

Equality Impact Assessment

1. Tell us about your service

My Directorate	Chief Executives
My Service	City Policy
My team / section	Our Manchester Funds Team
The name of the function being analysed	Our Manchester Voluntary and Community Sector Funding Programme
Who is completing the assessment?	Keiran Barnes, Policy and Programmes Manager (Communities and VCSE)
Who is the lead manager for the assessment?	James Binks, Assistant Chief Executive

2. Tell us about the activity that you're analysing

Briefly describe the main aims and objectives of your policy, project, service redesign or strategy, including outlining at a high level if it has implications for other areas of the Council's work and priorities.

Overview

The 2023-26 OMVCS programme is a three-year grant fund that supports VCSE organisations to progress the themes of the Our Manchester reset (Our Manchester: Forward to 2025), alongside other city priorities including, but not limited to, the impacts of Covid and the Cost of Living crisis. The purpose of the programme is: *to sustain and support a healthy and thriving local voluntary sector in Manchester, so that it can continue to support the city's residents and focus on what the sector excels at*

The programme's aims require funded organisations to deliver activities that progress one or more of: equality and inclusion; health and wellbeing, and; poverty action.

Background

The 2023-26 programme was extensively engaged on and co-designed with key stakeholders, mainly representatives of the city's VCSE sector but also including other public sector providers and Council officers. Numerous measures were taken to ensure the engagement, co-design and promotion processes were accessible and inclusive, such as:

- A mixture of five in-person and three virtual engagement sessions provided options for how people wanted / were able to engage – all engagement events took account of access needs (in terms of venue accessibility, offers of translation support etc)
- An online survey provided a further option to input for some individuals who were unable to attend in-person or virtual sessions
- A Co-Design Group supported the refresh of the fund – this group included individuals with experience of working in equality-related services and / or had lived experience, providing diverse and different perspectives
- The Co-Design Group prioritised Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) considerations throughout the process and identified EDI as a stand-alone aim of the grant programme as well as a cutting across all activities
- The co-design process identified that funding to Black, Asian and Minority Ethnicity organisations would be prioritised, specifically to increase the proportion of the available funds going to these organisations compared with the 2018 OMVCS programme
- The refreshed fund was communicated via the fund prospectus on the Council's website – an offer of alternative formats was included
- In addition, a guidance document was included to assist organisations with their applications and a Microsoft Word copy of the online application form was available to support the accessibility of the application process
- An information film was produced outlining the key elements of the fund – this included subtitles to enhance accessibility

More extensive detail on the engagement and co-design processes, including which groups and communities of identity engaged in them, is available in the Our Manchester Voluntary & Community Sector (OMVCS) Refreshed Funding Programme report, as considered by the Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee in its 19 July 2022 meeting.

Panel process

The OMVCS 2023-26 funding programme attracted 217 applications of which 212 were eligible and assessed by the funding panel. This panel was brought together to include a range of lived and professional experiences of EDI and was fully briefed on the role that EDI considerations had to play in the assessment process (ie training on unconscious bias in decision-making).

The assessment panel assessed each application individually before coming together for panel deliberations and balancing to arrive at a broadly balanced programme. This had regard, in particular, for the priorities of 1) increasing the proportion of funds to Black, Asian and Minority Ethnicity organisations compared to the 2018 programme, and 2) increasing the proportion of funds to organisations based in the north of the city compared to the 2018 programme.

More extensive detail on the panel assessment process is available in the Our Manchester Voluntary & Community Sector (OMVCS) Fund report, as considered by the Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee in its 6 December 2022 meeting.

The OMVCS assessment process highlighted the importance of increasing funding available to place-based, community organisations. This has been achieved through the development of the **Supporting Communities Fund (SCF)**, as further detailed in the Our Manchester Voluntary & Community Sector (OMVCS) Fund report being considered by the Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee in its 7

March 2023 meeting. The SCF aims to support place-based activity by organisations serving the local area, including organisations supporting older residents. As such, the fund's reach in terms of diversity of service users is primarily dictated by the demography of those areas where organisations are based, rather than funded organisations having a target community of identity.

This EqIA aims to present the profile of characteristics that are identified for support across both the OMVCS and Supporting Communities Fund programmes.

TIP: briefly summarise the key points and keep your answer under 500 words.

TIP: try not to duplicate information that's available elsewhere; you can easily use this space to signpost to other sources of background information instead of rewriting them here.

3. Analysing the impact on equality

Will the policy, strategy, project, service redesign being assessed here... (Tick all that apply):

Remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by individuals or groups because of their characteristics	Yes
Meet the needs of people from protected or disadvantaged groups where these are different from the needs of other people	Yes
Promote diversity and encourage people from protected or disadvantaged groups to participate in activities where they are underrepresented	Yes

Describe how you've reached your conclusion and what evidence it's based on (500 words max).

The OMVCS fund has a strong focus on EDI. Addressing inequality is at the core of the fund's aims of:

- addressing inequalities and building inclusion
- promoting communities' health and wellbeing
- tackling poverty

Across both the OMVCS and SCF programmes, there is a focus on delivering support services to communities that are historically disadvantaged and / or experience ongoing inequalities. Generally speaking, the services supported through these programmes do work to remove disadvantage, meet differing needs and encourage participation (some organisations do this as a specific aim of their charitable objects, others have a more universal impact for communities generally but do contribute to these aims).

Considering which group/s you have identified the policy, project, strategy or service redesign as being relevant to, complete the table below. Be brief with your answers and only complete them for the group/s relevant to your activity. If you identify any actions to address impacts, list these in Annex 1 along with responsible officers and timescales for each action.

IMPORTANT – PLEASE NOTE:

The data used for this analysis was gathered from the application forms submitted by OMVCS applicant organisations. Overall, the standard of data that organisations collected and reported was very inconsistent. In numerous cases, data-sets were incomplete, absent or reported inconsistently from one portion of the application to the next. Whilst this was not the case for all applicants, it is a prevalent enough trend to mean that the data provided should be seen as indicative only, and is not a robust source of intelligence.

For several characteristic groups, broad collective terms have been often used instead of more specific categories: this limits the extent to which some groups (ie Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic communities, disabled people, LGBT+ people) can be more deeply analysed.

In most cases, the data is likely to under-report the prospective impact delivered by the funding programmes. This is reflected in the narrative below, along with the indicative assessment of impact available from the data provided.

	<p>1. What is the impact of your proposal on this group?</p> <p>1) does your proposal remove or minimise disadvantage for each group 2) does it meet needs that are different from other people's 3) does it promote diversity or encourages participation</p>	<p>2. What evidence have you used to reach this assessment?</p> <p>Evidence could include customer profile data, demographic information, research, or engagement and consultation outcomes</p>	<p>3. What actions could be taken to address the impacts?</p> <p>1) to what extent does this proposal meet our equality duties 2) should or could this be improved</p>
<p>Age (older people)</p>	<p>Across both funds, a number of organisations have advised in their application forms that they will particularly target older people for their services (7 on OMVCS, 10 on SCG)</p> <p>The number of organisations having a positive impact on the lives of older residents through the availability of local support is likely to exceed this, but the extent of this is not quantifiable from the data provided</p> <p>The range of activities for older people across the programmes address all arms of the duty</p>	<p>16% of organisations supported by the OMVCS stated their activities are aimed at older people – the fact that this fund supports a number of place-based services supporting the local community, of which a proportion will be older people, means that the actual level of activity accessed by older residents is likely to be higher than the data provided indicates</p> <p>59% of organisations supported by the SCF support older people – activities here are particularly but not exclusively focused on reducing the occurrence of people being socially isolated, lonely and housebound – as above, there is likely to be a wider but unreported positive impact within this programme</p>	<p>The proportion of funding directed to older people across the funding programmes represents a positive impact</p> <p>Ongoing monitoring of the funds' activities and outcomes will ensure a sustained impact in this area</p>

	<p>1. What is the impact of your proposal on this group?</p> <p>1) does your proposal remove or minimise disadvantage for each group 2) does it meet needs that are different from other people's 3) does it promote diversity or encourages participation</p>	<p>2. What evidence have you used to reach this assessment?</p> <p>Evidence could include customer profile data, demographic information, research, or engagement and consultation outcomes</p>	<p>3. What actions could be taken to address the impacts?</p> <p>1) to what extent does this proposal meet our equality duties 2) should or could this be improved</p>
<p>Age (children and young people)</p>	<p>The OMVCS fund is only available to organisations supporting people aged 18+, it does not support youth specific provision. The Council has separate Children and Young People commissioning and grant funding arrangements with the VCSE, which are out of scope for this EIA.</p> <p>Within the OMVCS and SCF programmes, there are a number of groups supporting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Young adults (1 on OMVCS, 1 on SCF) • Families (including children) (4 on OMVCS, 4 on SCF) • Parents (2 on OMVCS, 0 on SCF) meaning that there is some positive impact, but this is more limited given the conditions of the programmes 	<p>The data provided by applicants indicates that activities will be targeted at the following cohorts in each of OMVCS and SCF (as a % of the total organisations on each programme):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2% of OMVCS organisations will target young adults; this is 6% on SCF • 9% of OMVCS organisations will target families (including children); this is 24% on SCF • 5% of OMVCS organisations will target parents; 0% on SCF 	<p>Despite the condition of funding being primarily for organisations providing support at age 18+, there is still a proportion of support being directed to children and young people through the programmes – the programmes therefore have a positive contribution to the duties</p>

	<p>1. What is the impact of your proposal on this group?</p> <p>1) does your proposal remove or minimise disadvantage for each group 2) does it meet needs that are different from other people's 3) does it promote diversity or encourages participation</p>	<p>2. What evidence have you used to reach this assessment?</p> <p>Evidence could include customer profile data, demographic information, research, or engagement and consultation outcomes</p>	<p>3. What actions could be taken to address the impacts?</p> <p>1) to what extent does this proposal meet our equality duties 2) should or could this be improved</p>
<p>Disability (including continuing health conditions)</p>	<p>Across both programmes, a number of applicants advised that their organisation targeted support towards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disabled people generally (7 on OMVCS, 1 on SCF) • Mental health support (3 on OMVCS, 0 on SCF) • Physical illness or continuing health conditions (5 on OMVCS, 2 on SCF) <p>As with other characteristics, it is likely that locally delivered services supporting the immediate community will also improve impacts for a number of disabled residents accessing those services, but this is not reported or therefore quantifiable</p>	<p>The data provided by applicants indicates that activities will be targeted at the following cohorts in each of OMVCS and SCF (as a % of the total organisations on each programme):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disabled people generally (16% of OMVCS organisations, 6% of SCF organisations) • Mental health support (7% of OMVCS organisations, 0% of SCF organisations) • Physical illness or continuing health conditions (12% of OMVCS organisations, 12% of SCF organisations) <p>Considering the increased prevalence of disability and continuing health conditions in older age, added to the fact that 16% and 59% of organisations on these programmes respectively target older residents, the actual % impact is likely to be considerably higher than the data provided suggests</p>	<p>Across the range of disability-related applications, all aims of the duty are supported. Activities that are being funded that meet these aims include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for and involvement of people with specific disabilities and health conditions such as dementia, profound hearing impairment / Deafness, mental health conditions and learning disability / cognitive conditions • Work to harness collective support and services for disabled residents across VCSE, public and private sectors <p>Given the positive impacts that can be assessed here (and likely unreported ones), no improvement actions are proposed</p>

<p>Race</p>	<p>Across both programmes, a number of applicants advised that their organisation targeted support towards either Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) communities generally (this was a stand-alone option on the application form), or towards particular ethnicities (also listed separately on the application form).</p> <p><i>Please note that in many cases, BAME has been used as a collective term instead of providing a more detailed breakdown of different ethnicities – the ethnicity-specific data here is incomplete then, and interwoven with the broader BAME category:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic people generally (10 on OMVCS, 6 on SCF) • African (1 on OMVCS, 0 on SCF) • Asian (not specified) (3 on OMVCS, 1 on SCF) • Asylum seekers / refugees (6 on OMVCS, 1 on SCF) • Bangladeshi (1 on OMVCS, 0 on SCF) • Black (not specified) (0 on OMVCS, 0 on SCF) • Caribbean (1 on OMVCS, 0 on SCF) • Chinese (1 on OMVCS, 0 on SCF) • Irish (0 on OMVCS, 0 on SCF) • Jewish community (1 on OMVCS, 0 on SCF) • Middle Eastern (0 on OMVCS, 0 on SCF) • Pakistani (0 on OMVCS, 0 on SCF) • Roma (1 on OMVCS, 0 on SCF) • Somali (0 on OMVCS, 0 on SCF) 	<p>The data provided by applicants indicates that activities will be targeted at the following cohorts in each of OMVCS and SCF (as a % of the total organisations on each programme):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic people generally (23% of OMVCS, 35% of SCF) • African (2.3% of OMVCS, 0% on SCF) • Asian (not specified) (7% of OMVCS, 6% on SCF) • Asylum seekers / refugees (14% on OMVCS, 6% of SCF) • Bangladeshi (2.3% of OMVCS, 0% of SCF) • Black (not specified) (0% of OMVCS, 0% of SCF) • Caribbean (2.3% of OMVCS, 0% of SCF) • Chinese (2.3% of OMVCS, 0% of SCF) • Irish (0% of OMVCS, 0% of SCF) • Jewish community (2.3% of OMVCS, 0% of SCF) • Middle Eastern (0% of OMVCS, 0% of SCF) • Pakistani (0% of OMVCS, 0% of SCF) • Roma (2.3% of OMVCS, 0 of SCF) • Somali (0% of OMVCS, 0% of SCF) • White / mixed white (5% of OMVCS, 0% of SCF) 	<p>There has been a sharp up-turn in BAME focused services in the 2023 OMVCS fund compared to the 2018 round (62.8% in 2023 compared to circa 14% in 2018), which is a positive reflection of the prioritisation of this characteristic throughout the process</p> <p>Increasing the amount and proportion of funding in the 2023 programme compared to the original 2019 OMVCS programme was a priority of the fund design, assessment and decision-making processes</p> <p>Across the range of activities funded here, there are measures to meet all of the arms of the duty. Activities that are being funded that meet these aims include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increasing access to information, benefits and other support for asylum seekers and refugees • BAME-specific support for carers and vulnerable adults • Health activities, therapeutic support and other help for specific ethnic groups, ie Bangladeshi women, African Caribbean communities etc • Activities to celebrate different communities' cultures and identities <p>Given these and numerous other positive impacts, no additional action is proposed for these programmes at this time. However, a separate BAME focused programme of funding of £125,000 for 2023-24 is being developed to further enhance the impact for this characteristic</p>
--------------------	--	---	---

	<p>1. What is the impact of your proposal on this group?</p> <p>1) does your proposal remove or minimise disadvantage for each group 2) does it meet needs that are different from other people's 3) does it promote diversity or encourages participation</p>	<p>2. What evidence have you used to reach this assessment?</p> <p>Evidence could include customer profile data, demographic information, research, or engagement and consultation outcomes</p>	<p>3. What actions could be taken to address the impacts?</p> <p>1) to what extent does this proposal meet our equality duties 2) should or could this be improved</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • White / mixed white (2 on OMVCS, 0 on SCF) <p>This means that the general 'BAME' category is the most well-served across both programmes.</p> <p>As with other characteristics, it is likely that locally delivered services supporting the immediate community will also improve impacts for a number of BAME residents accessing those services (this is particularly the case for SCF organisations, where there is clearly some under-reporting of BAME impact), but this is not reported or therefore quantifiable</p>		

	<p>1. What is the impact of your proposal on this group?</p> <p>1) does your proposal remove or minimise disadvantage for each group 2) does it meet needs that are different from other people's 3) does it promote diversity or encourages participation</p>	<p>2. What evidence have you used to reach this assessment?</p> <p>Evidence could include customer profile data, demographic information, research, or engagement and consultation outcomes</p>	<p>3. What actions could be taken to address the impacts?</p> <p>1) to what extent does this proposal meet our equality duties 2) should or could this be improved</p>
<p>Sex</p>	<p>Across both programmes, data on the sex of users was underreported. The great majority of applications did not make a distinction on the sex of target beneficiaries, making the analysis here unreliable. As a result, the specific impacts for each individual sex cannot be determined from the data provided.</p> <p>On OMVCS, 1 application specifically stated men as a target cohort, and 5 applications are targeted towards women. On SCF, 1 application is targeted at men and 0 target women. No applications across either fund expressly target support to trans communities (where support is available, this has been interwoven with the wider LGBT+ category)</p> <p>Clearly, across 60 applications, this is a significant underrepresentation of the wider impacts for each sex. During the funded period, the six-monthly monitoring returns will provide a clearer data set of users of each sex and an indication of the types of impact experienced by each.</p>	<p>The data provided by applicants indicates that activities will be targeted at the following cohorts in each of OMVCS and SCF (as a % of the total organisations on each programme):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Men: 2.3% of OMVCS, 6% of SCF • Women: 12% of OMVCS, 0% of SCF • Trans men and women: data not available 	<p>The underreporting here prevents a clear analysis of the extent to which the funds provide a positive impact for each sex and therefore, the extent to which it advances the arms of the duty. Clearly, the beneficiaries of all funded services will fall within a category here, either as a target beneficiary or as a more general one.</p> <p>Improved data on impact related to sex will become available during the funded period, via the six-monthly monitoring returns. This will be iteratively reported for the funding period in the programme's annual reports.</p>

	<p>1. What is the impact of your proposal on this group?</p> <p>1) does your proposal remove or minimise disadvantage for each group 2) does it meet needs that are different from other people's 3) does it promote diversity or encourages participation</p>	<p>2. What evidence have you used to reach this assessment?</p> <p>Evidence could include customer profile data, demographic information, research, or engagement and consultation outcomes</p>	<p>3. What actions could be taken to address the impacts?</p> <p>1) to what extent does this proposal meet our equality duties 2) should or could this be improved</p>
<p>Sexual Orientation</p>	<p>Across both programmes, a number of applicants advised that their organisation targeted support towards LGBT+ communities. Please also consider the trans information in the 'gender reassignment' section below.</p> <p><i>Please note that in the application form, applicants were asked to provide data for bisexual, gay, heterosexual, lesbian and 'other' sexual orientations. In the great majority of cases, this was reported under the collective term of LGBT+, not the sub-categories of it, so the data here is based on the higher level LGBT+ data</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On OMVCS, 4 organisations target support for LGBT+ people • On SCF, 3 organisations have targeted support for LGBT+ people <p>As with other categories, the actual 'non-targeted' support that LGBT+ residents will be able to access through the funded organisations is likely to be considerably greater than indicated in the data available</p>	<p>The data provided by applicants indicates that activities will be targeted at the following cohorts in each of OMVCS and SCF (as a % of the total organisations on each programme):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OMVCS: 9% of organisations target support for LGBT+ communities • SCF: 18% of organisations target support for LGBT+ communities 	<p>The extent to which LGBT+ support features in the programmes compares favourably with the % city's LGBT+ population according to data; within this, the activities are relevant to all arms of the duty. These include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing support for young LGBT+ people • HIV support, advice and advocacy • Support around LGBT+ hate crime, domestic abuse and health <p>No further action is proposed at this time</p>

	<p>1. What is the impact of your proposal on this group?</p> <p>1) does your proposal remove or minimise disadvantage for each group 2) does it meet needs that are different from other people's 3) does it promote diversity or encourages participation</p>	<p>2. What evidence have you used to reach this assessment?</p> <p>Evidence could include customer profile data, demographic information, research, or engagement and consultation outcomes</p>	<p>3. What actions could be taken to address the impacts?</p> <p>1) to what extent does this proposal meet our equality duties 2) should or could this be improved</p>
<p>Marriage / civil partnership</p>	<p>The characteristic of marriage / civil partnership was not monitored on the OMVCS application form – therefore, organisations were not required to submit any data on this characteristic, preventing analysis</p> <p>From the narrative sections of the application form, none of the funded organisations' activities are specifically targeted at married or civil partnership couples. Whilst some married / civil partnership couples / individuals will benefit from the services being funded in general terms, this will not be <i>on the grounds of</i> their married / civil partnership status</p>	<p>As noted, no evidence was requested on this characteristic in the application process</p>	<p>Given the lack of data requested, it is not possible to assess the extent to which the funded programmes will progress the aims of advancing equality and increasing participation – however, there is no content within the successful applications to indicate that the programmes would cause any form of discrimination for married / civil partnership people</p>

	<p>1. What is the impact of your proposal on this group?</p> <p>1) does your proposal remove or minimise disadvantage for each group 2) does it meet needs that are different from other people's 3) does it promote diversity or encourages participation</p>	<p>2. What evidence have you used to reach this assessment?</p> <p>Evidence could include customer profile data, demographic information, research, or engagement and consultation outcomes</p>	<p>3. What actions could be taken to address the impacts?</p> <p>1) to what extent does this proposal meet our equality duties 2) should or could this be improved</p>
<p>Pregnancy / maternity</p>	<p>The characteristic of pregnancy / maternity was not monitored on the OMVCS application form – therefore, organisations were not required to submit any data on this characteristic, preventing analysis</p> <p>From the narrative sections of the application form, none of the funded organisations' activities are specifically targeted at pregnancy / maternity, although some applications did target support towards family activity (see children and young people section for breakdown). Whilst this is a related group, it is not directly data on pregnancy and paternity so cannot be seen as directly representative</p>	<p>As noted, no evidence was requested on this characteristic in the application process</p>	<p>Given the lack of data requested, it is not possible to assess the extent to which the funded programmes will progress the aims of advancing equality and increasing participation – however, there is no content within the successful applications to indicate that the programmes would cause any form of discrimination related to pregnancy and maternity</p>

	<p>1. What is the impact of your proposal on this group?</p> <p>1) does your proposal remove or minimise disadvantage for each group 2) does it meet needs that are different from other people's 3) does it promote diversity or encourages participation</p>	<p>2. What evidence have you used to reach this assessment?</p> <p>Evidence could include customer profile data, demographic information, research, or engagement and consultation outcomes</p>	<p>3. What actions could be taken to address the impacts?</p> <p>1) to what extent does this proposal meet our equality duties 2) should or could this be improved</p>
<p>Gender Reassignment</p>	<p>The characteristic of 'gender reassignment' was not monitored in the OMVCS application process. As noted in the sex and LGBT+ sections of this analysis, information on trans service users, as a broader term, was requested but data for the funded organisations addresses this within the broader LGBT+ term, meaning a stand-alone analysis for this characteristic is not available</p> <p>As there are several LGBT+ inclusive organisations with targeted provision being supported across the programmes, it is likely that people transitioning will be supported, but this is not quantifiable from the data available</p>	<p>As noted, no evidence was requested on this characteristic in the application process</p>	<p>Given the lack of data requested, it is not possible to assess the extent to which the funded programmes will progress the aims of the duty specifically related to gender reassignment. However, it can be reasonably assessed that LGBT+ inclusive services will take account, to an extent, the needs of people transitioning and whilst this can't be quantified, there is a likely positive impact (see LGBT+ section above for breakdown)</p> <p>There is no content within the successful applications to indicate that the programmes would cause any form of discrimination related to gender reassignment</p>

	<p>1. What is the impact of your proposal on this group?</p> <p>1) does your proposal remove or minimise disadvantage for each group 2) does it meet needs that are different from other people's 3) does it promote diversity or encourages participation</p>	<p>2. What evidence have you used to reach this assessment?</p> <p>Evidence could include customer profile data, demographic information, research, or engagement and consultation outcomes</p>	<p>3. What actions could be taken to address the impacts?</p> <p>1) to what extent does this proposal meet our equality duties 2) should or could this be improved</p>
<p>Faith / religion / belief</p>	<p>Across both programmes, the majority of applicants did not gather data on the faith or belief of their service users, which impacts negatively on the robustness of the analysis here. The available data are presented here but given the extent to which this is drawn from an incomplete data-set, it is to be taken as indicative only.</p> <p>As with other characteristics, it is likely that locally delivered services supporting the immediate community will also improve impacts for a number of other faith groups / individuals but this is not reported or therefore quantifiable</p>	<p>The data provided by applicants indicates that activities will be targeted at the following cohorts in each of OMVCS and SCF (as a % of the total organisations on each programme):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Christian: 31% of OMVCS, 4% of SCF • Buddhist: 7% of OMVCS, 1% of SCF • Hindu: 4% of OMVCS, 1% of SCF • Sikh: 4% of OMVCS, 1% of SCF • Jewish: 6% of OMVCS, 1% of SCF • Muslim: 11% of OMVCS, 4% of SCF • Other: 15% of OMVCS, 0.5% of SCF 	<p>Faith was a stated data requirement of the OMVCS fund application, but the process has highlighted a degree of under-recording and therefore underreporting in how some VCSE organisations capture this information – work will take place with the funded organisations throughout the 3-year period to support them to improve data capture processes</p> <p>The faith groups listed here are interwoven with wide ranging activities which collectively meet all of the arms of the duty</p>
<p>Additional Characteristics</p>			

<p>People living in poverty</p>	<p>Addressing poverty was one of the 3 stated aim of the OMVCS fund (along with advancing equality and promoting health and wellbeing) and 84% of the 43 successful organisations identified it as relevant to their application</p> <p>All organisations on the SCF have been required to outline in their proposal how their activities support poverty action; all organisations have included this in their documents</p> <p>As with other characteristics, the extent to which organisations have been able to record this information and include it in their applications is inconsistent. In the context of the information above, it is clear that the data available substantially under-representative. The data is presented here, but given the gaps in data collected, it should be seen as indicative only:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Homelessness / rough sleeping: 2 in OMVCS, 0 in SCF • People experiencing poverty: 2 in OMVCS, 3 in SCF • Unemployment: 4 in OMVCS, 1 in SCF • Residents of temporary accommodation: 1 in OMVCS, 0 in SCF <p>Whilst not recorded and therefore not quantifiable, there will be a more general positive impact of the funded activity for people experiencing poverty</p>	<p>The data provided by applicants indicates that activities will be targeted at the following cohorts in each of OMVCS and SCF (as a % of the total organisations on each programme):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Homelessness / rough sleeping: 5% of OMVCS, 0% of SCF • People experiencing poverty: 5% of OMVCS, 18% of SCF • Unemployment: 9% of OMVCS, 6% of SCF • Residents of temporary accommodation: 2% of OMVCS, 0% of SCF 	<p>Despite the obvious limitations presented by an incomplete data-set for this characteristic, the substantial commitment to the 'addressing poverty' aim of the fund and the poverty-related activities presented across both programmes identifies that the funded activity has a strong alignment with the aims of the duty</p> <p>As with other characteristics, work will be undertaken with funded groups during the funded period to improve data collection processes</p> <p>The funding allocated here supports the wider work of the Council to address poverty across a range of services, including other VCSE funding activity</p>
<p>Carers</p>	<p>Across both programmes, several funded organisations include support for carers:</p>	<p>Whilst the SCF contribution to carers support cannot be quantified, the proportion</p>	<p>The healthy representation of carers organisations in the programmes, especially</p>

	<p>1. What is the impact of your proposal on this group?</p> <p>1) does your proposal remove or minimise disadvantage for each group 2) does it meet needs that are different from other people's 3) does it promote diversity or encourages participation</p>	<p>2. What evidence have you used to reach this assessment?</p> <p>Evidence could include customer profile data, demographic information, research, or engagement and consultation outcomes</p>	<p>3. What actions could be taken to address the impacts?</p> <p>1) to what extent does this proposal meet our equality duties 2) should or could this be improved</p>
	<p>11 OMVCS organisations provide targeted support for carers</p> <p>There are no SCF organisations that state that they have specialist, targeted support for carers, but more general support for people with caring responsibilities is written into the narrative content of some applications; given the distribution of carers across the city, it is highlight likely that the place-based support of the SCF will include a number of carers. This is not recorded though, so cannot be quantified</p>	<p>of specialist, targeted carer support on the OMVCS fund is 25% of all funded organisations – this includes 7 organisations that are on the Carers Pathway Programme of 19 carers organisations across the city,</p> <p>The success rate for carers groups on that pathway is 47%, compared to a 28% success rate for applicants to the programme more generally</p>	<p>those that are members of the carers pathway programme, demonstrates that the programmes are effective in meeting the arms of the duty – there is no further action proposed at this stage</p> <p>Funding for some VCSE carers organisations is being coordinated by Adult Services as part of the Carers Pathway programme</p>

	<p>1. What is the impact of your proposal on this group?</p> <p>1) does your proposal remove or minimise disadvantage for each group 2) does it meet needs that are different from other people's 3) does it promote diversity or encourages participation</p>	<p>2. What evidence have you used to reach this assessment?</p> <p>Evidence could include customer profile data, demographic information, research, or engagement and consultation outcomes</p>	<p>3. What actions could be taken to address the impacts?</p> <p>1) to what extent does this proposal meet our equality duties 2) should or could this be improved</p>
<p>Homeless people</p>	<p>As noted in the 'poverty' section of this analysis, the data for this characteristic is under-recorded and does not align to the commitments and activities of the successful organisations. There are 2 organisations on OMVCS stating in their data that they have specialised support for homeless people, and none on SCF – it is likely that this is not representative and continuing monitoring during the funded period will provide a clearer picture</p>	<p>The data provided by applicants suggests that 5% of OMVCS funded organisations will provide specialist homelessness support, and none on SCF will</p>	<p>Ongoing monitoring of funded services will take place throughout the funded period and will provide a clearer picture of reach and impact here – this will be considered within the programme's annual reports</p> <p>Organisations funded will be supported to improve data capture processes during the funded period</p> <p>Significant alternative funding for VCSE homelessness organisations is available through other Council services</p>

	<p>1. What is the impact of your proposal on this group?</p> <p>1) does your proposal remove or minimise disadvantage for each group 2) does it meet needs that are different from other people's 3) does it promote diversity or encourages participation</p>	<p>2. What evidence have you used to reach this assessment?</p> <p>Evidence could include customer profile data, demographic information, research, or engagement and consultation outcomes</p>	<p>3. What actions could be taken to address the impacts?</p> <p>1) to what extent does this proposal meet our equality duties 2) should or could this be improved</p>
<p>Ex-Armed Forces veterans and families</p>	<p>There are no organisations funded by either programme that provide targeted, specialist support to ex-armed forces personnel</p> <p>As with other characteristics, it is likely that the more general support offer available through these programmes will be accessed by ex-armed forces personnel, but this is not recorded or therefore quantifiable</p>	<p>There are no organisations funded by either programme that provide targeted, specialist support to ex-armed forces personnel</p>	<p>Ongoing monitoring of funded services will take place throughout the funded period and will help to clarify whether any of the services provided are being accessed by ex-armed forces personnel – this will be considered within the programme's annual reports</p> <p>Organisations funded will be supported to improve data capture processes during the funded period</p> <p>A small amount of funding for VCSE veterans' organisations is available via other Council services as part of the work on the Armed Forces Covenant</p>

	1. What is the impact of your proposal on this group? 1) does your proposal remove or minimise disadvantage for each group 2) does it meet needs that are different from other people's 3) does it promote diversity or encourages participation	2. What evidence have you used to reach this assessment? Evidence could include customer profile data, demographic information, research, or engagement and consultation outcomes	3. What actions could be taken to address the impacts? 1) to what extent does this proposal meet our equality duties 2) should or could this be improved
Care-experienced young people and care-leavers	This characteristic was not monitored on the OMVCS application form – therefore, organisations were not required to submit any data on this characteristic, preventing analysis	As noted, no evidence was requested on this characteristic in the application process	Given the lack of data requested, it is not possible to assess the extent to which the funded programmes will progress the aims of the duty Ongoing monitoring of funded services will take place throughout the funded period and will help to clarify whether any of the services provided are being accessed by this characteristic group – this will be considered within the programme's annual reports

A note on intersectionality

Several of the characteristics above intersect in numerous ways. For example, and as noted in the disability analysis above, the prevalence of disability and continuing conditions intersects with the characteristic of older age. Other examples include the Covid pandemic highlighted the higher prevalence of some life-limiting health conditions and disability amongst some BAME communities; some characteristic groups (BAME, disabled and older people) are more likely to live in some of the city's poorest wards with an impact on health and living in poverty associated with this. The impact analysis for any given characteristic above, then, is helpful but does not fully quantify the contribution of these programmes towards the lives of residents identifying with multiple characteristics. Analysis of the cumulative impact of the fund is not available at this time and is not required of this document, but annual reporting of progress in the programme will provide an overview of impact and outcomes, and EDI will form a facet of this process.


4. Quality Assurance - Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Team

Send your draft EqIA to the EDI Team inbox - egalitiesteam@manchester.gov.uk using **EqIA Advice – Your Service Name.** in the subject line.

EDI Team: Name	Barry Young	Date reviewed:	23 February 2023
-----------------------	--------------------	-----------------------	-------------------------

5. Head of Service Approval

Your completed analysis needs to be signed off by your Head of Service.

Name:	James Binks	Date:	24 February 2023
Job title:	Assistant Chief Executive	Signature:	

Annex 1 – Actions Log

Use this table to list the actions you have identified to mitigate and adverse risks, detailing who will be responsible for completing these and setting clear timescales for delivery. Your actions will be reviewed at 6 months and 12 months to assess progress.

Actions identified in your EqIA	Responsible officer / team for delivery	Timescale for delivery	Comments
Ongoing support for funded organisations on recording and reporting of user data	Our Manchester Funds Team via infrastructure contract	Ongoing throughout 2023-26 funded period	
Production of annual report for OMVCS 2023-26 programme	Our Manchester Funds Team	Annual in quarter 4 of 2024, 2025 and final programme report in 2026	