

Equality Impact Assessments Toolkit

EqlA Template



You must consider the [Equality Impact Assessment Guidance](#) when completing this template.

The EDI team can provide help and advice on undertaking an EqIA and also provide overview quality assurance checks on completed EqIA documents.

EDI team contact email: edi_team@sandwell.gov.uk

Quality Control	
Title of proposal	Joint Equipment Service -
Directorate and Service Area	Adult Social Care Direct Services – Joint Equipment Service
Officer completing EqIA	Sanjeev Kataria
Contact Details	Sanjeev1_Kataria@sandwell.gov.uk
Other officers involved in completing this EqIA	Sanjeev Kataria Louise Butler
Date EqIA completed	01.06.2025
Date EqIA signed off or agreed by Director or Executive Director	
Name of Director or Executive Director signing off EqIA	Rashpal Bishop
Date EqIA considered by Cabinet	Cabinet Member Briefing date TBC
Where the EqIA is Published (please include a link to the EqIA and send a copy of the final EqIA to the EDI team)	

Section 1.

The purpose of the project, proposal or decision required

The Joint Equipment Store is a service that is operated within Adult Social Care that provides low level equipment to residents within Sandwell, such as walking aids, toilet aids, as well as equipment that helps support the discharge of service users from hospital and helps maintain the independence of service users within their own homes.

The Joint Equipment Store currently procure and purchase the equipment from the Croydon Integrated Hub framework. This framework has been in place since 2013.

The proposal is to bring the all the Joint Equipment Store in-house, including the purchase and procurement of the equipment. This would mean that the Joint Equipment Service would no longer procure from the framework but manage all the procurement in-house.

Section 2.

Evidence used and considered. Include analysis of any missing data

In reviewing the current procurement arrangements and considering alternative models, a detailed cost comparison exercise was undertaken to assess the relative value for money offered by different frameworks. This analysis focused on the top 50 items of community equipment that are most frequently issued to service users. The following options were considered in this context:

Option 1: Bring Procurement In-House (Recommended)

Under this option, Sandwell Council would terminate routine use of the Croydon Framework and bring the full procurement function in-house within the JES. The Council would directly manage procurement activities, including sourcing, ordering, and supplier liaison. To support this transition, two additional Business Support Officers would be recruited. Existing management structures would remain in place. This model allows for greater local control, improved responsiveness, and potential cost savings through direct supplier engagement.

Strengths:

- Avoids the 9.5% management fee currently paid to Croydon

- Enhances local oversight and flexibility
- Supports integrated delivery for adults and children for standard equipment
- Allows re-investment of savings into frontline services

Risks:

- Requires internal capacity and new staffing
- Procurement input may still be required.

Option 2: Negotiate Reduced Management Fee with Croydon

This option involved seeking a reduction in the 9.5% management fee while continuing to use the Croydon Framework. However, Croydon has confirmed there is no intention to revise the fee. The benefits of staying in the Framework are therefore outweighed by the lack of pricing flexibility, particularly given that approximately 50% of equipment now falls outside the standard catalogue.

Strengths:

- Minimal operational change

Risks:

- No cost reduction achievable
- Limited flexibility for non-standard items
- Continued payment of management fees on full spend

Option 3: Transition to NHS-C Framework

This model explored transitioning procurement to the NHS-C Framework. While this route benefits from being publicly procured and compliant, detailed analysis identified that the NHS-C Framework lacks a comprehensive equipment catalogue and would not support the JES operational requirements. Furthermore, cost comparisons of the top 50 high-volume standard items showed no material savings.

Strengths:

- Compliant framework arrangement

Risks:

- Catalogue does not meet local need
- No demonstrable cost benefit
- Limited operational flexibility

Option 4: Use YPO Framework for Standard Items Only

This option involves using the YPO (Yorkshire Purchasing Organisation) Framework to procure only standard items, while the JES team would independently source all non-standard and specialist items. Although this

hybrid model could offer partial savings, it adds complexity and potential inefficiencies through dual procurement routes.

Strengths:

- Access to competitively priced standard items

Risks:

- Increased complexity managing multiple routes
- Additional administrative burden
- Partial exposure to Croydon fees if retained for some bespoke items

Option 5: Do Nothing

Retaining the current model without change would avoid disruption but would perpetuate poor value for money. Given that half of all equipment is now non-standard and subject to full retail pricing, with an added 9.5% management fee, this option is not sustainable. It also maintains operational constraints that hinder service flexibility.

Strengths:

- No change required

Risks:

- Fails to deliver value for money
- No control over procurement process
- Ongoing high management fees

Following detailed evaluation, Option 1 (bringing procurement in-house) is the preferred option. It offers improved financial control, greater local autonomy, and supports the evolving needs of the JES. The other options either lack

The Joint Partnership Board have ratified the recommendation to bring the Joint Equipment Store in-house, including the procurement of the equipment and move away from the Croydon Integrated Procurement Hub.

Section 3.

Consultation

The provision of service will remain the same. The only change will be the way in which the equipment is procured. This will not impact the service users.

Section 4.

Summary assessment of the analysis at section 4a and the likely impact on each of the protected characteristics (if any)

There will be no negative impact on the identified protected characteristics.

Section 4a - What are the potential/actual impacts of the proposal on the protected characteristics?

Reviewed Characteristic	Impact? Positive (P) Negative (N) Neutral (Ne)	Details of impact	Actions to address negative impact or promote positive impact (use section 8 table)	Owner of action/ Timescale
Age	Ne	There will be no impact on the age of individuals. The service provision is across the Children Services and Adult Social Care.	No action required.	
Disability	Ne	There will be no impact for the individuals who have a disability. The service provision is across the Children Services and Adult Social Care.	No action required.	
Gender Reassignment	Ne	There is no impact on individuals in relation to their gender reassignment. The service provision is across the Children Services and Adult Social Care.	No action required.	
Marriage and civil partnership	Ne	There is no impact on individuals in relation to if they are married or in a civil partnership. The service	No action required.	

Reviewed Characteristic	Impact? Positive (P) Negative (N) Neutral (Ne)	Details of impact	Actions to address negative impact or promote positive impact (use section 8 table)	Owner of action/ Timescale
		provision is across the Children Services and Adult Social Care.		
Pregnancy and maternity	Ne	There is no impact on individuals in relation to if they are pregnant or on maternity. The service is provided irrespective of this characteristic.	No action required.	
Race	Ne	There is no impact on individuals in relation to their race. The service is provided irrespective of this characteristic.	No action required.	
Religion or belief	Ne	There is no impact on individuals in relation to their religion or belief. The service is provided irrespective of this characteristic.	No action required.	
Sex	Ne	There is no impact on individuals in relation to their sex. The service is provided irrespective of this characteristic.	No action required.	

Reviewed Characteristic	Impact? Positive (P) Negative (N) Neutral (Ne)	Details of impact	Actions to address negative impact or promote positive impact (use section 8 table)	Owner of action/ Timescale
Sexual Orientation	Ne	There is no impact on individuals in relation to their sexual orientation. The service is provided irrespective of this characteristic.	No action required.	
Could other socio-economic groups be affected?				
Carer Low income groups Veterans/Armed Forces Community Other	Ne	There is no impact on this group. The service is provided as a free service to residents of Sandwell and is not means tested.	No action required.	

If there are no adverse impacts or any issues of concern or you can adequately explain or justify them, then please move to Sections 6.

5. What actions can be taken to mitigate any adverse impacts?

There will not be any adverse impacts.

6. Section 6: Decision or actions proposed

The decision that is required from Cabinet is to approve bringing the end-to-end procurement and deliver of the service in-house.

7. Monitoring arrangements

The Project Group will include operational management, HR and representatives who will ensure adequate monitoring of their relevant areas.

The current monitoring arrangements that are in place will remain. There is no change in the information that is captured and recorded when completing an assessment.

Section 8 Action planning (if required)

Question no. (ref)	Action required	Lead officer/ person responsible	Target date	Progress

If you have any suggestions for improving this process, please contact EDI_Team@Sandwell.gov.uk