consultation and involvement and coproduction have you identified (set out any gaps as they relate to specific equality groups)? Please describe where more consultation, involvement and/or coproduction is required and set out how you intend to undertake it. If you do not intend to undertake it, please set out your justification.</i></p>	<p>The Council acknowledges that gaps remain in the available equalities information due in part to the historical nature of events some of which date back to before the formal constitution of the Council in 1965. Furthermore access to the Scheme cannot be predicated on completion of equalities data by applicants, so the Council is reliant on individuals self-reporting this. By definition, this means that the Council will only have partial equalities information.</p> <p>Nevertheless the Council will continue efforts to ensure key groups access the scheme including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People of African Caribbean, African and Irish ethnicity. • People with learning and physical disabilities, particularly those who may lack the capacity to make a claim on their behalf. • Older people and those individuals who may be in poor health. • Individuals who have died but may have family members who may be entitled to claim on their behalf.
<p>4.0 Conclusions, justification and action</p>	
<p>4.1 Conclusions and justification <i>What are the main conclusions of this EIA? What, if any, disproportionate negative or positive equality impacts did you identify at 2.1? On what grounds do you justify them and how will they be mitigated?</i></p>	<p>As outlined the applications to the Scheme to date have been broadly in line with the Council’s expectations. Nevertheless the Council is committed to maximising uptake of the scheme as far as possible from people who may be eligible to make a claim. To achieve this the Council will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to adopt a multi-channel approach to advertising the scheme in both national, targeted and specialist publications in recognition that many affected individuals live outside London in other parts of the UK.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure organisations that represent victims and survivors have up to date information about the scheme. • Regularly circulate information about the scheme both local locally and nationally to health and voluntary sector partners and organisations including advocacy and advice agencies; media outlets; those that represent and/or work with a range of potentially vulnerable groups such as older people; people with physical and/or learning disabilities; carers organisation; and welfare and legal advice agencies (including in the legal press); and offenders. • Continuing to provide information in easy read and audio file format for individuals who may need support with literacy or have a visual impairment. • Following up on those individuals identified on the adult social care database who may be entitled to make a claim so that a mechanism can be put in place to enable this especially where they lack capacity or may be deceased.
--	---

4.2 Equality Action plan

Please list the equality issue/s identified through the evidence and the mitigating action to be taken. Please also detail the date when the action will be taken and the name and job title of the responsible officer.

Equality Issue	Mitigating actions
<p>Example: That the equality analysis may not have accurately covered all the equality impacts; and the mitigations may not act to reduce disproportionate impact</p>	<p>Example: Review the EIA and assess whether the mitigating actions were sufficient. 12/09/12. Joe Bloggs. Head of ABC</p>

5.0 Publishing your results	
The results of your EIA must be published. Once the business activity has been implemented the EIA must be periodically reviewed to ensure your decision/change had the anticipated impact and the actions set out at 4.2 are still appropriate.	
EIA publishing date	
EIA review date	
Assessment sign off (name/job title):	

All completed and signed-off EIAs must be submitted to equalities@lambeth.gov.uk for publication on Lambeth's website. Where possible, please anonymise your EIAs prior to submission (i.e. please remove any references to an officers' name, email and phone number).