



Securing Client Contributions – Executive Report Appendices		
Appendix 1	Consultation Outcomes Report: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Appendix A: Consultation document• Appendix B: Consultation survey• Appendix C: Presentation given at events/forums• Appendix D: Letter to people in receipt of community-based social care• Appendix E: October 2018 Press release	Pages 2 - 44
Appendix 2	Equality Impact Assessment	Pages 44 - 54
Appendix 3	DPIA Screening Questions	Pages 55 - 59

Appendix 1 – Consultation Outcomes Report:

North Yorkshire County Council

Health and Adult Services

**Consultation on fair charges for the cost of care
29th October 2018 - 21st January 2019**

Consultation Report

1. Introduction

The purpose of this report is to give an overview of the public consultation ‘Fair charges for the cost of care’, and to provide the results of the consultation.

The consultation was commissioned as a result of the need to find savings in the county council’s budget following significant reductions in the Government grant from 2010 onwards.

The consultation covered two main areas:

- The cost of transport to places where people may receive a service;
- How the total cost of care is calculated.

Timeline

The meeting of the County Council HAS Executive on 19 October 2018 gave approval for the proposals to go forward to public consultation.

Reports were taken to the Care and Independence Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 27th September 2018 and 17th December 2018.

The consultation took place between 29th October 2018 and 21st January 2019, a period of 12 weeks.

Public events took place in November 2018, plus attendance of senior officers at a number of community forums.

The analysis of the consultation responses was carried out during late January/early February 2019.

The findings of the consultation were used to inform the final versions of the equality impact assessments that accompanied the consultation, and the recommendations for each of the proposals.

The findings have been considered in February 2019 by Health and Adult Services Management Board, going forward to Health and Adult Services Executive in May 2019 for review. If approved, proposals will be implemented from June 2019 onwards.

2. Methodology

The methods of consultation were:

- a) A consultation document explaining the proposals, the rationale for the proposals, the decision making process, and how to feed back views (appendix 1).
- b) A survey available on the Council's website, and also available in easy-read as a download on the website, in paper format on request, and any other format such as large print or audio on request (appendix 2).

The most popular alternative format was easy-read; there were also a small number of requests for large print and audio.

- c) Seven public events were held in order to allow people to contribute to the consultation face to face. The events were held in Northallerton, Richmond, Harrogate, Malton, Scarborough, Selby and Skipton.
- d) Paper copies of the consultation document and survey – standard and easy-read versions - were made available at the events and community forums, at libraries and at Adult Social Care reception points across the county.

Packs of paper consultation documents and surveys were provided on request for community forums.

- e) In addition, officers attended and gave presentations to the North Yorkshire Learning Disability Partnership Board in September 2018, the North Yorkshire Disability Forum in September and December 2018, and the North Yorkshire Forum for Older People in December 2018 (presentation – appendix 3).
- f) People were also able to contribute to the consultation via email or letter, and contact details for this were provided.

3. Communication

A letter (appendix 4) was sent to all those who were shown as being in receipt of community-based social care services on the Adult Social Care customer database – 4060 in total.

informed all those who may be directly affected by the proposals.

The aim of the letter was to tell people about the consultation and how to take part. An easy read version of the letter was included with the standard letter.

Press releases (appendix 5) were sent out on 31st October 2018 and 11th December 2018.

The social media platforms Twitter and Facebook were used to publicise the consultation, plus the NYCC website.

Publicity was sent out via social media on three occasions: when the consultation went live, in mid-December, and in early January 2019.

Information about the consultation was sent to networks via email and e-bulletins, including the following:

- North Yorkshire Learning Disability Partnership Board
- Keyring self-advocacy support service
- North Yorkshire Disability Forum and local disability forums
- North Yorkshire Forum for Older People
- Age UK North Yorkshire
- Carers Centres
- North Yorkshire Carers Forum circulation list
- Adult Social Care provider list (approx. 800 providers)
- Dementia strategy network
- Healthwatch North Yorkshire e-bulletin
- Community First Yorkshire e-bulletin

It was also sent to partner statutory organisations including district councils, clinical commissioning groups, community voluntary associations and community care associations.

A page on the County Council's website was produced, with summary information and all the documents available as downloads, including easy read versions, and the link to the survey. The page also included information about the public events.

The Corporate Director of Health and Adult Services, Richard Webb, was interviewed on Radio York about the consultation on 7th November 2018.

4. Responders to the consultation:

There were approximately 100 attendees in total at the public events and 47 attendees at Boards and Forums (not including officers and guests).

411 people responded to the survey, via a combination of the online survey, paper surveys, and easy-read paper surveys. 135 paper surveys were received, 58 of the standard version including large print, and 77 easy-read surveys.

Comparing the number of responders who indicated that they were in receipt of adult social care or a family member of someone receiving social care (268) with the number of letters sent directly to people on the Adult Social Care customer database (4060), the response rate to the survey was 6.6%

9 emails that constituted a response to the consultation rather than a general query were received, three of these were after the consultation closing date.

9 letters were received that constituted a response to the consultation, including one letter received after the closing date.

Note that some responders will have responded to the consultation in more than one way, for example by completing a survey and by attending an event.

The comments from the survey in full, notes of events, minutes of community forums, email and letter responses can be seen in the appendices. Note that to preserve anonymity there has been some redaction, and a small number of responses by letter will be submitted to decision makers but not made publicly available for that reason.

5. Analysis of responses to the consultation survey

Question 1: The average cost of travel to a social care service using transport provided by the County Council is over £18 per journey. At the moment, we charge £2.70 per day for this transport. We are proposing to charge £7.50 per journey in future, with the Council continuing to pay for the remainder.

Do you think that this is a reasonable split of the costs?

YES: 37% (142)
NO: 63% (241)

Of those who indicated that they used social care or were the family carer of a person using social care, and indicated that they used transport services (70 people), the responses to question 1 (increase cost per journey to £7.50) are as follows:

YES: 17% (12)
NO: 83% (57)

This indicates a significantly higher level of disagreement with the proposal from people who said that they use the transport service.

Looking at the demographic profile of responders (appendix 6), people aged 65+ were slightly more likely to agree with the proposal, particularly those in the age group 75-84. There was no significant difference in response between men and women, or between people who identified themselves as disabled and those who did not. The number of minority ethnic responders was very low (3 people or 1%), however all 3 disagreed with the proposal.

Question 2: If not, what do you think a reasonable level would be?

Number of responders suggesting a specific amount: **162** (*note: a small number of respondents (3) proposed a per-journey fare and a reduced return fare and have therefore been counted twice*).

Proposals for amount considered to be ‘reasonable level’ (per journey/per day not specified):

Note: a number of suggestions did not specify whether they were per journey or per day. Given that question 1 specified a per-journey charge, it is likely that responders were therefore suggesting an alternative per-journey charge, but this cannot be assumed.

<u>Cost</u>	<u>Number of respondents</u>
£1 - £3	6
£3 - £4	12
£4 - £5	1
£5	36
£5 - £5.50	5
£6	1
£7.50	1

Proposals that specify cost per day/per return journey:

<u>Cost</u>	<u>Number of respondents</u>
No change / £2.70	17
£5.00	22
£7.50	13
Between £3 and £4	9
Between £4 and £5	2
Between £5 and £6	4
Between £8 and £10	3

Proposals that specify cost per journey:

<u>Cost</u>	<u>Number of respondents</u>
Between £2.50 and £3	8
Between £3 and £4	6
Between £4 and £5	1
£5.00	13
£8.00	1
£10.00	1

Aggregating per day/per journey proposals to give a 'per day' cost:

<u>Cost</u>	<u>No. of respondents</u>
No change/£2.70	17
Between £3 & £4	9
Between £4 & £5	2
£5	22
Between £5 & £6	12
Between £6 & £8	19
Between £8 & £10	4
£10	13
£10+	2

Other proposals
£15 week/£60 per month
50/50 split
Proposals for reduced return fare
£12 return, £8 single
£7.50 return, £5 single
£5 return, £3 single

Comments for question 2: If not, what do you think a reasonable level would be?

Looking at the comments for question 2 made by those who use transport services (70) and taking out suggestions for alternative sums which have been summarised elsewhere in the report, the following were the most frequently occurring themes:

- The increase is too high
- Concern about affordability, impact on those on low income, family budget
- Some agreement that the current rate is too low, but that the proposed increase is too high
- Suggestions to look at the effectiveness and efficiency of the current system

- Concern that people may refuse services/not access services

All comments for question 2:

Proposed increase is too steep/too high	49
Concern about impact on people on low income/benefits; impact on household budget/family income; not affordable; people in receipt of social care more likely to be on low income	35
Concern that people may stop using services; increase in social isolation; impact on providers if people stop using services	17
Need to assess person's ability to pay/should be means-tested	14
Increases should be gradual, not all at once	12
Unfair to charge same for all: charge mileage or percentage on individual journey costs	12
Impact on disabled people/disabled young people/people with care needs – unfair/discriminatory	11
Should be fully funded.	10
Comparisons of proposed charges and commercial providers/public transport; proposals are more expensive than public transport; may reduce take-up of council transport	7

Should charge for round trip, not per journey	5
Council should look at effectiveness of current transport system/cheaper providers/efficiency of invoicing for travel costs	5
Government funding: council already funded for transport; council should lobby for increased funding; Government has increased funding for adult social care; already pay via tax and NI; concern re how council uses Govt. funding for transport	4
Other	4
Comments around standard and enhanced mobility rates/proposed increase higher than standard mobility rate	3
Find other savings; senior council officers should take pay cut; reduce councillor allowances	3
Other: link to percentage increase in service users' income; link to percentage increase in providers' payments; increase in line with inflation;	3
Reduce need for travel/provide services closer to home/concern about lack of rural services	2
Not enough information given to be able to comment	2

Question 3: Do you agree with our proposal to have a cap on transport charges to ensure that no-one has to pay more than £40 per week?

YES: 70% (266)
NO: 30% (112)

Of those who indicated that they used social care or were the family carer of a person using social care, and indicated that they used transport services (70 people), the responses to question 3 (cap on transport charges) are as follows:

YES: 59% (39)
NO: 41% (27)

This shows that people who use the transport service agree with the proposal for a cap, but not to the same extent as all responders.

Looking at the demographic profile (appendix 6), people in the age ranges 30-39 and 50-64 were less likely to agree with the proposal for a cap. Men were less likely to agree with the proposal than women. There was no identifiable variation for ethnicity. Disabled people were slightly more likely to agree with the proposal.

31 respondents proposed a specific alternative amount for the cap:

<u>Amount</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
£3:	1 person
£4:	1 person
£5:	1 person
£15:	2 people
£15 or £20:	1 person
£20:	3 people
£25:	11 people
£30:	7 people

Phased cap: 2 people

- a) £15 yr 1, £25 yr 2, £40 yr 3
- b) £20 yr 1, £30 yr 2

Comments for question 4: If not, why do you disagree?

Looking at the comments for question 3 made by those who use transport services (70) and taking out suggestions for alternative sums for the cap which have been summarised elsewhere in the report, the following were the most frequently occurring themes:

- The proposed amount for the cap is too high.
- The proposed amount is not affordable particularly for people on benefits
- People may refuse services, increase in social isolation, increase in costs to council if care at home breaks down

All comments for question 4

Proposed increase is too steep/too high	61
Concern about impact on people on low income/benefits; impact on household budget/family income; not affordable; people in receipt of social care more likely to be on low income	38
Need to assess person's ability to pay/should be means-tested/sliding scale	17
Concern that people may stop using services; increase in social isolation; impact on providers if people stop using services; may result in increased needs therefore increased cost to council	12
Should be free/fully funded.	10
Impact on disabled people/disabled young people/people with care needs – unfair/discriminatory	7
Concerns re fairness: unfair to charge same for all; charge mileage; unfair to be charged same as someone using the service more often; how to ensure system is fair	6
Increases should be gradual, not all at once	5
Comments around standard and enhanced mobility rates/proposed increase higher than standard mobility rate/base cap on level of mobility award/proposed cap disproportionate to amount of mobility award	5
Other	3
Comparisons of proposed charges and commercial providers/public transport/voluntary transport	2

Comments for question 5: Do you have any other comments regarding our transport proposals or transport service?

Concern about impact on people on low income/benefits; impact on household budget/family income; not affordable; people in receipt of social care more likely to be on low income	33
Concern that people may stop using services; increase in social isolation; impact on providers if people stop using services; may result in increased needs therefore increased cost to council	30
Importance/value of transport service and staff; transport should be available to more people; essential to those disabled people who cannot use public transport	21
Suggestions for alternatives to current transport system eg community transport, sharing taxis, integration with health/schools, sponsorship, families, travel training, increase availability of public transport; use concessionary passes before 9am	18
Need to assess person's ability to pay/should be means-tested/financial assessment/sliding scale	16
Proposed increases are too steep/too high	14
Need to ensure effectiveness/efficiency of current transport system, occupancy levels, running costs of system, efficiency of invoicing	13
Impact on disabled people/disabled young people/people with care needs – unfair, discriminatory	12
Other	11
Difficulty of accessing services and alternative/public transport in rural areas; need for services closer to home	9



Council should find other savings/funding/revenue	8
Costs should be based on distance or mileage	8
Proposals may have unintended impact on transport costs eg may reduce take-up of council transport/increase overall cost of transport to council	7
Agree with proposals	7
Impact on family carers, loss of respite/breaks	5
Comments on consultation/concern about effectiveness of consultation	4
The transport should be free	4
Comments about costings: how have the proposed amounts have been calculated; charges will need to be well-explained	3
Need to look at individuals' needs, look for alternatives for each individual, use care assessment to do this	3
Increases should be gradual, not all at once	3
Government funding; concern re reductions in Government funding; council should lobby Government	2
Comments on equality impact assessment/Equality Act	2

Comments about purpose and use of motability allowance and vehicles	2
Transport service is poorly run, poor service, not value for money	2

[Note: the comments about transport proposals from a small group of responders related to hospital transport.]

Question 6: Do you agree that the full cost of providing social care should be taken into account when working out how much people who use social care should contribute toward the cost?

YES: 59% (220)
NO: 41% (152)

Of those of who indicated that they used social care or were the family carer of a person using social care, and indicated that they had a second carer (68 people), the responses to question 6 are as follows:

YES: 40% (26)
NO: 60% (39)

Whilst overall the responses to the consultation indicate agreement with the proposal, those who stated that they had a second carer did not agree. The percentage of Y/N responses were reversed, eg from 59% YES to 60% NO.

Looking at the demographic profile (appendix 6), for age there was no substantial difference, except in the age group 85+ who were more likely to disagree with the proposal. Men were more likely to disagree than women. As for question 1, the number of minority ethnic responders was very low (3 people or 1% of the total), however all 3 disagreed with the proposal. Disabled people were more likely to disagree with the proposal.

Question 7: If not, why do you disagree?

Looking at the comments for question 7 made by people who said that they or a family member had a second carer, the following were the most frequently occurring themes:

- Concern about impact on disabled people, that the most disabled and vulnerable would be affected and that it was unfair to penalise them
- Concern that people did not have a choice about whether or not to have two care workers, because it was required for health and safety reasons
- Concerns about money: about affordability, running out of savings, people have already contributed eg through council tax
- Comments about poor value for money for the care received, and poor quality for the money

All comments for question 7

Concern about impact on those most in need, the most vulnerable; discriminatory; the most vulnerable should be protected; role of society to protect; unfair as disabled/ill people do not have choice about needing care	51
Concern about impact on people with low income; concern about ability to afford other costs of living; increasing costs of living; people who receive social care more likely to have low income	18
Two carers not choice of the individual; individual has to accept two carers; council/provider decision to allocate two carers due to Health and Safety/hoists	17
Concern about current costs and affordability for those who pay; costs already too high; concern about using up savings to pay for care/running out of savings	15
Alternative proposals for the way in which the council should calculate for care eg for task/episode/needs; alternative models of care; care system needs to be more joined up/integrated	14
Other	12
Care should be free; available to all; based on need not ability to pay	11



Means-testing – importance of; importance of assessing affordability; concern that financial assessment does not cover all of a person’s disability-related needs	10
Unfair as people have already contributed through tax, NI, council tax	8
May result in increased costs to council if person can no longer manage to stay in their own home/moves to residential care/runs out of savings more quickly	8
Proposals penalise those who have worked hard/have savings; unfair on those who have saved up	7
Concern about value for money of care; quality of care versus cost; quality of service not good enough for cost; concerns about quality of care workers; need to pay care workers more	6
Needs to take individuals’ needs into account; importance of care assessment; need to have flexible client-centred approach; risk assessments	6
Council should find other savings; proposals for other ways to make savings; government should increase funding; social care funding should be seen as priority	5
Comments about consultation; comments about information/examples provided; proposals not clear; questions about way in which costs calculated	5
Charges already too high for self-funders; increase is too high for self-funders; concern about affordability for self-funders	4
Council should look at overall costs of care; make savings on cost of care; efficiency of provision; efficiency and accuracy of provider billing; commercial providers cost less	3

Concern about impact on family carers; unfair on family carers who have saved the council money by providing care	3
Agree with concept of means-testing to assess fair contribution to care costs	2
Agree with proposal – fairness	2
Keep it as it is now	2
Too big an increase; increases should be phased in	3
Comments about NHS role/contribution to costs of care; NHS should be paying for some conditions	2

Question 8: Do you have any other comments regarding our cost of care proposal?

Concern about impact on those most in need, the most vulnerable; discriminatory; the most vulnerable should be protected; unfair as disabled/ill people do not have choice about needing care; concern that people will feel that they are a burden; poorer outcomes	19
Agree with proposal for contributing to full costs of care/two care workers	16
Agree with principle of contribution to cost of care; agree with principle but concerned about affordability	16
Comments about means-testing; how affordability levels set; concern about what financial assessment does/does not take into account; need to consider living costs/household budget/reasonable standard of living; concern that 100% of income is included	16
Alternative proposals for delivery of care, calculation of costs of care, funding of social care, contribution to costs of care; look at other ways to support people, other models of care; directly employ care workers; cap on cost of care	15



Comments on consultation and on information/examples provided; not enough information; comments on example cost of care calculations; do not understand proposals; comments on equality impact assessment	13
Concern that proposals would increase costs to the council; if care at home not affordable, more people will require residential care; proposals undermine the push for care at home; concern that people will run out of savings more quickly	10
Concern that people may make choices based on what they feel they can afford rather than need; concern that people will reduce care visits; concern that this will put people at risk; concern re safety if people cannot afford or refuse two care workers	9
Unfair on people who have already contributed through taxes, national insurance; those who have paid into system; those who have savings/self-funders; unfair as council tax has already been increased	9
Importance of understanding and assessing each individual's needs and circumstances; look for ways to support individuals so that they need less care input/maintain more independence, eg ensure availability of physio, equipment, rehab	9
Concern about quality of care; efficiency of care system; efficiency and accuracy of billing/invoicing for care; efficiency of assessment and financial assessment process; re-use of equipment	9
Concern about impact on people with low income; impact on family budget; not enough money for living costs; people who need social care more likely to have low income	6
Government should provide more funding to councils/for social care; concern about Government cuts to council funding; need for national debate on funding for health and social care	6
Concern about impact on family carers; family carers have saved money for council, unfair to now be penalised by increased costs; impact on household costs and therefore on family	6



Other	5
People do not have a choice about two care workers; two care workers required because of health and safety; importance of making sure two care workers only provided if justified by care needs	5
Comments about cost of care; costs already too high; too high compared to other providers; council should provide information about comparative cost of care eg council v private; proposals fail to recognise variation in care costs across the county	5
Proposed increase is too high; increases should be gradual	6
Comments about NHS contribution to cost of care; NHS should fund care for people who are ill; comments about continuing health care funding	4
Comments re cost of travel for care provision, care workers; council should lobby Government for increased funding for rural areas with high travel time/costs; potential for savings on travel costs for two care workers eg if they travel together	4
Council should find other ways to save money; increase council tax; concentrate funding on essential services	3
Comments about passenger transport proposals: need more transport options for people in rural areas; organise passenger transport better/make it more efficient to reduce costs	3
Comments about quality of financial assessment; importance of good quality financial assessment; need for sympathetic assessors and financial assessors to reduce worry/anxiety about the financial impact experienced by people who need support	2
Importance of care workers, care workers' role; need to treat care workers fairly, reimburse fairly including for travel/mileage	2
Disagree with proposal	1

6. Other responses to the consultation: public events, community forums, emails and letters

Public consultation events

Seven public consultation events were held in November and December 2018; one event in each district. There were approximately 100 attendees in total. The key themes emerging from the events are as follows.

A. Transport proposals

The most frequently-made comments related to concern about affordability; impact on those with low income; and possible unintended impact of the proposals by potentially increasing transport and care costs to the council. There was also concern about a negative impacting on providers if people use day services less.

- Concern about impact on people with low income or on benefits; the proposed increases do not leave enough of a person's PIP or mobility allowance for other travel needs.
- This is one of several increases or demands on people's budgets. If transport not affordable, people may not be able to get out as much; may impact on quality of life, may result in increased social isolation. Increases in transport and day services costs together – people may make choice not to pay/not to attend as not affordable, or perception that it is not affordable
- Concern about impact on providers as well as individuals, if people use day services less.
- If people don't access day services or access them less often, they may then require more 1-2-1 or residential care which will increase costs for the council. May result in increased need for care due to deterioration as a result of social isolation.
- If people use council transport services less due to the price increase, the overall cost to the council may go up.
- The proposed increase is very high, too high; the proposed cap is too high; increases too high for those travelling short distance; increases should be gradual.
- Concern about the impact on disabled people; unfair to charge more when people have no choice due to their condition or disability. Public transport is inadequate,

particularly in rural areas, so NYCC transport is a necessity, particularly for disabled people.

Other comments about the transport proposals included the following areas:

- [Transport and care] Comments/concern about the efficiency of processes, particularly invoicing – comments that invoices are often inaccurate, have to be checked, confusing and contradictory information about whether or not an individual has to pay, person should not have to pay if has not been able to use the transport that day. Potential for efficiencies to be made by accurate invoicing.
- Comments/queries about mobility vehicles and how this works or does not work alongside passenger transport; impact of mobility vehicle on PIP allowance; more expensive for authority if mobility vehicle used instead of passenger transport; council not able to use mobility vehicles on behalf of the individual so passenger transport has to be used.
- Concerns about customer service, quality of transport, amount of time people have to spend on transport. Proposed increase not justified by quality of service.
- Comment about travel training for young people.
- A number of comments/questions to clarify that the proposals do not cover hospital transport.
- Alternative proposal for increasing income for transport – take on private clients who are using same day services as people supported by adult social care.
- Alternative proposal for transport charges – consider a banding system.
- Comment re possible impacts of proposals for changes in both children's and adults social care

B. Proposals for charging for full cost of care

Overall, there were fewer comments made during the events about the proposal to take the full cost of care into account when calculating contributions. The key messages were as follows:

- Council should seek more funding from Government; consider raising council tax; find other ways to save or boost income
- Proposals are unfair as it is not the choice of the individual to have two care workers, but as a result of need, social care assessment; discriminates against people who need two care workers for personal care. Provider policy not NYCC or individual choice; needed because of health and safety.



- Importance of NYCC enforcing individual needs assessment, risk assessment with providers.
- Concern about impact on family carers; increased demand on family carers; unfair on family carers who have saved the council money by providing care; risk of increased costs to council if family carers not able to continue.
- Proposed increase too high, unaffordable, concern about people's savings running out more quickly, concern about cost of care rising.

Other comments about the proposal included the following:

- Unfair to penalise those who have saved.
- Concern about the amount that the council has to save and that there may be more proposals for savings in future.
- Comments about quality of care versus cost; poor quality of care / care workers provided by care agencies.
- Concern about potential safety issues for individual and care worker if one care worker employed due to cost, when there should be two
- Potential for proposals to result in costs shifting to health service.

Other comments

There were a number of other questions aimed at clarifying the proposals and potential impact on individuals; comment on future provision for people with learning disability; a request for information about care providers and costs so that people can have choice; queries about the consultation, how it was publicised and some feedback on timing and location of events; queries about financial assessments, frequency of and expenses that are considered; queries about the income maximisation service.

Community forums: key themes

Three community forums were attended just before the consultation period and during the consultation period (one forum was attended twice). Membership of the forums is made up of people with lived experience, eg people with learning disability and/or autism, family carers, disabled people (physical and sensory impairment), and older people.

- North Yorkshire Learning Disability Partnership Board on 14 September 2018
- North Yorkshire Disability Forum on 28 September and 7 December 2018
- North Yorkshire Forum for Older People on 3 December 2018

Key themes from the forums are as follows:



- Ideas for other ways to fund transport, including sponsorship, hiring out minibuses when not in use; let people use their bus passes for council transport.
- Concern about affordability of transport if charges are increased; concern about impact on people with low income.
- Concern that the proposals could be discriminatory; proposals are inequitable for disabled people; people should not be penalised for severity of their disability.
- Two carers required for health and safety; not the fault of the person.
- Other ways for council to find money: increase taxes rather than making cuts, other ways to save money eg save on universal bus passes for older people, stop people misusing benefit system (conversely, concern about impact of increased council tax on younger people)
- Increase in transport as well as charges for day care not affordable; potential for increase in social isolation
- Recognition that there is a high spend on transport
- Comments re consultation, who should be included, how to reach people

Email feedback to consultation – summary of comments

A small number of emails were received in response to the consultation. The majority of emails were to inform of change of address or other issue relating to contact details; to request large print or paper consultation documents; about the public events; requesting clarification of some element of the proposals; about personal circumstances. The emails that constituted a response to the consultation (nine in total, three received after the consultation closing date) are captured in the appendices and summarised below. The emails included a response to the consultation from the Independent Care Group, the representative body for independent care providers in North Yorkshire.

- Disagree with proposals for charging for care; should not increase costs from current system; unfair for those who have contributed during their working life; increase too high, unfair on self-funders, unfair on people who need support; concern about running out of savings more quickly
- Comments re direct payments: value of direct payments to support people and thus families; concern about the amount that direct payment is set at, not enough to pay care workers, can't recruit care workers
- Concern about impact on family carers; importance of respite for family carers; concern about potential for breakdown of care and thus increase costs to council; already impact on family budgets eg where top-up payments are required



- Importance of social interaction; concern about reduction in access to day services and therefore increase in social isolation; may result in increased need and increase in costs to council
- Concern re impact of transport proposals on people on low income; impact on disabled people, vulnerable people; understand financial pressures but disagree with making savings from most vulnerable
- Query re Government increase to social care funding; will council amend the proposals in light of this increase?
- Comments re need for more Government funding, increase taxation, insurance scheme for social care
- Concern re impact on providers if people use day services less or stop using them; may increase costs to council if demand for care at home increases
- Agreement with proposals as fair and workmanlike
- Suggestion for higher transport charges and higher cap but means-tested (nb this comment referred to hospital transport)
- Concern about knock-on effect on demand for care workers in areas where it is already difficult to source care workers; concern re shortage of care workers (and see comment re direct payments above); impact of rurality on supply of care workers and agency charges
- Council should look for other ways to manage the increasing demand for social care, and value family carers and communities. Council should be more innovative. Some good examples by NYCC, should build on these. Should not increase charges until innovation has been explored/implemented.

Letters in response to the consultation

Nine letters were received that constituted a response to the consultation, including one received after the closing date (see appendices). Several people responding in this way said that they had also responded to the consultation in another way, but wanted to provide more detailed feedback or more detail about their personal circumstances. Nearly all disagreed with the proposals, and the majority focused on the proposal for costs of care. The comments made echoed the main themes expressed via the surveys, events, meetings and emails.

- The letter-writers expressed concern about the increase in costs and the impact on savings, their ability to fund care in the longer term and maintain living in their own home. The support needs and therefore cost of care to the council could then increase.
- There was a view that the proposal was discriminatory, particularly because people did not have a choice about whether or not to accept two care workers at

it impacted on the most vulnerable who should be protected.

- Comments were made about provider policies for two care workers when a hoist is required and that these policies lack flexibility; the importance of individual risk assessments was flagged. One writer included a report from Salford University, 2014, titled 'It takes two?: exploring the manual handling myth'.
- The impact on family carers and potential for increased demand on family carers was raised.
- The proposals were seen as unfair on those who have worked, paid taxes and saved.
- There was concern about affordability, particularly for those with a limited income, and about increased charges on top of the additional day to day costs of living with a disability, such as incontinence aids, laundry and heating.
- The importance of joint working between social care and the NHS was mentioned as a way to make better use of available funding, and references to the additional funding for social care from central government. Alternative proposals for funding social care included the suggestion to increase taxes and have fundraising events.
- One writer referred to the transport proposals and expressed concern that people may then use transport less, may use their day services less. This person also mentioned the potential impact on availability of wheelchair-accessible taxis if people use these instead of council transport, as there is already a lack of supply of such taxis.
- There were also some comments about the consultation, including about the timing of events being difficult for family carers and that the information given in the consultation documents was not helpful or representative.

7. Demographic profile of responders to the consultation survey

Are you:	
Receiving an adult care service	(111) 28%
A family member of someone receiving adult social care	(157) 40%
A provider of social care	(11) 3%
A voluntary sector organisation	(17) 4%
A member of the public	(83) 21%
Other	(18) 5%

If you or a family member are receiving an adult social care service, please tick all the services being received:	
Transport services	(70) 30%



29%		
Don't know	(24)	10%
Any other care services	(116)	50%

Any other care services:		
Respite	(10)	11%
Supported living	(8)	9%
Direct payments	(16)	21%
Home care	(39)	43%
Transitions	(1)	1%
Care home	(4)	4%
Section 117	(2)	2%
Telecare	(1)	1%
Mental health services	(1)	1%
Carers Resource	(1)	1%
Sitting service	(1)	1%
Reablement	(1)	1%
Other	(6)	7%

North Yorkshire district		
Scarborough	(84)	23%
Ryedale	(36)	10%
Hambleton	(74)	20%
Selby	(26)	7%
Harrogate	(78)	21%
Richmondshire	(26)	7%
Craven	(36)	10%
None	(9)	2%

Age category		
16-19	(2)	1%
20-29	(21)	6%
30-39	(20)	6%
40-49	(29)	8%
50-64	(110)	31%
65-74	(61)	17%
75-84	(62)	17%
85+	(40)	11%
Prefer not to say	(16)	4%



(215) 59%	
Male	(136) 38%
I describe myself in another way	(0)
Prefer not to say	(11) 3%

Ethnic group	
White	(342) 95%
Minority ethnic	(3) 1%
Prefer not to say	(15) 4%

Do you consider yourself to be a disabled person or to have a long-term limiting condition?	
Yes	(221) 62%
No	(125) 35%
Prefer not to say	(11) 3%

For breakdown of responses to questions 1, 3 and 6 by equality characteristic, please see appendix 6. Whilst there were some small differences in agree/disagree responses by equality profile, they were not substantial and it is difficult to draw any conclusions from the data.

8. Summary conclusions

A. Transport proposals

The majority (63%) of responders to the survey **disagreed** with proposal 1, to increase the charge per journey to £7.50. Of those who stated that they, or a family member, used transport services, a significantly higher proportion disagreed (83%)

Of those offering suggestions for an alternative amount, question 2, nearly all responders proposed a lower amount. £5 was the most frequently suggested amount (44% of suggestions), however this comes with the caveat that some answers specifically stated per journey or per day, and some did not.

£5 (per day or per journey not stated):	36
£5 per day/per return journey:	22
£5 per journey:	13

If the proposals that specify per journey or per day are aggregated to give a 'per day' cost (62% of responses):	
28% for sums below £5, with 61% of this group suggesting no change, 32% £3-£4, and 7% £4-£5.	
22% for £5	
50% are for sums above £5, with 24% of this group suggesting £5-£6, 38% £6-£8, 8% £8-£10, 26% suggesting £10 and 4% £10+.	



responders **agreed** with proposal 2, to have a cap on transport charges. Of those who stated that they, or a family member, used transport services, the majority (59%) agreed but less strongly.

31 responders proposed a specific alternative amount for the cap. The most frequently suggested amount (35% of suggestions) was £25.

The key themes arising from the comments for questions 1 and 2 were as follows:

- The proposed increase is too high, and so is the proposed level for the cap. There was some recognition that the current charge was too low, but concern about the level of the proposed increase, and some suggestions that increases should be gradual.
- Concern was expressed about the impact on people on low income and/or on benefits, that many people are having to manage on very tight margins with a number of demands on their budgets, and that people would not have anything left for other expenses or travel needs.
- A sub-theme emerged about the level of proposed increase in comparison to a person's PIP, DLA or mobility allowance payments, with varying views being expressed but a consistent strand reflecting concern about affordability.
- Concern was also expressed that people may no longer be able to afford transport and may therefore use services less or stop using them; this could result in increased social isolation and potential for increased costs to council eg if needs increase, if care at home breaks down, if there is more demand for care at home. There was also some concern about the potential for an increase in the cost of transport for council if fewer people use it.
- Related to the above, there was concern that there may be an impact on providers if fewer people access day services due to the cost of transport; there was a sub-theme that people have also had to pay more for day services and the two increases together would make the service unaffordable.
- A number of suggestions were made about means-testing, and that if charges were to increase this should be means-tested, or that there should be a sliding scale.
- There was a view that the proposals were unfair on disabled people and could be discriminatory, and linked to this the importance of transport for disabled people, particularly people who cannot use public transport and for those who live in areas where there is no public transport.
- Suggestions were made for alternatives to increasing charges, including community transport, sharing transport, sponsorship and increased availability of public transport.



- There were comments and suggestions about the efficiency of transport, invoicing for transport services, the quality of the service, concern re value for money if the cost goes up significantly; that the service should be made more efficient before or instead of charging more for it. A sub-theme expressed concern about the efficiency of invoicing for transport.
- Some comments about fairness of charging a flat rate particularly for those who only travel a short distance.
- The council should find alternative savings, and some suggestions for where these savings could be made.
- Transport should be free.

The feedback received via public events, community forums, letters and emails echoed the above themes.

B. Cost of care proposal

The majority (59%) **agreed** with the proposal to take the full cost of care into account when calculating a person's contribution. However, of those of who indicated that they used social care or were the family carer of a person using social care and that they had a second carer (68 people), the majority (60%) **disagreed**.

The key themes emerging from the comments about the cost of care proposal are:

- Concern about the impact on the most vulnerable people, on disabled people, that it would be discriminatory, that there is a duty to protect the most vulnerable people in society.
- Concern about impact on people on low income/benefits, concern about affordability, not being able to afford other costs of living, impact when already having to pay for additional costs of disability, impact of increasing costs of living, concern about family income/budget.
- Comments expressing agreement with the proposal / principle of contributing to the cost of care but with concern about affordability.
- Comments about why people have two carers, that it is not the choice of the individual but due to health and safety requirements, the social care assessment, provider policy. Linked to this are two sub-themes: a) the need to ensure that people only have two carers if definitely needed and some lack of trust of providers; b) the importance of assessing each individual's needs, ways to support individuals so that they need less care, eg rehabilitation, equipment, physiotherapy.
- Comments that care costs are already too high; concern about using up savings/running out of savings more quickly. Linked to this, comments that costs

- to the council may increase if people can no longer afford to pay for their care, if the changes result in people not being able to afford to stay at home, or if people refuse care and therefore are at risk/develop higher needs.
- There were a number of proposals for alternatives, including other ways to calculate costs eg based on need, episode or task; comments that the care system needs to be more joined up or integrated.
- Means-testing was seen as important, particularly that the financial assessment should fairly assess affordability, household expenditure and disability-related needs.
- A number of responders felt that it was unfair that people who had saved and/or had contributed throughout their working lives via taxes, council tax and national insurance should now be penalised. Linked to this, a sub-theme around unfairness on family carers who have saved the council money by providing unpaid care.
- Some people commented that social care should be free.
- There were also comments about the efficiency of the social care system, financial assessment and invoicing, accuracy of invoices, quality of providers and care workers, value for money of care and costs in comparison with commercial providers.
- As with the transport proposals, a number of people suggested that the council should find alternative savings, should lobby Government, and that the Government should increase funding for social care. Reference was also made to the announcement made by the Government in late 2018 about increased funding for social care.
- Some respondents commented about the impact on family carers and the potential for carer breakdown.

The feedback received via public events, community forums, letters and emails echoed the above themes.

Comments about the consultation:

Some comments were also made about the consultation itself, in particular feedback about the examples and information provided with some concern expressed about whether or not these were realistic. One person expressed concern that the consultation had not directly targeted young disabled people and their parent carers, and another expressed the view that the proposals may not be in line with the Care Act 2014.

9. Appendices:

- Appendix A: Consultation document

- Appendix B: Consultation survey
- Appendix C: Presentation given at events/forums
- Appendix D: Letter to people in receipt of community-based social care
- Appendix E: October 2018 Press release

Appendix A:

Consultation on fair charges for the cost of care

Consultation timescale - Monday 29th October to Monday 21st January 2019.

North Yorkshire County Council wants your views on some proposals for changes to the way we charge for adult social care.

We are consulting on proposals about how people who use adult social care services contribute to their costs. The consultation covers two main areas:

- The cost of transport to places where people may receive a service;
- How the total cost of care is calculated.

Background

In England, adult social care services (sometimes known as “*care and support*”) are not free. Many people have to pay something towards their care. In some cases they may have to pay the whole cost. People who have to pay the whole cost are often referred to as “*self-funding*”.

Like other local authorities, the Council may pay some or all of the cost. The council works out how much it will give towards the cost by completing a means-tested financial assessment with the person. The amount anyone is asked to pay depends on how much money they have, and how much care and support they need.

There are other services we provide which are not classed as “care and support”. Councils are allowed to charge people the full cost of these services. This includes transport to places where people receive support, or

meals they have there. In North Yorkshire we do not pass on the full cost of these services to people, but we do ask for a contribution.

This consultation is about proposals which would result in some changes to our “Charging Policy for Community-Based Services” – which can be found at <https://www.northyorks.gov.uk/paying-care-home>. It is this document which sets out the services people may have to make a contribution towards (and in some cases, how much that is).

The proposals may result in a change to how much the Council pays and how much individuals pay towards the costs of their services. We are keen to ensure that we hear the views of people who access social care support, service providers and other residents of North Yorkshire.

Why are we considering these proposals?

The Council is facing severe budget pressures. The Government grant to the Council has reduced by 49% between 2010 and 2018. Between 2011 and 2022, we estimate that the Council’s annual budget will need to make £190m of savings.

The Council has prioritised spending on Adult Social Care during this period. We want to keep supporting people, and the number of people who need support is growing. Additional funding has been found to help with the increasing pressures on the service, but we need to use the limited money we have as efficiently as possible. We have made lots of changes to help us do this, but we need to find more ways to save money.

The other reason for the proposals is about fairness. We want to make sure that the way we calculate charges is reasonable, and strikes the right balance between what the individual is asked to pay and what the council pays.

Proposals

1. Contributing to the Cost of Transport

The first issue deals with the cost of transport to a person’s social care service (such as a day centre). Some people have their transport arranged by the council. At the moment, the council does not pass on the full cost for this.

We currently provide transport to around 500 people.

The average cost of someone using our buses is over £18 per person for each journey. At the moment the council only charges £2.70 per person each day regardless of the number of trips or distance travelled.

This means it costs the Council over £2.2 million annually to provide transport with just £100,000 coming from contributions from those people who are using the transport.

We are not proposing to pass on the full cost of transport to people. The council will still use money raised from Council Tax and other sources to help pay for this, but we are proposing that people contribute more to the cost. This would allow the council to use the money saved to continue to provide this service and other important services.

In coming up with a revised charge, we have looked at what other councils do and also at what the cost of private-provided transport (such as the public bus service or taxis) in the county is. We have considered introducing a charge based on the distance people may have to travel, but feel that is not fair in a rural county like North Yorkshire. More information on these costs can be found in the Executive Member report which can be found here: [Link](#).

Although we do not take transport costs into account when carrying out a means-tested financial assessment, we are committed to making sure that we consider the impact of any increase in charges on the amount of money a person has left to live on. We have done this by looking at the government's Minimum Income Guarantee and any allowances that people may be paid to assist with mobility costs.

Our proposal is to increase the amount that people will have to pay to a flat rate of £7.50 per journey. However we will put a limit on that to ensure that the most anyone will have to pay will be £40 per week.

Assuming that there are no changes in the number of people who use transport, this is likely to mean that the council will pay around £1.8 million annually for transport with contributions from people being approximately £650,000. The actual split of costs will depend on how many people are limited by the £40 per week cap.



For individuals, this would mean that if you have two journeys per week, you would now pay £15 (rather than £2.70, assuming both of those journeys were on the same day). The table below illustrates this:

Number of journeys per week (each journey is one-way)	Charge
1	£7.50
2	£15.00
3	£22.50
4	£30.00
5	£37.50
6 or more	£40.00

2. Contributing to the Cost of Care

The second issue deals with the cost of care and how it is calculated. We are proposing that the entire cost of a care package is included in the financial contributions calculation. This is important because it may affect how much people are asked to pay towards their care.

At the moment, we do not include the entire cost of a care package when we calculate how much a person should pay towards the cost of their care.

Currently, if a person has two care workers at the same time, we only include the cost of one care worker.

If someone has two care workers, but at different times (for example one person in the morning and one person in the evening), we include the cost of both care workers.

We do not think this is reasonable and this is why we are proposing to change it. Other councils have already made this change. We would use the money saved to continue to provide this and other important services.

It is important to state however that anyone’s actual contribution will only change if the amount they are able to pay is currently more than what they actually pay. **If someone is already paying the maximum they can afford, there will be no increase to them.** A few examples are shown below which help to explain this proposal.



Mr A is currently supported by two carers for an hour per day at the same time (e.g. 10am-11am). The cost for providing this care is £50 per day or £250 per week. However in calculating his contribution, £125 of this is included as he pays for one carer. His financial assessment shows that the maximum he is expected to pay is £100 per week. The proposed change in how we make the calculation makes no difference to this and he will still be asked to contribute £100 per week.

Mrs B currently is currently supported by two carers for an hour per day at the same time (e.g. 10am – 11am). The cost for providing this care is £50 per day or £250 per week. However in calculating her contribution, £125 of this is included. Her financial assessment shows that the maximum she is expected to pay is £175 per week. The proposed change in how we make the calculation means that she will be asked to pay £175 per week in future, but not the full cost.

Mr C is currently supported by two carers for an hour per day at the same time (e.g. 10am -11am). The cost for providing this care is £50 per day or £250 per week. However in calculating his contribution, £125 of this is included. Mr C is “self-funding” and a financial assessment shows that he would be able to pay the full £250. He will in future be asked to pay this amount.

Miss D is currently supported by two carers for an hour each per day at different times. One attends 10-11am and the other at 1pm-2pm). The cost for providing this care is £50 per day or £250 per week. In calculating her contribution, the full £250 is included. Miss D is “self-funding” and a financial assessment shows that she would be able to pay the full £250. The proposed change in how we make the calculation makes no difference to this and she will still be asked to pay the full £250.

Information about our equality impact assessment

We have carried out an equality impact assessment to check if the proposals will affect one group of people more than another. We think the proposals will affect disabled people most of all, but the financial assessment and the cap on transport charges will reduce the impact. The equality impact assessment will be reviewed after the consultation, and we welcome your views on our draft. It is available online with the other consultation documents.

Who are we consulting?

We are consulting with all those people who may be directly affected by these proposals.

We are also taking steps to make sure that people who receive any adult social care service are aware and have the opportunity to take part even if they are not likely to be personally affected.

We will also notify providers of social care in the county of our proposals.

Finally, as this is an issue which impacts on all council tax payers in North Yorkshire we will make this consultation known to the wider public and encourage them to respond.

Why are we consulting?

We are seeking your views on our proposals before we take any final decisions in 2019. Your views will be fed back to county councillors so they are made aware of what you think, before they take any decisions. Decisions have not yet been made.

What is the timescale?

We are consulting for 12 weeks (90 days), starting on Monday 29th October to Monday 21st January 2019.

Once the consultation has closed, we will review all of the responses and prepare a report for county councillors. They will consider the results of the consultation and any proposals to change our Charging Policy and the amounts charged. They will make a decision early in 2019. If there are any changes, they will not take effect before 1st April, 2019.

How can you have your say?

We have held a number of informal sessions over recent months with providers and service users as we have developed our proposals. These groups included Disability Forums, Independent Sector Partnership Group and the Knaresborough Self-Advocacy Group.

The proposed consultation has also been approved by the Council's Executive Member for Adult Services and Health Integration

We would like to hear your views about our proposals and any other ideas and suggestions you might have. You can tell us what you think by completing a survey available on the council's website. We will also provide paper copies and an 'easy read' version, and other formats will be provided on request. We will also hold events around the county to talk about the consultation.

We are also planning to talk to community engagement forums such as the North Yorkshire Disability Forum, North Yorkshire Learning Partnership Board and North Yorkshire Forum for Older People.

Completing the survey

Please give your feedback on the proposals outlined by filling in our online survey, at www.northyorks.gov.uk/consultations

If you would like a paper copy of the survey, please call our customer service centre on 01609 780780. You can also call into your local library or to Health and Adult Services offices to collect a copy. Call 01609 780780 for more information about locations.

To return a completed paper copy of the survey please send to:
Health and Adult Services
County Hall,
Northallerton
North Yorkshire
DL7 8DD

Events

We are also holding a number of events where the council will explain the proposals and ask people what they think. The dates and locations of the events are as below:

- 13 November 2018 at 9.30am. The Council Chambers, County Hall, Northallerton, DL7 8AD



- 14 November 2018 at 2:00pm. Main Function Room, Richmond Cricket Club, Hurgill Road, Richmond, DL10 4AR
- 15 November 2018 at 1:00pm. The Council Chambers, Civic Centre, St Lukes Avenue, Harrogate, HG1 2AE
- 19 November 2018 at 10:00am. The Council Chambers, Ryedale District Council, Ryedale House, Old Malton, Malton, YO17 7HH
- 27 November 2018 at 10.30am. Hall B, The Street, 12 Lower Clark Street, Scarborough, YO12 7PW
- 04 December 2018 at 12.30pm. Community House Selby, Community House, Portholme Road, Selby YO8 4QQ
- 07 December 2018 at 10:00am. Civic Suite, Craven District Council, 1 Belle Vue Square, Broughton Road, Skipton BD23 1FJ

All venues have wheelchair access. There will be BSL interpreters at the events in Harrogate, Scarborough and Selby.

If you have any questions about the events or the consultation, you can call us on 01609 780780 or email us at HASConsultation@northyorks.gov.uk.

Appendix B:



Consultation on
Charging HAS - Que

Appendix C:



Consultation on
fair charges for the r

Appendix D:

(Name and address)

Health and Adult Services
County Hall,
Northallerton
North Yorkshire DL7 8DD
Tel: 01609 780780
Email: hasconsultation@northyorks.gov.uk
Web: www.northyorks.gov.uk

29 October 2018

Dear

Consultation on charges for the cost of adult social care, 29 October 2018 – 21 January 2019

We are writing to you to ask you to tell us what you think about the council's proposals to make changes to the charging policy for adult social care in North Yorkshire. Your views are very important to help the council make decisions about the proposals.

The proposals are about how people who use adult social care services contribute to their costs. The consultation will cover two main areas:

- The cost of transport provided by adult social care to places where people may receive a service;
- How the total cost of care is calculated. This may affect people who have two care workers to help them at the same time.

We have written to you because you are on our records as receiving a service from adult social care, and so you may be affected by the changes, if the council decides to go ahead. Not everyone will be affected, though. The consultation document explains the proposals in more detail.

We would like to reassure you that no decisions have yet been taken. These are still proposals. If the decision is made to implement the proposals, the changes would not begin until April next year.

How to take part in the consultation

The consultation will be on our website at <https://www.northyorks.gov.uk/current-consultations> from Monday 29th October 2018 to Monday 21st January 2019. Please visit the website for further details of the consultation and to complete the online survey.

information on the current Charging Policy: <https://www.northyorks.gov.uk/paying-care-home>

If you, or your friend or relative, have any questions about the consultation, or if you would like the documents in another format such as large print, audio, or easy read (words and pictures), please ring the council's Customer Services Centre on 01609 780780.

You can visit your local library or reception desks at county council offices to pick up a copy of the consultation documents. You can also ask library staff for help to access it online or ask your care manager (social worker) or care provider to help you.

Receptions:

- White Rose House, Thurston Road, Northallerton, DL6 2NA
- County Hall, Boroughbridge Road, Northallerton, DL7 8AE
- North Yorkshire House, 442 – 444 Scalby Road, Scarborough, YO12 6EE
- Sandpiper House, Brook Street, Selby, YO8 4AL
- Belle Vue Mills, 1 Belle Vue Square, Broughton Road, Skipton BD23 1FJ
- Ryedale House, Malton YO17 7HH
- Jesmond House, 31-33 Victoria Avenue, Harrogate HG1 5QE

Other ways to tell us what you think

You could also tell us your views by coming to an event where the council will explain the proposals and ask people what they think. Here are the dates of the events:

- 13 November 2018 at 09.30 am. The Council Chambers, County Hall, Northallerton, DL7 8AD
- 14 November 2018 at 2:00 pm. Main Function Room, Richmond Cricket Club, Hurgill Road, Richmond, DL10 4AR
- 15 November 2018 at 1:00 pm. The Council Chambers, Civic Centre, St Lukes Avenue, Harrogate, HG1 2AE
- 19 November 2018 at 10:00 am. The Council Chambers, Ryedale District Council, Ryedale House, Old Malton, Malton, YO17 7HH
- 27 November 2018 at 10.30 am. Hall B, The Street, 12 Lower Clark Street, Scarborough, YO12 7PW
- 04 December 2018 at 12.30 pm. Community House Selby, Community House, Portholme Road, Selby YO8 4QQ
- 07 December 2018 at 10:00 am. Civic Suite, Craven District Council, 1 Belle Vue Square, Broughton Road, Skipton BD23 1FJ

You can also telephone us, write to us or email us. Here are the contact details:



North

Yorkshire County Council

Telephone us: Customer Service Centre 01609 780780

Write to us: Fair Charges Consultation, Health and Adult Services, North Yorkshire County Council, County Hall, Northallerton DL7 8DD

Email us: HASConsultation@northyorks.gov.uk

What will be done with the results of the consultation?

The results of the consultation will be used to help county councillors make decisions about the proposals for changes to the charging policy. We expect that the decisions will be taken early next year, 2019.

Yours sincerely

Anton Hodge
Assistant Director, Strategic Resources

Appendix E:

News

Communications Unit

County Hall, Northallerton, North Yorkshire, DL7 8AD

Tel: 01609 532448 01609 533109

communications@northyorks.gov.uk

Adults who use social care asked to give views on charges

People and their families who use adult social care services in North Yorkshire have the chance to give their views on how they pay for them.

They are being consulted on proposals about how people who use adult social care services contribute to their costs. The consultation will cover two main areas:

- the cost of transport provided by adult social care to places where people receive a service – for example a day care centre; and
- how the total cost of care is calculated and the amount people may be asked to contribute in the future.

County Councillor Michael Harrison, executive member for adult social care and health integration, said: “In February, county councillors approved the adult social care budget and agreed to look at reviewing our charging policy. Since then we have been talking to residents and service providers to look at ways in which we might do that.

“In North Yorkshire, it’s crucial to us to support adult social care as much as possible. We have welcomed additional funding from Government, we have raised additional Council Tax through the social care precept and we have protected budgets, as much as we can, to the point where social care is now nearly 45% of all that we spend.

“However, given that adult social care is our largest budget – and we have other important commitments, to children and parents and to road users, for example – we still have had to make savings. We continue to lobby Government for a long-term sustainable solution to funding adult social care and look forward to the forthcoming Green Paper, and the next Spending Review, which we hope will set out the Government’s proposals. In the meantime, we must continue to look critically at how we spend taxpayers’ money and how it can be spent better.

“We are now consulting about our proposals for changing the way we charge for some adult social care services and want as many people as possible to take part in this consultation. People’s views will form a very important part of the decision making process.

“If the decision is made to implement the proposals, the changes would not begin until April next year and we will also take steps to advise people on how they can claim other benefits and support to which they may be entitled.”

The County Council has produced a consultation document that explains the proposals. The document is on the County Council website together with the survey at <https://www.northyorks.gov.uk/current-consultations>

To request the documents in another format, such as large print, audio, or easy read (words and pictures), please ring the County Council’s Customer Services Centre on 01609 780780. Please note that there are

already easy read versions of the consultation documents available as downloads on the consultation web page. The consultation documents are also available from libraries and council offices. Information on the current charging policy is at <https://www.northyorks.gov.uk/paying-care-home>.

The County Council is also holding information sessions:

- 13 November 2018 at 09.30 am. The Council Chamber, County Hall, Northallerton, DL7 8AD
- 14 November 2018 at 2:00 pm. Main Function Room, Richmond Cricket Club, Hurgill Road, Richmond, DL10 4AR
- 15 November 2018 at 1:00 pm. The Council Chamber, Civic Centre, St Lukes Avenue, Harrogate, HG1 2AE
- 19 November 2018 at 10:00 am. The Council Chamber, Ryedale District Council, Ryedale House, Old Malton, Malton, YO17 7HH
- 27 November 2018 at 10.30 am. Hall B, The Street, 12 Lower Clark Street, Scarborough, YO12 7PW
- 04 December 2018 at 12.30 pm. Community House Selby, Community House, Portholme Road, Selby YO8 4QQ
- 07 December 2018 at 10:00 am. Civic Suite, Craven District Council, 1 Belle Vue Square, Broughton Road, Skipton BD23 1FJ

All venues have wheelchair access.

The survey is open until Monday 21 January 2019.

31-10-2018

Press contact: media@northyorks.gov.uk Tel 01609 532448

Executive member: County Councillor Michael Harrison (Con), 01423 536157

Equality impact assessment (EIA) form: evidencing paying due regard to protected characteristics

(Form updated May 2015)

Health and Adult Services – Consultation on fair charges for the cost of care

If you would like this information in another language or format such as Braille, large print or audio, please contact the Communications Unit on 01609 53 2013 or email communications@northyorks.gov.uk.



যদি আপনি এই ডকুমেন্ট অন্য ভাষায় বা ফরমেটে চান, তাহলে দয়া করে আমাদেরকে বলুন।

如欲索取以另一語文印製或另一格式製作的資料，請與我們聯絡。

اگر آپ کو معلومات کسی دیگر زبان یا دیگر شکل میں درکار ہوں تو برائے مہربانی ہم سے پوچھئے۔

Equality Impact Assessments (EIAs) are public documents. EIAs accompanying reports going to County Councillors for decisions are published with the committee papers on our website and are available in hard copy at the relevant meeting. To help people to find completed EIAs we also publish them in the Equality and Diversity section of our website. This will help people to see for themselves how we have paid due regard in order to meet statutory requirements.

Name of Directorate and Service Area	Health and Adult Services, Care and Support
Lead Officer and contact details	Anton Hodge
Names and roles of other people involved in carrying out the EIA	Anton Hodge Dale Owens Linda Porritt Shanna Carrell
How will you pay due regard? e.g. working group, individual officer	This project is governed through 2020 processes as part of the Care and Support Where I Live sub-programme within Health and Adult Services. All proposed changes have been subject to formal 90 day public consultation and the recommendations if approved will influence changes to be made to the Charging Policy. This will be signed off by the Executive Member

	in May and the EIA will be reviewed and finalised depending on the outcome of the updated Policy.
When did the due regard process start?	The Client Contributions project initially started in November 2017.

Section 1. Please describe briefly what this EIA is about. (e.g. are you starting a new service, changing how you do something, stopping doing something?)

This EIA is about proposed changes to the HAS Charging Policy due to the requirement to create additional savings within the Local Authority (LA) whilst still providing services to those who require support.

Significant analysis work has been carried out in relation to two specific areas:

- To explore changes to the method of calculating the total cost of care, which may impact on the contribution that people make to that cost
- To strengthen application of existing policy through process improvement and further explore options for future charging levels and approaches

The Local Authority has undertaken a public consultation on the above two areas. The consultation feedback has been analysed to help the LA to understand the potential impact on key groups with protected characteristics who are currently in receipt of the services and other stakeholders and are reflected in the proposals below.

Section 2. Why is this being proposed? What are the aims? What does the authority hope to achieve by it? (e.g. to save money, meet increased demand, do things in a better way.)

The Council is continuing to face severe budget pressures, with reductions in government funding of 49% between 2010 and 2018. Although we have prioritised spending on Adult Social Care in this period, we still need to find ways to save money and use our more limited resources as efficiently as possible.

If following consultation, the proposals are implemented the Local Authority intends to still provide care and support to those who need it the most. Customers directly affected by the changes will pay for services on a more equitable basis; according to their individual financial means and their agreed social care and support requirements.

The Local Authority must ensure its charging policies and procedures are fit for purpose and are compliant with the legal requirements and code of practice.

Overall objectives

- To review elements of the charging policy for community based care and support to ensure a more equitable and consistent approach to assessing client contributions against the cost of providing their care and support.
- To review options for approach to charging and consider any potential impacts and how these may be mitigated.

- To implement the preferred options for charging based on consultation feedback for Second Carers and Transport.

Approach to charging for second carers:

- To introduce a charge for the second carer based on the overarching principle of charging the client against the total cost of providing their care and support in the community subject the outcome of the means tested financial assessment.

Transport

- Introduce unified processes and systems to enable charges to be collected more effectively and efficiently.
- Ensure that all charges due are collected in full. Currently around £57k of eligible charge is not collected.
- Develop an accurate process to 'track and bill' for journeys undertaken to ensure accurate charging and collection;
- Bring forward proposals to increase the charge levied to reduce the overall cost of transport to the Directorate subject to consultation feedback.

Section 3. What will change? What will be different for customers and/or staff?

Taking into account the feedback summarised from the consultation it is clear that while a majority of respondents felt that it was right to charge for the full cost of care (Question 4), there was less support for the proposal to increase charges for transport to £7.50 per journey with many feeling that such an increase would be too steep.

It should be noted that those who responded to the consultation and indicated that they would be personally affected by the proposals were more likely to disagree with them.

Reasons for this included the financial impact on individuals particularly those on lower incomes, concern that the proposals were potentially discriminatory due to their impact on disabled people, as well as concerns that the increased cost would lead to people deciding not to access services, and in particular to not use the transport, or use it less, which could lead to people not accessing day centres. This in turn could lead to a negative impact on providers, and potentially a requirement for higher-cost services for the individual. These are all legitimate concerns and we made clear in the consultation that we would need to take account of these.

Any impact on take-up of transport and/or the related services will need to be monitored.

The proposed changes are:

- a) Practice is changed to ensure that the full cost of care is taken into account when charging people who use services.
- b) The service works with every individual affected by this proposal to ensure that the appropriate level of care is in place and that individuals understand the reasons behind this.
- c) For new users, these changes come into place from 1 June 2019 and for those using the service from September 2019.



- d) Charges for transport are increased to £7.50 per journey for all users but that this is only fully implemented on 1 April 2021; and that these charges are set at £5 from 1 Sept 2019. During this first period the cap will be £30 per week and then increase to £40 per week from 1 April 2021.
- e) Monitoring of the impact of the changes is undertaken during the period of the reduced charge on those using the service and the impact on other council services and budgets.
- f) It is noted that there is a corporate review of transport provision and cost and that through that review we seek to address the concerns raised by users about the effectiveness and efficiency of the service.
- g) Charges for transport will be based on planned provision rather than actual. A minimum notice period for cancellation of one week has been given.

Section 4. Involvement and consultation (What involvement and consultation has been done regarding the proposal and what are the results? What consultation will be needed and how will it be done?)

Pre-Consultation:

Ahead of the formal consultation we carried out pre-consultation activity throughout July – September 2018. Sessions with various engagement groups have taken place around the County for people to have the opportunity to voice their views and concerns ahead of the formal consultation. The pre-consultation period also included making Councillors and internal staff aware of the upcoming consultation. This period was used to provide an initial sense test on the proposals as well as suggestions for implementation and people’s views on this such as how people think it will affect them and what can we do to mitigate the impact of this. We sought advice on assistance with communication methods and how to get the message out to stakeholders. Throughout this period we established a baseline from the feedback and also provided some example scenarios of how the changes may affect people.

Formal Consultation:

The formal 90 day public consultation was approved in October 2018 and took place from Monday 29 October 2018 until 21 January 2019. Everyone who is currently in receipt of a community based service from us was informed of the consultation via letter and directed to the survey, although not all of these people will be directly affected, in total around 4000 letters were sent out. In addition to the survey we have considered any feedback received by email, letters and from meetings during the consultation period.

Throughout the formal consultation there was an online survey for people to complete with easy read and paper versions available if required, including via libraries and other council buildings. 411 responses were received in total to the survey via the website and completed paper copies. 7 public events were held around the County in each district which were well attended with an average of 20 people per session, other forums such as the Learning Disability Partnership Board and North Yorkshire Disability Forum were also attended. The presentation was positively

received by audiences and people thought they had a better understanding of transport provision, why we have developed the proposals for change and the rationale behind this. Please see Appendix A below which is the presentation which was delivered at all events and has details of all public events which have been held throughout the consultation.

The consultation has been promoted via the NYCC website, corporate Facebook and Twitter accounts with regular releases on social media ahead of the public events. We have also utilised other networks including existing forums as outlined above. Groups and organisations have also been contacted directly via email with details of the consultation. A press release was published in October 2018 when the online survey went live and an interview took place on BBC Radio York highlighting the consultation. A further reminder press release was published in December 2018.

Statutory stakeholders were emailed via the corporate database with a link to the website and consultation documents.

Section 5. What impact will this proposal have on council budgets? Will it be cost neutral, have increased cost or reduce costs?

The proposals are estimated to achieve net savings of £490k in 2019-20, rising to £800k and then £981k in subsequent years. These savings are estimates at this stage and may need to be amended if there is any change in take-up of the services. We have also identified the risk of transferring cost to other services and this will be monitored.

Section 6. How will this proposal affect people with protected characteristics?	No impact	Make things better	Make things worse	Why will it have this effect? Provide evidence from engagement, consultation and/or service user data or demographic information etc.
Age	X		X	<p>Of the clients most likely to be directly affected by these proposals, 464 clients are over 60 years old 383 clients are under 60 years old As the client groups most directly affected are slightly more likely to be older people (55%) it is anticipated that there may be some adverse impact in relation to age.</p> <p>The majority of individual (rather than organisational) responders to the consultation were under 65 (52%), however more than half of this group (31%) were in the age category 50-64. People in the age</p>



				<p>group 85+ were more likely to disagree with the proposals than other age groups.</p> <p>There may be some adverse impact on some people if they are asked to contribute more to their social care costs and will therefore have less disposable income.</p> <p>Family carers of older/disabled people may also experience some adverse impact due to a) the potential impact on household budgets and b) the possibility of the proposals leading to reduced take-up of transport and day services, or social care support, and therefore increasing the pressure on family carers.</p> <p>This will be mitigated by a means tested financial assessment and proposal to cap transport costs.</p> <p>There is also potential for some neutral or positive impact as the proposals will assist the Council to continue to provide the services referred to in the proposals.</p>
Disability	X		X	<p>People affected by the proposals will be receiving a social care service, including transport to those services, as a result of disability, condition or frailty and could therefore all be considered as 'disabled'.</p> <p>Responders to the consultation who indicated that they were disabled were more likely to disagree with the proposals than those who were not.</p> <p>There may be some adverse impact on some people if they are asked to contribute more to their social care costs and will therefore have less disposable income.</p> <p>Family carers of older/disabled people may also experience some adverse impact due to a) the potential impact on household budgets and b) the possibility of the proposals leading to reduced take-up of transport and day services, or social care support, and therefore increasing the pressure on family carers.</p>



				<p>This will be mitigated by a means tested financial assessment and proposal to cap transport costs.</p> <p>There is also potential for some neutral or positive impact as the proposals will assist the Council to continue to provide the services referred to in the proposals.</p>
Sex (Gender)	X			<p>There is a slightly higher proportion of female clients at 447 than male clients - 400.</p> <p>A higher proportion of women (59%) responded to the consultation than men, but men were more likely to disagree with the proposals for the cap and for the full cost of care than women.</p> <p>It is anticipated there would be no identifiable impact on specific groups in relation to sex as a result of the project.</p>
Race	X			<p>Of the client groups most likely to be directly affected by the proposals, 98% identify as white British and 2% as minority ethnic, including other white backgrounds. This is slightly higher than the overall figure for North Yorkshire, which is 94% white British. It is anticipated that there would be no identifiable impact on minority ethnic people as a result of the proposals.</p>
Gender Reassignment	x			<p>It is anticipated there would be no identifiable impact on specific groups in relation to Gender Reassignment as a result of the project.</p> <p>The survey included space for people to say if they identified their gender in another way; there was a nil return for this option.</p>
Sexual orientation	x			<p>It is anticipated there would be no identifiable impact on specific groups in relation to Sexual orientation as a result of the project.</p>
Religion or belief	x			<p>It is anticipated there would be no identifiable impact on specific groups in relation to Religion or belief as a result of the project.</p>
Pregnancy or maternity	x			<p>It is anticipated there would be no identifiable impact on specific groups in relation to</p>



				pregnancy or maternity as a result of the project.
Marriage or civil partnership	x			It is anticipated there would be no identifiable impact on specific groups in relation to Marriage or civil partnership as a result of the project.

Section 7. How will this proposal affect people who...	No impact	Make things better	Make things worse	Why will it have this effect? Provide evidence from engagement, consultation and/or service user data or demographic information etc.
..live in a rural area?	X			<p>It is acknowledged that some people may not have alternative access to transport options who live in a rural area and therefore may be affected by the possible changes to transport charges.</p> <p>However, no one in receipt of transport services from the Council will be penalised in terms of distance as the transport charges are not calculated on this basis. This will remain the same regardless of the outcome of the consultation as there are no proposals associated with charging on a 'per distance' basis.</p>
...have a low income?	X			<p>People with a low income will not be affected by these proposals as they will be protected due to their financial assessment and taking into account their ability to pay for care and support.</p> <p>There is a proposal to implement a cap for transport charges to ensure an individual's spare income is not consumed entirely by transport charges.</p>

Section 8. Will the proposal affect anyone more because of a combination of protected characteristics? (e.g. older women or young gay men) State what you think the effect may be and why, providing evidence from engagement, consultation and/or service user data or demographic information etc.

People with the combined protected characteristics of age (older people) and disability may be slightly more likely to experience some adverse impact as a result of the proposals.

Section 9. Next steps to address the anticipated impact. Select one of the following options and explain why this has been chosen. (Remember: we have an anticipatory duty to make reasonable adjustments so that disabled people can access services and work for us)	Tick option chosen
---	---------------------------



<p>1. No adverse impact - no major change needed to the proposal. There is no potential for discrimination or adverse impact identified.</p>	
<p>2. Adverse impact - adjust the proposal - The EIA identifies potential problems or missed opportunities. We will change our proposal to reduce or remove these adverse impacts, or we will achieve our aim in another way which will not make things worse for people.</p>	
<p>3. Adverse impact - continue the proposal - The EIA identifies potential problems or missed opportunities. We cannot change our proposal to reduce or remove these adverse impacts, nor can we achieve our aim in another way which will not make things worse for people. (There must be compelling reasons for continuing with proposals which will have the most adverse impacts. Get advice from Legal Services)</p>	<p>X</p>
<p>4. Actual or potential unlawful discrimination - stop and remove the proposal – The EIA identifies actual or potential unlawful discrimination. It must be stopped.</p>	
<p>Explanation of why option has been chosen. (Include any advice given by Legal Services.)</p> <p>There is some potential for adverse impact on some people, as their disposable income may reduce as a result. However, this will be mitigated, if the proposals are agreed, by the application of the means tested financial assessment and by the implementation of a cap for transport charges.</p> <p>The proposals have been subject to public consultation; the Local Authority has considered all responses to the consultation before bringing final recommendations before county councillors, who will make the final decision.</p> <p>As the proposals for consultation were developed, potential for adverse impact was considered and the proposals were amended to reflect this, for example by the proposal for a cap on weekly transport costs and the decision not to propose a charge based on distance. However, it is recognised there may still be some adverse impact as outlined above.</p>	

<p>Section 10. If the proposal is to be implemented how will you find out how it is really affecting people? (How will you monitor and review the changes?)</p>
<p>The effect of the changes if implemented will be from June 2019 onwards. The Local Authority will continue to monitor the impact these changes may have on clients currently in receipt of community based services.</p>
<p>The project has a clear project plan, communication strategy and risk log, all with detailed requirements which are monitored and updated regularly. There are clear paths to implementation and who the key stakeholders are, this will continually be reviewed throughout the consultation.</p>

Action	Lead	By when	Progress
Review of consultation responses	Anton Hodge	08.02.19	Complete
Completion of Final Business Case	Anton Hodge	01.03.19	Complete
Update Charging Policy for sign off based on consultation feedback.	Anton Hodge	31.03.19	Planned



Executive sign-off of updated Charging Policy	HAS Executive	03.05.19	Planned
---	---------------	----------	---------

Section 12. Summary.

There is potential for some adverse impact on those with protected characteristics of age and disability, given the nature of the proposals and the groups who are most likely to be affected due to their requirement for social care support. As part of the implementation of the updated policy (subject to approval) each person's circumstances will be reviewed individually and any impact monitored throughout this process.

The proposals include some mitigation in the form of the means-tested financial assessment, and considerations of affordability when calculating the proposed transport charges and weekly cap.

Section 13. Sign off section

This full EIA was completed by:

Name: Anton Hodge
Job title: Assistant Director, Strategic Resources
Directorate: Central Services
Signature: A Hodge

Completion date: 05.03.19

Appendix 3 – DPIA Screening Questions:

Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA) – Screening Questions

Overview

A Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA) is essential to ensure that new systems and processes are compliant with Data Protection Legislation (GDPR and the Data Protection Bill). A DPIA is mandatory if the processing operation is “likely to result in a high risk to the rights and freedoms of natural persons”. The risk is considered high when processing personal information about a living person. Failure to carry out a DPIA, or failure to carry one out correctly when the risk is high, may result in a large fine.

What is Personal Data?

“personal data’ shall mean any information relating to an identified or identifiable natural person (‘data subject’); an identifiable person is one who can be identified, directly or indirectly, in particular by reference to an identification number or to one or more factors specific to his physical, physiological, mental, economic, cultural or social identity.”

It may be that a single piece of information can identify an individual, or it may be that it requires a combination of information to identify them. The following information would be considered personal data:

- Name
- Address
- Date of birth
- Email address (personal and work)
- NI number
- Bank details

Personal data also extends to items such as a photo, posts on social media or an IP address.

What is Special Category Data?

“personal data revealing racial or ethnic origin, political opinions, religious or philosophical beliefs, trade-union membership, and data concerning health or sex life.”

The following information would be considered special category data:

- Gender
- Age
- Religion
- Ethnicity
- Sexual orientation
- Health information
- Criminal history
- Biometric data

In order to determine whether a DPIA is necessary, insert the required information into the table below and complete the checklist.

If the answer is **YES** to any of the screening questions in the checklist then a DPIA must be carried out.

Project/Process Title	Securing Client Contributions											
Overview of Project/Process (brief details)	<p>Clients of Adult Social Care services receive a means-tested financial assessment to determine the extent to which they are able to contribute to the cost of their care. In 2013/2014, Health and Adult Services undertook a wide-ranging review of the Charging Policy, resulting in a number of changes to the policy being made.</p> <p>Since that review, Section 14 of the Care Act 2014 now gives Councils the power to charge adults for care and support where an adult has been assessed as having eligible needs. The ability to charge therefore remains discretionary, although other regulations and statutory guidance stipulate that certain types of care and support must be provided free of charge. The principles around charging previously found in the Fairer Charging Guidance and the Fairer Contributions Guidance are still applicable, namely that a person should only be required to pay what they can afford, aligned to the actual cost for providing that care, that Councils are clear and transparent so people know what they will be charged and apply the charging rules equally so those with similar needs or services are treated the same.</p> <p>As part of the 4% savings challenge, Health and Adult Services identified a range of proposals relating to charging for community-based services to be further explored:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="424 1200 1378 1413"> <thead> <tr> <th>ID</th> <th>Proposal</th> <th>Target (£k)</th> <th>Status</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1796</td> <td>Transport</td> <td>250</td> <td rowspan="2">Approval to consult on this from Executive Member in October 2019 and full public consultation has now taken place</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1946</td> <td>Charging for cost of care</td> <td>100</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These targets were agreed by the County Council and incorporated into the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) with full implementation of all savings in 2019-20.</p> <p>The Council currently has two policies for charges relating to adult social care. These are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Charging Policy for Residential Services • Charging Policy for Community-Based Services <p>Although there are no changes proposed to the policies themselves, the options out forward in the consultation may mean some:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Changes to the way we calculate – and charge for – that cost of care 	ID	Proposal	Target (£k)	Status	1796	Transport	250	Approval to consult on this from Executive Member in October 2019 and full public consultation has now taken place	1946	Charging for cost of care	100
ID	Proposal	Target (£k)	Status									
1796	Transport	250	Approval to consult on this from Executive Member in October 2019 and full public consultation has now taken place									
1946	Charging for cost of care	100										

	<p>- Increases to the charges for transport</p> <p>This project aligns with the following NYCC strategic objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - People in North Yorkshire live longer, healthier, independent lives - Support is centred on the needs of people and their carers, enabling them to take control of their health & independence - we want people to have more choice and control over the support to meet their social care needs. 		
Project Sponsor	Anton Hodge		
Directorate / Service Area	HAS		
Date of Assessment	14/06/2018		
Assessment Criteria	Yes/No	Justification for answer	
<p>Will there be a need to collect new information about individuals?</p> <p><i>Examples where the answer would be YES:</i></p> <p><i>This a new system/process processing personal data that has not been previously collected</i></p> <p><i>This is an existing system/process processing personal data but additional data must be collected due to a change in scope of the system/process</i></p>	No	Means testing will be based upon data already collected.	
<p>Will there be a need to ask individuals to provide personal information about themselves?</p> <p><i>Example of where the answer would be YES:</i></p> <p><i>A change in the scope of a system/process requires contacting individuals to ask for personal data</i></p>	No	Information already supplied as part of processes in place.	
<p>Will information about individuals be disclosed to organisations or people who have not previously had routine access to the information?</p> <p><i>Example of where the answer would be YES:</i></p> <p><i>There is a requirement to share information with an external 3rd party who has not previously had access to the data. This would also result in the need for a Data Sharing Agreement (DSA)</i></p>	No		
<p>Are you using information about individuals for a purpose it is not currently used for, or in a way it is not currently used?</p> <p><i>Example of where the answer would be YES:</i></p> <p><i>Details of the Information Asset in question will be contained within NYCC's Information Asset Register (IAR) and the purpose for processing, along with the legal basis for processing will be recorded. The way information will be used in this new system/process must match the existing purpose/legal basis, otherwise a DPIA is required</i></p>	No	Extending the scope of chargeable services only and not processing PD in another way.	

Does the new system or process involve using new technology that might be perceived as being privacy intrusive? For example, the use of biometrics or facial recognition.	No	
Will introduction of the new system or process result in you making decisions or taking action against individuals in ways that can have a significant impact on them? <i>This is in terms of the impact of processing their personal data</i>	No	
Is the information about individuals of a kind particularly likely to raise privacy concerns or expectations? <i>For example, health records, criminal records or other information that people would consider to be private</i>	No	
Will you need to contact individuals in ways that they may find intrusive? <i>By phone, by email or by post, where they have not be informed that this contact will take place</i>	No	

If you have answered **YES** to **ANY** of the above screening questions then contact the Data Governance Team for the full DPIA documentation or download a copy from the Data Governance Intranet site.

If you have answered **NO** to **ALL** of the above screening questions then a DPIA is not necessary. Please complete the declaration below and email a copy to the Data Governance Team, email: datagovernance@northyorks.gov.uk.

Project Sponsor Name	Anton Hodge	Data Governance Officer Name	David Kempen
Project Sponsor Signature	A Hodge	Data Governance Officer Signature	D Kempen
Date of Declaration	14.06.18	Date of Approval	14.06.18

Note: If the scope of work changes in any way then the pre-assessment MUST be repeated.

