



# EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EqIA)

## Summary results of the EqIA

**Title of policy/practice/process/service:**

Advice and Assistance (A&A) and advice on same matter (civil and children's).

**Is the policy new (proposed), a revision to an existing policy or a review of current policy?**

Review of current policy.

**Key findings from this assessment (or reason why an EqIA is not required):**

Equalities considerations appear to be embedded in our policy here, but we currently lack specific evidence as to the experiences of those potentially affected by this policy which would give us greater confidence in our conclusions.

The assessment suggests that the factors involved in our decision-making are either neutral in their impact or may be positive from an equalities perspective by enabling particular circumstances associated with an applicant's protected characteristics to be taken into account.

**Summary of actions taken because of this assessment:**

We should be clear in our decision-making and external guidance that we will take equalities considerations into account and provide guidance as to the kinds of information which will assist in enabling us to make decisions where equalities issues are relevant to our policy position.

**Ongoing actions beyond implementation include:**

N/A.

**Lead person(s) for this assessment (job title and department only):**

Policy and Research Analyst, in conjunction with Head of Civil and Children's Legal Assistance.

**Senior responsible owner agreement that the policy has been fully assessed against the needs of the general duty (job title only):**

Director of Operations.

**Publication date (for completion by Communications):**

25/06/2024

Document control		
Document control:	Advice and Assistance (A&A) and advice on same matter (civil and children's) v0.4	
Date policy live from:	Live	
Review cycle:	Every three years	
Document change log		
Version/Author	Date	Comment
V0.1	October 2022	First draft
V0.2	March 2023	Updated draft following further discussion with Operational staff
V0.3	February 2024	Section 3 update following consultation
V0.4	April 2024	Draft updated as considered by GALA Review Group

## Step 1 - Framing the planned change

*Discussing step 1 and step 2 with the Policy Officer (Equalities) at an early stage will help identify appropriate evidence. This may include support from the wider Policy and Development team.*

**1.1 Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the policy/practice/process/service. You can use the information in your project specification, business case etc.**

SLAB's policy on distinct matters in civil A&A operationalises the requirements of the relevant Regulation, that is Regulations 13(1) through (5) of the Advice and Assistance (Scotland) Regulations 1996.) The purpose of a policy statement is to identify a test to be undertaken by decision-makers: in this case, whether we will grant prior approval for advice to be given on the same matter generally, as well as how we specifically approach the giving of a second diagnostic interview within three months. Section D of the policy statement is set out below, for reference.

“In order for our approval to be given for advice to be given on the same matter by more than one solicitor, in line with the Regulations, the solicitor making the application must firstly confirm that they are willing to act for the client: our policy is that the submitting of a new grant of A&A itself provides this confirmation.

Our policy is that we will also ask the previous solicitor to confirm that they are no longer acting, as we will only provide prior approval where this has been confirmed.

### Defining same matter: when must prior approval be sought?

The second solicitor must provide us with information which allows us to determine whether or not advice is to be given on the same matter. In particular, we will consider whether the advice to be given can be seen as logically related to the subjects and circumstances of advice previously given to the client on the same topic, such that the further advice also relates to the same matter. Where this is the case prior approval must be sought: the solicitor must provide a statement of reasons.

### Prior approval for advice on same matter

Whilst there are separate prior approval requirements for advice on the same matter in the context of standard A&A, and for multiple diagnostic interviews (civil only), in practice, our policy is that we approach the task of decision-making in the same way. We need to be satisfied that the request has been justified.

When considering applications for advice to be given on the same matter, or for multiple diagnostic interviews to be given, our policy is that we will grant approval where we are satisfied that the potential impact of the matter on the client is such that further advice appears to be reasonable, including with regards to the applicant's protected characteristics and their ability to deal effectively with the matter themselves.

Our position is that this may arise in the following circumstances:

- Where a conflict of interest has arisen, such that the initial solicitor is no longer able to act; and/or
- Where there has been a justifiable breakdown in the relationship between the client and the first solicitor; and/or
- Where the client has moved to another part of the country such that it is no longer reasonable to expect the client to remain with the first solicitor; and/or
- Where we are otherwise satisfied that the intention of the client in seeking any further advice is not purely to obtain a second opinion, without a material basis for seeking the same.

For multiple diagnostic interviews specifically, we will only grant where it has been demonstrated that any further advice cannot reasonably wait until the three month bar has been passed.

Regulation 13(3) is clear that our prior approval is required for a further diagnostic interview on any subject matter, not just one on the same matter as the initial interview.

As a matter of policy, we do not apply conditions in relation to a second (or subsequent) solicitor providing advice, where approved.”

### **1.2 Why is the change required? *Legislative, routine review etc.***

No change: this is a routine review of policy.

### **1.3 Who is affected by this policy/practice/process/service? *Be clear about who the 'customer' is.***

The customer is the client to whom legal services (in this case, on the same matter) are provided, with those serviced being supported through the Legal Aid Fund. Whilst solicitors work with the policies and guidance we develop, they will not be affected in relation to their protected characteristics.

**1.4 Policy/practice/process/service implementation date?** *Project end date, date new legislation will take effect.*

Policy is currently in effect.

**1.5 What other SLAB policies or projects may be linked to or affected by changes to this policy/practice/process/service?**  
*The EqlA for related policies might help you understand potential impacts, and/or your findings might be relevant to share.*

The main related operational policies are those with regards to valid grants of advice and assistance, distinct matters, and changes in nominated solicitor.

## **Step 2: Consider the available evidence and data relevant to your policy/practice/process/service**

*The information you gather in this section will:*

- *help you to understand the importance of your policy/practice/process/service for different equality groups,*
- *inform the depth of equality impact assessment you need to do (this should be proportional to the potential impact on equality groups), and*
- *provide justification and an audit trail behind your decisions, including where it is agreed an equality impact assessment is not required.*

**2.1 What information is available about the experience of each equality group in relation to this policy/practice/process/service?**

*Stay focused on the topic and scope of your policy/practice/process/service. Does the policy/practice/process/service relate to an area where there are already known inequalities? Refer to the EqlA guidance for sources of evidence.*

*Remember, this step in the EqlA process is NOT about the impact your policy has on equality groups and what we need to do to mitigate those. That assessment is done under Step 4.*

*Note: If you proceed to a full EqlA you should continue to add to this section as you develop the policy/practice/process/service, come across new evidence and/or undertake a consultation.*

Equality characteristics	Evidence source (web link, report, survey, complaint)	What does the evidence tell you about the experiences of this group in relation to the policy/practice/process/service? <i>Lack of evidence may suggest a gap in knowledge/need for consultation (step 3).</i>
<b>Cross-cutting considerations</b>		<p>The profile of applicants to the Legal Aid Fund is patterned by protected characteristics within different aid types and by case categories within those aid types. However, we have no control over who applies to the Fund, which operates on eligibility rather than entitlement basis. Solicitors are the key intermediaries who decide which clients and which cases they take on. The aggregate position of who applies is the result of complex interactions between societal trends, changes in wider justice sector processes, individual firms' appetite to undertake legally aided work for a particular case or client, and the actual legal issue at play.</p> <p>Some of the evidence is general in nature. There is no specific evidence we have been able to produce or find which provides evidence as to the experiences of different protected characteristic groups with regards to, for example, numbers of occasions on which advice is sought on the same matter, and how often permission is granted/refused on distinct matters, or uplifts to advice and assistance from a diagnostic interview at this stage.</p> <p>Instead, the information below focuses setting out evidence relating to the ability of individuals to deal with legal problems without a solicitor, which is relevant to the test we apply in considering whether to grant prior approval.</p>
<b>Age</b>		No evidence found.
<b>Disability</b>	(1) <a href="#">Pleasence et al, 2015, 'How people understand and interact with the law'</a>	Pascal's 2015 study on how people understand and interact with the law found that "41.6 per cent of low capability respondents reported a long-term illness or disability compared to 24.8 per cent of high capability respondents, while 36.4 per cent of low capability respondents self-reported a stress-related illness compared to 21.4 per cent of high capability respondents." (1)

Equality characteristics	Evidence source (web link, report, survey, complaint)	What does the evidence tell you about the experiences of this group in relation to the policy/practice/process/service? <i>Lack of evidence may suggest a gap in knowledge/need for consultation (step 3).</i>
	<p>(2) <a href="#">Capital District Health Authority guidance; Anxiety: The Cognitive Perspective</a></p> <p>(3) <a href="#">SLAB equality outcomes research</a></p>	<p>People experiencing mental health problems can find concentrating and remembering things difficult, as well as experience heightened stress levels, which may be an issue for participating in tribunal proceedings. Anxiety and stress can exacerbate problems with reading comprehension. (2)</p> <p>For people with experience of poor mental health, stress in formal situations was a common theme throughout the conversations. This could manifest itself in tension whilst waiting for a service or appointment, and in making it challenging to absorb and retain information. For some, the ability to retain information was a daily challenge due to the nature of their conditions. (3)</p> <p>All this evidence suggests that an applicant’s disability may be relevant to our policy as it may mean applicants with disabilities can find it more challenging to deal with their problem without a solicitor. This would be relevant to the test we apply in considering whether the applicant is likely to be able to deal with their problem without a solicitor.</p>
Race	<p>(1) <a href="#">SLAB equality outcomes research</a></p> <p>(2) <a href="#">Census results</a></p> <p>(3) <a href="#">SCILT: Languages in Scotland</a></p>	<p>Our recent equality outcomes research indicated that ethnic minority applicants for legal aid may face issues linked to language and communication, with participants highlighting the difficulties faced by those with poor or no English. These included the challenge of making phone calls or appointments, explaining a situation, filling in forms or understanding background materials. The first common theme to emerge when discussing the appointment itself was a difficulty filling in forms. This could be due to language, understanding or accessibility issues. (1)</p> <p>There is a potentially relevant and important intersection between race and English language comprehension. The relevant results from the 2011 census are:  “The proportion of the population aged 3 and over reported as not being able to speak English well or at all was 1.4% overall, and 11% for those born outside the UK. This</p>

Equality characteristics	Evidence source (web link, report, survey, complaint)	What does the evidence tell you about the experiences of this group in relation to the policy/practice/process/service? <i>Lack of evidence may suggest a gap in knowledge/need for consultation (step 3).</i>
		<p>proportion generally increased with age of arrival into the UK: for those who arrived aged under 16 it was 5% while for those who arrived aged 65 and over it was 31%. The proportion of Scotland’s population aged three and over who could speak, read and write English was 94%. This proportion was lowest for those born in the EU Accession countries (75%) or in the Middle East and Asia (89%).” (2)</p> <p>The most spoken languages in Scotland other than English are Polish, Urdu, Scots, Punjabi and Arabic. (3)</p> <p>This evidence suggests that an applicant’s race may be relevant to our policy as it may mean applicants from certain ethnic origins could find it more challenging to deal with their problem without a solicitor. This would be relevant to the part of this policy dealing with multiple diagnostic interviews.</p>
Sex		No evidence found
Gender Reassignment		No evidence found
Sexual orientation		No evidence found
Religion or Belief	<p>(1) <a href="#">Census results</a></p> <p>(2) <a href="#">SCILT: Languages in Scotland</a></p>	<p>In line with evidence sources (1) and (2), English language proficiency is patterned by ethnicity and country of birth, as well as religion. The proportion of people in Scotland identifying a Muslim or ‘other’ religion overall is 3.6% but they make up 34.6% of people living in Scotland who were born outside the UK or EU27. Roman Catholics make up 13.6% of the population overall, but account for 39.6% of the population born in the EU27. (2)</p> <p>Language proficiency may be relevant to our consideration of whether the applicant is</p>



Equality characteristics	Evidence source (web link, report, survey, complaint)	What does the evidence tell you about the experiences of this group in relation to the policy/practice/process/service? <i>Lack of evidence may suggest a gap in knowledge/need for consultation (step 3).</i>
		able to understand the legal issues they face and act upon them without a solicitor, which is directly relevant to our policy.
Pregnancy or maternity		No evidence found
Marriage/civil partnership		No evidence found
Care Experienced ( <i>corporate parenting duty</i> )	(1) <a href="#">SLAB care experience literature review</a>	A SLAB review of relevant literature suggests that being care experienced is linked to higher levels of mental ill health (1) - this suggests an intersection between care experience and disability, which may be relevant to our policy as set out above.

**2.2 Using the information above and your knowledge of the policy/practice/process/service, summarise your overall assessment of how important and relevant the policy/practice/process/service is likely to be for equality groups.**

This policy will not affect every applicant for A&A, as not all applicants will seek advice on the same matter. However, it does form an in/out point, as if we do not provide approval the grant will not be valid and, as such, the potential outcomes of this policy will be important for those applicants who are subject to it.

We are not currently aware of any internal or external evidence which suggests that applicants from particular protected characteristic backgrounds are more or less likely to seek advice on the same matter, the reasons they do so (including whether protected characteristics have any bearing on this) and whether we are more or less likely to provide our approval. We will seek to produce and analyse relevant internal data in future and may also seek to undertake consultation on this area which would assist in gathering relevant information on the experience of different groups in relation to this policy.

In terms of our general policy on advice on the same matter, our policy is permissive. Equalities concerns are specifically considered with regards to whether an applicant’s protected characteristics have a bearing on the impact of the matter and their ability to deal with the matter themselves: an applicant’s protected characteristics are noted as being relevant here, in

line with the evidence above, which suggests that there may be an intersection between a person’s protected characteristics and a person’s abilities to deal with legal issues.

Otherwise, the policy factors primarily focus on the scope of the advice to be given and the reasons for it being sought, which in our view are likely to be equalities neutral.

**2.3 Outcome of step 2 and next steps. Complete the table below to inform the next stage of the EqIA process.**

*Consult with the project group and/or Corporate Policy Officer (Equalities) on completing this section.*

<b>Outcome of Step 2 following initial evidence gathering and relevance to equality characteristics</b>	<b>Yes/ No (Y or N)</b>	<b>Next steps</b>
There is no relevance to equality or our corporate parenting duties	N	Proceed to Step 5: agree with decision makers that no EqIA is required based on current evidence
There is relevance to some or all of the equality groups and/or our corporate parenting duties	Y	Proceed to Step 3: complete full EqIA
It is unclear if there is relevance to some or all of the equality groups and/or our corporate parenting duties	N	Proceed to Step 3: complete full EqIA

**Step 3 - stakeholder involvement and consultation**

*This step will help you to address any gaps in evidence identified in Step 2. Speaking to people who will be affected by your policy/practice/process/service can help clarify the impact it will have on different equality groups.*

**Remember that sufficient evidence is required for you to show ‘due regard’ to the likely or actual impact of your policy/practice/process/service on equality groups. An inadequate analysis in an assessment may mean failure to meet the general duty.**

*The Policy and Development team can help to identify appropriate ways to engage with external groups or to undertake research to fill evidence gaps.*

**3.1 Do you/did you have any consultation or involvement planned for this policy/practice/process service?**

Yes.

### **3.2 List all the stakeholder groups that you will talk to about this policy/practice/process/service.**

We published a consultation covering this policy area on our website, with responses open to all. A link to the consultation was also provided to all solicitors registered to provide legal aid as part of a broader mailshot to the profession.

### **3.3 What did you learn from the consultation/involvement? Remember to record relevant actions in the assessment action log.**

In autumn 2023, we undertook a public consultation concerning our policies on A&A and ABWOR. This included a specific question regarding the equalities implications of our policies. The consultation documents were publicly available on SLAB's website. The consultation received three responses, all of which came from solicitor firms. We note that whilst this particular policy fell within the scope of that consultation, none of the comments received were directly relevant to this policy area; as such, our assessment for the purposes of this EqIA has not changed following the consultation exercise.

## **Step 4 - Impact on equality groups and steps to address these**

*You must consider the three aims of the general duty for each protected characteristic. The following questions will help:*

- **Is there potential for discrimination, victimisation, harassment or other unlawful conduct that is prohibited under the Equality Act 2010? How will this be mitigated?**
- **Is there potential to advance equality of opportunity between people who share a characteristic and those who do not? How can this be achieved?**
- **Is there potential for developing good relations between people who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not? How can this be achieved?**

### **4.1 Does the policy/practice/process/service have any impacts (whether intended or unintended, positive or negative) on any of the equality characteristics?**

*In the tables below, record the impact the policy/practice/process/service might have on each equality characteristic, as it is planned or as it operates, and describe what changes in policy/practice process/service or actions will be required to mitigate that impact. Copy any actions across to the project action log.*

Cross-cutting: all protected characteristics	Place 'X' in the relevant box(es)			Describe the changes or actions (if any) you plan to take. For example, to mitigate any impact, maximise the positive impact, or record your justification to not make changes despite the potential for adverse impact.
	Positive impacts	Negative impacts	No impact	
potential for discrimination			X	We acknowledge that at a societal level, some protected characteristic groups may be more or less likely to apply for A&A and could perhaps be more or less likely to seek advice on the same matter. However, we have no control over this and in individual cases, this societal fact has no bearing on our decision-making in relation to how we approach the test at hand. As such, we do not believe there is any potential for discrimination here.
potential for developing good relations			X	
potential to advance equality of opportunity	X			The policy involves a factor specifically geared at considering whether an applicant's protected characteristics may impact on their ability to deal with their legal issues. If relevant information is provided to us, in principle, any protected characteristic could be relevant here. Decision-makers' guidance and external guidance for solicitors will specify how this factor is to be considered, and what information to provide.

Age	Place 'X' in the relevant box(es)			Describe the changes or actions (if any) you plan to take. For example, to mitigate any impact, maximise the positive impact, or record your justification to not make changes despite the potential for adverse impact.
	Positive impacts	Negative impacts	No impact	
potential for discrimination			X	

potential for developing good relations			X	
potential to advance equality of opportunity	X			As set out in table 2, there are various ways an applicant's age may be relevant to their ability to understand and deal with their legal issues. We have included a specific factor which enables this to be considered. Decision makers' guidance and external guidance for solicitors will specify what kinds of information may be relevant to addressing this factor.

Sex	Place 'X' in the relevant box(es)			Describe the changes or actions (if any) you plan to take. For example, to mitigate any impact, maximise the positive impact, or record your justification to not make changes despite the potential for adverse impact.
	Positive impacts	Negative impacts	No impact	
potential for discrimination			X	The limited evidence for this protected characteristic does not highlight any potential differential impacts with regards to how this policy would be experienced.
potential for developing good relations			X	
potential to advance equality of opportunity			X	

Disability	Place 'X' in the relevant box(es)			Describe the changes or actions (if any) you plan to take. For example, to mitigate any impact, maximise the positive impact, or record your justification to not make changes despite the potential for adverse impact.
	Positive impacts	Negative impacts	No impact	
potential for discrimination			X	

potential for developing good relations			X	
potential to advance equality of opportunity	X			As set out in table 2, there are various ways in which disability could have an impact on an applicant's ability to understand and deal with their legal issues. We have included a specific factor which enables this to be considered. Decision-makers' guidance and external guidance for solicitors will specify how this is to be approached and what information to provide.

Gender reassignment	Place 'X' in the relevant box(es)			Describe the changes or actions (if any) you plan to take. For example, to mitigate any impact, maximise the positive impact, or record your justification to not make changes despite the potential for adverse impact.
	Positive impacts	Negative impacts	No impact	
potential for discrimination			X	The limited evidence for this protected characteristic does not highlight any potential differential impacts with regards to how this policy would be experienced.
potential for developing good relations			X	
potential to advance equality of opportunity			X	

Race	Place 'X' in the relevant box(es)			Describe the changes or actions (if any) you plan to take. For example, to mitigate any impact, maximise the positive impact, or record your justification to not make changes despite the potential for adverse impact.
	Positive impacts	Negative impacts	No impact	
potential for discrimination			X	

potential for developing good relations			X	
potential to advance equality of opportunity	X			As set out in table 2, there are various ways in which race, particularly in the context of language ability, could have an impact on an applicant's ability to understand and deal with their legal issues. We have included a specific factor which enables this to be considered. Decision-makers' guidance and external guidance for solicitors will specify how this balancing/considering is approached and what information to provide.

Religion or Belief	Place 'X' in the relevant box(es)			Describe the changes or actions (if any) you plan to take. For example, to mitigate any impact, maximise the positive impact, or record your justification to not make changes despite the potential for adverse impact.
	Positive impacts	Negative impacts	No impact	
potential for discrimination			X	
potential for developing good relations			X	
potential to advance equality of opportunity	X			The evidence for this protected characteristic does not highlight any impact on how this policy may be experienced: impacts are due to the intersectionality with ethnicity, nationality and spoken language, as set out in table 2. We have included a specific factor which enables this to be considered. Decision-makers' guidance and external guidance for solicitors will specify how this balancing/considering is approached and what information to provide.

Sexual Orientation	Place 'X' in the relevant box(es)			Describe the changes or actions (if any) you plan to take. For example, to mitigate any impact, maximise the positive impact, or record your
--------------------	-----------------------------------	--	--	--

	Positive impacts	Negative impacts	No impact	justification to not make changes despite the potential for adverse impact.
potential for discrimination			X	The limited evidence for this protected characteristic does not highlight any impact with regards to how this policy would be experienced.
potential for developing good relations			X	
potential to advance equality of opportunity			X	

Pregnancy & Maternity	Place 'X' in the relevant box(es)			Describe the changes or actions (if any) you plan to take. For example, to mitigate any impact, maximise the positive impact, or record your justification to not make changes despite the potential for adverse impact.
	Positive impacts	Negative impacts	No impact	
potential for discrimination			X	The limited evidence for this protected characteristic does not highlight any impact with regards to how this policy would be experienced.
potential for developing good relations			X	
potential to advance equality of opportunity			X	

Marriage & Civil Partnership	Place 'X' in the relevant box(es)			Describe the changes or actions (if any) you plan to take. For example, to mitigate any impact, maximise the positive impact, or record your justification to not make changes despite the potential for adverse impact.
	Positive impacts	Negative impacts	No impact	
potential for discrimination			X	Not relevant to be considered for this policy.



potential for developing good relations			X	
potential to advance equality of opportunity			X	

Care experienced young people	Place 'X' in the relevant box(es)			Describe the changes or actions (if any) you plan to take. For example, to mitigate any impact, maximise the positive impact, or record your justification to not make changes despite the potential for adverse impact.
	Positive impacts	Negative impacts	No impact	
potential for discrimination			X	The evidence for care experienced young people suggests that impacts on how these applicants experience these cases and this policy will flow from the intersectionality with mental health and age. Our policy incorporates a specific factor which may enable these to be considered.
potential for developing good relations			X	
potential to advance equality of opportunity			X	

**4.2 Describe how the assessment so far might affect other areas of this policy/practice/process/service and/or project timeline?**

The assessment so far indicates that an important consideration may be ensuring that guidance for decision-makers and solicitors is clear, and that we may take equalities issues into account. The guidance should address the kinds of information we would expect to see in this regard. This will be considered further at Decision-makers Guidance drafting stage.

**4.3 Having considered the potential or actual impacts of your policy/practice/process/service on equality groups, you should now record the outcome of this assessment below.**

*Choose from one of the following (mark with an X or delete as appropriate):*

Please select (X)	Implications for the policy/practice/process/service
X	<p><b>No major change</b>  Your assessment demonstrates that the policy/practice/process/service is robust. The evidence shows no potential for unlawful discrimination and that you have taken all opportunities to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations, subject to continuing monitoring and review.</p>

### Step 5 - Discuss and review the assessment with decision makers and governance structures

*You must discuss the findings of this assessment with senior decision makers during the lifetime of the project/review and before you finalise the assessment. Relevant groups include, but are not limited to, a Project Board, Executive Team or Board members. EqlA should be on every project board agenda therefore only note dates where key decisions have been made (for example draft EqlA sign off, discussion about consultation response).*

#### 5.1 Record details of the groups you report to about this policy/practice/process/service and impact assessment. Include the date you presented progress to each group and an extract from the minutes to reflect the discussion.

Discussions with key staff involved in making these decisions, including the Head of Civil and Children’s Legal Assistance.

There is limited data available in relation to this decision set, and whilst there are technically two key elements here:

1. our general policy on advice on same matter, and
2. our policy on repeat diagnostic interviews,

in practice, our policy position is the same on both.

We explicitly take equalities considerations into account and no specific concerns were raised about the operation of this policy with regards equalities, notwithstanding the current lack of data.

### Step 6 - Post-implementation actions and monitoring impact

*There may be further actions or changes planned after the policy/practice/process/service is implemented and this assessment*

*is signed off. It is important to continue to monitor the impact of your policy/practice/process/service on equality groups to ensure that your actual or likely impacts are those you recorded. This will also highlight any unforeseen impacts.*

**6.1 Record any ongoing actions below.**

*This can be copied from the project action log or elsewhere in this assessment and should include timescales and person/team responsible. If there are no outstanding items please make this clear.*

No ongoing actions at present.

**6.2 Note here how you intend to monitor the impact of this policy/practice/process/service on equality groups. In the table below you should:**

- *list the relevant measures,*
- *identify who or which team is responsible for implementing or monitoring any changes,*
- *identify where the measure will be reported to ensure any issues can be acted on as appropriate.*

Measure	Lead department/ individual	Reporting (where/ frequency)
<p><b>Internal data</b>            Analysis showing number of applicants who seek advice on the same matter by protected characteristic and subject matters; and numbers of requests for approval (both general and repeat diagnostic), broken down by subject matter, PC and grant/refusal.</p>	<p><b>AMI (data extraction) with Policy (analysis)</b>            Suggest this should be explored as part of business impact assessment regarding recording, and options for gathering this information in a manageable way</p>	<p>Head of Civil and Children’s Legal Assistance (yearly).</p>

**6.3 EqlA review date.**

*This EqlA should be reviewed as part of the post-implementation review of the policy/practice/process/service. The date should not exceed three years from the policy/practice/process/service implementation date.*

04/04/2026.

## Step 7 - Assessment sign off and approval

*Once final consultation has been undertaken with Corporate Policy Officer (Equalities), all equality impact assessments must be signed off by the relevant Director or Senior Responsible Owner (SRO), even where an EqlA is not required. The Chief Executive must approve all equality impact assessments. Note the relevant dates here:*

**Director/SRO sign off:** 04/04/2023.

**Chief Executive approval:** 04/04/2023.

*All full equality impact assessments must be published on SLAB's website as early as possible after the decision is made to implement the policy, practice, process or service.*