

Impact Analysis – Option 4

Mobile Meal recipients have been placed into 6 groups in order to make assumptions about the future services they may receive. This then enables consideration of possible changes to the charges that customers may have to pay.

	Assumption About Replacement Services	Customer Numbers	Number of Meals	Will Not Pay More	Will Pay More
1	Customers already in receipt of a mealtime home care visit	73	441	63	10
2	Customers in receipt of a DP for any other services	20	106	20	0
3	Customers who live alone and receive no other services	58	319	54	4
4	Customers who live alone and receive other services	39	230	38	1
5	Customers who do not live alone and receive no other services	23	136	22	1
6	Customers who do not live alone and receive other services	23	116	23	0
		236	1348	220	16
				93%	7%

How Many Customers Will Pay More Than Currently?

It is estimated that out of the 236 current mobile meals recipients 220 (93%) will pay no more than they do currently; 16 people (7%) are expected to pay more. This is based on applying assumptions about the future services that people will receive, along with information from financial assessments for the 70% who have had them.

How Much More Will People Pay?

Using information about the expected services that people will receive, and the outcomes of financial assessments already undertaken, it has been possible to estimate the future contribution amounts as follows:

People who will pay no more	220	93%
Pay less than £2.50 per week extra	1	0%
Pay between £2.50 and £5 per week extra	6	3%
Pay between £5 and £7.50 per week extra	0	0%
Pay between £7.50 and £10 per week extra	2	1%
Pay between £10 and £12.50 per week	2	1%
Pay between £12.50 and £15 per week	5	2%
	236	

Financial Impact for the Council

Under this scenario the total cost of replacement services would be in the region of £156k. This takes into account the additional income from chargeable replacement services. The forecast net cost of the Mobile

Meals service as at the end of August 2013 was £369k. There would therefore be annual savings in the region of £213k.

Impact Analysis – Option 5

Under this option, the cost implications for customers are expected to be the same as for Option 4. If a person receives a managed Direct Payment rather than a contracted service, then the charge to the customer would be identical. The cost to the Council would be slightly higher under Option 5 as a result of the additional cost of the third party DP support service.

How Many Customers Will Pay More Than Currently?

It is estimated that out of the 236 current mobile meals recipients 220 (93%) will pay no more than they do currently; 16 people (7%) are expected to pay more. This is based on applying assumptions about the future services that people will receive, along with information from financial assessments for the 70% who have had them.

How Much More Will People Pay?

Using information about the expected services that people will receive, and the outcomes of financial assessments already undertaken, it has been possible to estimate the future contribution amounts as follows:

People who will pay no more	220	93%
Pay less than £2.50 per week extra	1	0%
Pay between £2.50 and £5 per week extra	6	3%
Pay between £5 and £7.50 per week extra	0	0%
Pay between £7.50 and £10 per week extra	2	1%
Pay between £10 and £12.50 per week	2	1%
Pay between £12.50 and £15 per week	5	2%
	236	

Financial Impact for the Council

Under this scenario the total cost of replacement services would be in the region of £163k. This takes into account the additional income from chargeable replacement services. The forecast net cost of the Mobile Meals service as at the end of August 2013 was £369k. There would therefore be annual savings in the region of £206k.

Equality Impact

It is not possible to identify the individual people who will pay more in any scenario, since this will depend on the replacement service that each person will receive in the future (which, in turn, is dependent on their individual needs) and their financial circumstances.

However, as an indicator we can look at the 47 people whose financial assessment indicates that they could pay more. Care must be taken given the small number of people; numbers are shown alongside the percentages for perspective.

Gender

Proportion of each gender that have had a financial assessment and can afford to pay more:

Female	23%	(23 out of 101)
Male	38%	(24 out of 64)

Ethnicity

Proportion of each ethnicity that have had a financial assessment and can afford to pay more:

Asian or Asian British – Indian	24%	(18 out of 76)
Asian or Asian British - other Asian origin	67%	(2 out of 3)
Black Caribbean & White	100%	(1 out of 1)
Black or Black British – Caribbean	10%	(1 out of 10)
White British	35%	(24 out of 68)
White Irish	0%	(0 out of 1)
White –other	0%	(0 out of 5)
Other	100%	(1 out of 1)

Primary Client Type

Proportion of each Primary Client Type that have had a financial assessment and can afford to pay more:

Mental Health	27%	(13 out of 48)
Learning Disabilities	33%	(1 out of 3)
Physical Disabilities	28%	(31 out of 111)
Substance Misuse	50%	(1 out of 2)
Other Vulnerable People	100%	(1 out of 1)

Age

Proportion of each age group that have had a financial assessment and can afford to pay more:

18 to 64	41%	(12 out of 29)
65 to 74	20%	(5 out of 25)
75 to 84	25%	(12 out of 48)
85 to 94	28%	(16 out of 57)
95+	33%	(2 out of 6)