

* Name of proposal/policy	Reduction in Trading Standards capacity	* Budget number	16-006-03
* Service area responsible	Place – Environment, Planning & Transport	* Cabinet meeting date	14 th February 2017
* Name of completing officer	Alison Parry	* Approved by Director / Assistant Director	Tony Ciaburro
* Version	1.0	* Date	2 February 2017

PART A

* Section 1a: Description of proposal under consideration/development	* Section 1b: Is this new or existing? Does it link to current provision?
Reduce the Trading Standards operational budget by £50k to be achieved through for example reducing the number of proactive checks on illegal sales, businesses etc. The Trading Standards service applies a threshold when deciding whether to take action in relation to consumer and business complaints about unfair trading practice, which will need to be reviewed against this budget reduction.	This is a reduction in an existing service.

* Section 2: How does this align with the Council Plan/ corporate priorities/ partnership strategies and plans/ Next Generation Council?	
Delivers increased wellbeing and/or safeguarding by ensuring that...	✓
People of all ages are safe, protected from harm and able to live happy, healthy and independent lives in our communities	✓

People have the information and support they need to make healthy choices and achieve wellbeing		
People achieve economic prosperity, in a healthy, low carbon economy which gives access to jobs, training and skills development		
Communities thrive in a pleasant and resilient environment, with robust transport and communications infrastructure		
Resources are utilised effectively and efficiently, in coordination with partners and providers	✓	
Does it align with any NCC/ partnership strategies and plans? (if so, please list below)		
Community Safety and Police activities		
Does it support the transformation into a Next Generation Council? (if so, please explain below)		

*** Section 3: If this relates to a statutory duty, please give details of the relevant legislation below:**
The Trading Standards is a statutory service delivering the requirements of extensive legislation. The service activities are risk managed within the available budget envelope to minimise legal challenge, public harm and reputational damage to NCC.

Section 4: Have other alternatives been considered?
Previously investigations have been undertaken to merge with neighbouring authorities but all these have fallen through.

*** Section 5: Financial / resource implications**

a) Costs (e.g. invest to save)
None

b) Staffing implications
None at this stage

c) Savings
£50k

Section 6: Has a similar initiative/proposal been implemented elsewhere? What were the benefits or risks? Are there lessons that can be learned?

N/A

THIS SECTION HAS REPLACED THE EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORM AND MUST BE COMPLETED TO DEMONSTRATE COMPLIANCE WITH THE EQUALITY DUTY

*** Section 7: Who will be affected by this proposal? (this may be service user data, or be based on a particular geographical area or more general population data depending on the proposal) Include demographic information where this is available e.g. breakdown by gender, age, ethnicity, disability etc. BIPI can support with the provision of data. You may include staff, partner organisations and any other stakeholders who might be affected by the proposal.**

Data Source (include link where published) and summary of what it tells us for example “X number of people use this service, X are male, Y are female etc”	Why is this relevant to the proposal?
TS have responsibility for enforcing 263 different pieces of legislation from different parts of Government – this covers everything from car boot sales, farms to large multi-national businesses. An Office of Fair Trading report estimated that for every £1 of money spent on Trading Standards fair trading enforcement at least £6 of consumer detriment was avoided (excluding the deterrent effect).	

*** Section 8: Based on the above information, will this proposal have an impact on the following? ✓ the relevant box for each line and then expand on the reasons why in Section 9**

	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Unsure
<u>Age</u>		✓		
<u>Disability</u>		✓		
<u>Gender reassignment</u>			✓	

Marriage and civil partnership			✓	
Pregnancy and Maternity			✓	
Race			✓	
Religion or Belief (or No Belief)			✓	
Sex			✓	
Sexual orientation			✓	

* Section 9: Initial impact	
* Section 9a: From your analysis in section 8 above, please explain the positive implications	
N/A	
* Section 9b: From your analysis in section 8 above, please explain why you have categorised any of the implications as neutral	
The proposed reduction is unlikely to have anything other than a neutral impact on people because of gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex or sexual orientation.	
* Section 9c: From your analysis above, please explain the negative implications	* Section 9d: What actions have you identified to mitigate any negative implications?
<p>The Trading Standards Service exists to protect all customers and the public at large. However, one of its key roles relates to carrying out test purchases to ensure that age-controlled products e.g. tobacco products, alcohol etc are not sold to young people who are underage.</p> <p>Similarly, elderly and disabled people are often targeted by illegal/unscrupulous traders because of their vulnerability.</p> <p>This means that a reduction in capacity in Trading Standards could reduce the service's ability to protect these vulnerable groups.</p>	Every effort will be made to prioritise how this budget reduction will be implemented to reduce impact on vulnerable groups.
* Section 9e: From your analysis above, please explain the areas where you are unsure of the impact	* Section 9f: What actions have you identified to fill gaps in information?

N/A	N/A
-----	-----

* Section 10: Internal considerations: are there any implications for the following?		
	✓ or X	If there are any implications, please explain them here and identify any actions you may need to take as a result
Staff		Consideration given to deletion of (vacant) post if sufficient savings not found as planned.
Financial (NCC)	✓	Saving £50k
Legal	✓	We need to be mindful that we are still fulfilling our statutory duty if we reduce the capacity of the service
NCC Policy		
Performance	✓	Risk of reduction in performance
Data quality / information security		
IT		
Strategic assets		
LGSS / federated bodies		
Procurement		
Project support		
Other (if appropriate)		

* Section 11: External considerations: are there any implications for the following?		
	✓ or X	If there are any implications, please explain them here and identify any actions you may need to take as a result
Community impact		

Impact on the consumer (e.g. communication needs, access, rurality, complaints)	✓	Possibility of complaints being received due to a reduction in the service
Reputation	✓	Risk of reputational damage if there is a perception that the Council is not protecting the public against rogue traders
Political		
Partners		
Human Rights		
Health impact – individual		
Health impact – wider community	✓	Possibility that reduction in capacity could lead to public health and safety concerns
Economic impact - individual	✓	Trading Standards protects the public against traders who seek to defraud them by overcharging/charging for good/services that do not exist – if there is a reduction in capacity, this could affect the ability to protect the public’s economic wellbeing
Economic impact – wider community		
Community Safety impact	✓	Reduction in capacity to protect against criminal behaviour
Environmental impact		
Consultation	✓	None outside the budget consultation
Other (if appropriate)		

Based on the impacts and considerations above, please identify the RAG status using the RAG assumptions below:

RAG Status	Overall RAG	Time	Proposal Delivery	Cash Saving	Risk	Issue	Dependency

* Section 12a: What are the risks associated with NOT implementing the proposal? (tick if applicable)	✓	* Section 12b: What actions have you identified to mitigate the risks? Will anything in the current arrangements need to be changed to acknowledge this risk? Is implementing the proposal the only way to mitigate the risks?
Non-compliance with legislation or NCC policy		
Financial	✓	Not making this service cut would require the money to be found elsewhere
Change in performance/ data quality/ information security		
Reputational/ Political		
Increase in complaints and/ or legal challenge		
Other		

* Section 13: Budget Delivery Programme Highlight Report information – total amount allocated to savings proposal 2017-18 through to 2020-2021; profiled budget; 2017-18 action plan extended savings narrative; cost code information			
Total amount allocated to savings proposal 2017-18			
2017-18 (£000)		50	
Impact of saving within the budget profile			
Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
50			
	Milestone	Owner	By when
1	Project plan for reduction	D Hedger	1 st April 2017

*** Section 14: Do you need to undertake further work (e.g. consultation, further proposal development, further equality analysis) based on the impact and actions identified above? If yes, set this out below and then carry out the work and complete Part B:**

This proposal will form part of the overall budget consultation process. Any feedback received (as well as any further intelligence gathered in the course of developing the project) will inform a final analysis of the impact of the proposal which will be considered by Cabinet and Council in February when taking a final decision on the budget. The EqIA will be updated accordingly.

PART B

Section 15: Consultation, follow up data and information gathered from actions identified above

	What does this information tell us?
This proposal formed part of the overall budget consultation process.	We received no comments specifically on this proposal.

Section 16: Final impact analysis (taking the findings from Part B into account) – including review date if required

It is acknowledged that a reduction in trading standards activity has the potential to negatively impact upon vulnerable groups, namely older people, people with disabilities and younger people. Every effort will be made to ensure that any negative impact is mitigated by way of prioritising areas of activity which particularly affect vulnerable people.