



# EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

## (EqIA)

### Summary results of the EqIA

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

Prior (and retrospective) approval for unusual work: children's legal assistance.

**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):**

Our assessment is that this policy does have relevance to equality groups, particularly with regards to age in some circumstances, but potentially more broadly. However, we note that comparatively low volumes of applications mean a full analysis of the available data is difficult; moreover, we also note that there are many forms of unusual work which would have no link to applicants' equality characteristics and associated needs at all.

Nonetheless, based on the evidence available to us, our conclusion is that the factors in the policy are framed in such a way that would allow us to take into account requests which relate to a person's protected characteristics (across any of the nine protected characteristics), and that overall, the policy assists in advancing equality of opportunity, with no amendment required.

However, we also note for clarity that an applicant's protected characteristics will not be relevant to our decision-making in and of themselves: these require to be tied into the policy factors which we set out to be considered.

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

No specific actions taken.

**Ongoing actions beyond implementation include:**

Continue monitoring and analysis of decisions.

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

Head of Civil and Children's Legal Assistance.

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

Director of Operations.

## **Step 1: Scoping the work being assessed**

### **1.1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the policy/practice/process/service.**

SLAB's policy on prior and retrospective approval for unusual work sets out how SLAB operationalises and records the requirements of the relevant Regulation. The purpose of a policy statement is to identify a definition and a test to be undertaken by decision-makers where approval is sought to carry out work of an unusual nature. In this case the test is whether it is 'reasonable' to approve the proposed 'unusual' work. We then define what is meant by 'unusual' work. The relevant section of the policy statement is set out below.

*"For the purposes of this policy, SLAB's definition of 'unusual' work is as follows:*

*'Unusual work is that which would not ordinarily and as a matter of course be expected to be carried out in the average case of its kind, and/or in the particular circumstances of the case at hand.'*

#### **Test applied to proposed unusual work**

*Where the proposed work falls within the definition above, the test SLAB applies in making a decision on whether to grant approval is **whether the proposed work is reasonable in all the circumstances of the case.***

*SLAB will grant a request to undertake unusual work where it is shown that the work is likely to advance the case or assist in its resolution and shows due regard for economy of litigation; and where relevant, where the solicitor has shown whether relevant consent for the work has been secured (for example, from the child, from prison authorities, or similar).*

#### **Retrospective requests for the approval of unusual work**

*For retrospective requests for unusual work, the first limb of the test (set out in the Regulations) is whether approval would have been granted had it been sought timeously. As stated in the parent policy statement, SLAB's policy is to apply exactly the same test and factors to the request as if it had been received in time (that is, those set out above).*

*For the second aspect of the test, SLAB's policy on 'special reason' is that where a solicitor can show that:*

- they were prevented from making a timeous application for prior approval by circumstances which were beyond their control and these circumstances were ones which could not have been reasonably foreseen; or*
- the circumstances were within the solicitor's control, and ought to have been foreseen, but the oversight was nonetheless justifiable given the particular or unusual circumstances in which the expense was incurred*

*this will generally be accepted as a special reason for late submission of a request for approval of unusual work. SLAB's policy is that the particular circumstances described must amount to more than simply plain oversight or ignorance of the Regulations to suffice as a 'special reason'."*

## **1.2. Why is the policy/practice/process/service being examined?**

Review of policy/process/service/practice.

## **1.3. Who is affected by this policy/practice/process/service?**

The customer for the purpose of this policy is the assisted person in receipt of children's legal assistance, whose case the unusual work is intended to have some sort of impact on. The extent to which assisted persons (and by connection, their solicitors and, where appropriate, counsel) can undertake unusual work in relation to their case will be affected by how SLAB sets its policy in this area.

There may also be an impact on other parties to the proceedings, and to other parties within the justice system (for example the judiciary, Scottish Courts and Tribunals Service or SCRA).

## **1.4. Policy/practice/process/service implementation date.**

Currently live.

## **1.5. What other SLAB policies or projects may be linked or affected by changes to this policy/practice/process/service?**

As set out in the policy statement, there is a relationship between what SLAB approves at this stage (or retrospectively, also under the terms of this policy), and what may eventually be paid for.

Where SLAB's policy on what is likely to be 'reasonable' changes, this may have implications for what can later be paid for.

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

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

#### **General information about the policy/practice/process/service**

The number of requests we have received for prior (or retrospective) approval in this area is extremely low: in 2024-25, the total number of requests was 49 (or around four per month). This low volume limits our ability to undertake meaningful statistical analysis of our applications data for more protected characteristics.

Overall, the grant rate under this policy was 78%. For context on the grant rate, discussions with operational leads indicate that a primary reason for refusal under this policy is because prior approval was not required (for instance, because we do not deem the proposed work to be unusual), rather than a substantive refusal on the grounds due that the request was not reasonable with regards to the factors set out in this policy.

Consideration of the applications data indicates that the range of work proposed under the unusual work policy is fairly large, with no particular types predominating. Whilst there are a few types with potential relevance to equalities (discussed in relevant sections below), there are various forms of

requests in which there is no obvious bearing on equalities whatsoever: for instance, requests for multiple solicitors, travel costs, and some forms of medical testing (for example DNA testing).

More broadly, we suggest that this is a specific and niche policy area of the Scottish legal aid system, for which no obvious external equivalents are available that might enable comparison with other public decision-making bodies (for instance).

## Age

### Statistics

- SLAB's data

Age band	Percentage of requests for unusual work	Percentage of applications for children's legal aid
<=24	5-10%	20%
25-34	35-40%	36%
35-44	40-45%	31%
45-54	5-10%	10%
55-64	<5%	3%
65+	<5%	3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

Age band	Granted	Not granted
<=24	50-55%	50-55%
25-34	75-80%	20-25%
35-44	80-85%	20-25%
45-54	>95%	<5%
55-64	>95%	<5%
65+	50-55%	50-55%
<b>Total</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>22%</b>

The initial table above shows that the profile of persons requesting approval for unusual work is fairly similar to that seen under our other children's prior approval policies, and to applications for children's legal aid more broadly: that is, the main volumes of requests are from applicants clustered around what can be seen as broadly speaking of parenting age and who are most likely to be involved in children's proceedings.

There are comparatively limited numbers of requests from young applicants (including children themselves) and older applicants: however, we do not believe there is evidence to show this arises because of barriers faced by older people in engaging with our policy.

When considering the table on grant rate, it is important to bear in mind the low total of applications. We are unable to test for statistical significance given the volumes. Whilst there is a degree of variation in the grant by age bands seen above, this is likely to be accounted for by what are in reality very small differences in total numbers: for instance, the apparently lower grant rate for <=24 is accounted for in large part by one application being refused on the grounds that prior approval for an expert witness should have been sought instead.

Based on this data, we cannot conclude that there is clear evidence of problematic differences in outcomes by age under this policy.

- **Data relevant to the policy**

There are certain special measures for child and adult vulnerable witnesses (which could also include older people who are witnesses) in children’s legal assistance court proceedings which require our prior approval. These consist of a commissioner taking evidence; use of a live television link where the child and/or adult vulnerable witnesses are in a remote site not operated by the Scottish Courts and Tribunal Service; and potentially other special measures.

Clearly, an applicant’s age (and associated vulnerability) may therefore be a factor in whether a special measure (such as use of a commissioner to take evidence) is requested, and thus whether our prior approval is required. The use of a commissioner (and ancillary costs) was one of the more common requests for unusual work, amounting to around a fifth of total requests. We note that the grant rate for such requests is very high, suggesting that in these requests (where age is likely to be relevant) the policy does not have a detrimental impact.

Due to the nature and subject matter of children’s legal assistance court proceedings, it appears reasonable to conclude that there will be a fairly high number of children where special measures of some sort will be required (that is, because the witness is young): however, for the purposes of this policy, it should be noted that very few forms of special measures actually require our prior approval.)

### **Evidence on different age categories**

We are aware of external research on issues faced by children in engaging with legal proceedings and adaptations which can be made in order to facilitate their evidence being given in an appropriate way: for instance, research in relation to the ‘Bairns Hoose’ initiative suggests that special measures for child witnesses are in line with trauma-informed practice and can avoid re-traumatisation of children involved in legal proceedings, and are intended to be child-friendly in a way that supports the reliable giving and collecting of evidence.<sup>1</sup> Whilst the research referenced relates to the giving of evidence in criminal cases, our view is that it is likely to apply equally to children giving evidence in children’s court proceedings.

## **Disability**

### **Statistics**

- **SLAB’s data**

<b>Disability status</b>	<b>Percentage of requests</b>
One or more disabilities	20-25%
No disability	75-80%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>

We note that the disclosure rate for this protected characteristic was only 63%, which may obscure the true profile of applicants somewhat. However, looking at the table above, the rate of disability appears to be slightly lower than thought, broadly in line with the figure from the 2023 Scottish Household Survey being 28% of the population<sup>2</sup>. Whilst in principle this policy can cover work which arises in relation to an assisted person’s disability, we are not aware of other evidence that suggests

---

<sup>1</sup> [Bairns Hoose | Justice Support for child victims and witnesses required to give evidence in criminal cases | November 2025.](#)

<sup>2</sup> [Scottish Government | Supporting documents for Scottish Surveys Core Questions 2023.](#)

that the policy is particularly important for persons with disabilities: there are unlikely to be any problematic barriers for disabled persons in submitting requests under this policy.

Disability status	Granted	Not granted
One or more disabilities	75-80%	25-30%
No disability	70-75%	25-30%
<b>Total</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>26%</b>

We note that there is a slightly higher grant rate amongst persons with disabilities compared to those who do not have disabilities; however, the numbers involved are too small to test for statistical significance. We do not believe that this amounts to clear evidence of a problematic differential outcomes because of our policy position.

### Data relevant to the policy

#### Evidence on different disabilities

- **Physical disabilities**

No specific evidence found.

- **Learning disabilities**

No specific evidence found.

- **Mental health**

There were several requests made which specifically mentioned issues relating to disability: a number of these pertained to covering the costs of seeking an applicant’s medical records from their GP to speak on their mental health issues in the proceedings. This establishes that this policy does have potential relevance to equalities issues.

### Sex

#### Statistics

- **SLAB’s data**

Sex (86% disclosure)	Percentage of total requests for unusual work	Percentage of applications for children’s legal aid
Male	45-50%	33%
Female	50-55%	67%
Prefer not to say (PNTS)	<5%	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

The table above indicates that whilst many requests for unusual work come from female applicants, when compared to the profile of applications for children’s legal aid, a disproportionately high level of requests come from men. It is not clear why this is the case, or how far this simply reflects the low numbers of applications, rather than a systematic impact of our policy. The numbers of applications appear too low to draw any clear conclusions as to whether there is meaningful variation in the types of work which applicants are seeking to cover and the extent to which those might be related to sex or for instance differences in men and women’s place within proceedings (such as being the primary/resident parent or otherwise).

Sex (86% disclosure)	Granted	Not granted
One or more disabilities	80-85%	20-25%
No disability	75-80%	20-25%
Prefer not to say (PNTS)	<5%	>95%
<b>Total</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>24%</b>

The table above shows that the grant rate for women is slightly lower than for men. The numbers are too low to test whether this is a statistically significant. In the absence of other evidence to support a finding that this difference in grant rate reflects a meaningful difference resulting from our policy position, our view is that the policy does not result in undue differential outcomes by sex.

### **Evidence on women**

No specific evidence seen.

### **Evidence on men**

No specific evidence seen.

## **Race**

### **Statistics**

- SLAB's data**

Race (80% disclosure)	Percentage of total requests
White majority	35-40%
White minority	5-10%
Non-white ethnic minority	15-20%
PNTS	40-45%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>

The usefulness of the applications data set out above is limited by the very high rate of 'prefer not to say', combined with 20% of applicants not disclosing data against this protected characteristic: this is likely to obscure the true picture. This is most obviously the case for applications from the white majority group, which is very low compared to the profile of the Scottish population, as in the Scottish Household survey data from 2023, figures for this group would be around 85%. Moreover, the fact that individual applicants can submit multiple requests for unusual work also complicates the picture and may make the rates of applications from some groups within this protected characteristic appear particularly high when the total volumes are so low.

Race (80% disclosure)	Granted	Not granted
White majority	60-65%	35-40%
White minority	>95%	<5%
Non-white ethnic minority	>95%	<5%
PNTS	75-80%	25-30%
<b>Total</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>23%</b>

Whilst the table above shows variation in the grant rate across groups within this protected characteristic, again, there are insufficient numbers of applications to draw any robust conclusions from the data (particularly given the role of multiple applications). Discussions with operational decision-makers confirmed that their view is that the operation of the policy is unlikely to have a disproportionate impact on any of the groups within this protected characteristic.

We would also note again that a higher rate of refusal does not in itself indicate a substantive barrier created by the policy position with a key reason for refusals being approval was not necessary (for instance), or because a different form of prior approval was required, with no impact on equalities.

- **Data relevant to the policy**

*Evidence on different ethnicities*

No specific evidence seen.

*Evidence on people whose first language is not English*

A small number of requests for unusual work related to interpreting and translation costs: all of these were granted: however, we note that interpreting costs do not require prior approval. These requests therefore either involved an additional 'unusual' element or were perhaps granted unusually.

## **Gender reassignment**

*Statistics*

- **SLAB's data**

No data available.

- **Data relevant to the policy**

*Evidence on trans people*

No evidence found.

## **Sexual orientation**

*Statistics*

- **SLAB's data**

No data available.

- **Data relevant to the policy**

*Evidence on gay men*

No evidence found.

*Evidence on gay women/lesbians*

No evidence found.

*Evidence on bisexual people*

No evidence found.

## **Religion or belief**

*Statistics*

- **SLAB's data**

No data available.

- **Data relevant to the policy**

*Evidence on different religions*

No evidence found.

## Pregnancy or maternity

### Statistics

- SLAB's data

No data available.

- Data relevant to the policy

### Evidence on pregnancy and maternity

No specific evidence found. Whilst formerly, prior approval for unusual work was required for a solicitor to make a home visit to a client who is heavily pregnant (for example), we no longer require such work to be covered by prior approval, meaning such work can now proceed more quickly.

## Marriage/civil partnership (only applies to policies related to employment)

### Statistics

- SLAB's data

Not relevant.

- Data relevant to the policy

N/A.

### Evidence on marriage and civil partnership

N/A.

## Care Experienced

### Statistics

- SLAB's data

No evidence available.

- Data relevant to the policy

### Evidence on care experienced people

We did not find any evidence that suggested there may be a link between this characteristic and the need to instruct any particular forms of unusual work.

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

Our policy on prior approval for unusual work appears to be directly relevant and potentially important to a number of protected characteristics: in particular, age and possibly disability, where these are relevant to certain forms of special measures, such as a child or adult vulnerable witness requiring a live television link, because they are located at a remote site; or evidence being taken by commission.

In these circumstances, our current policy is that some (though by no means all) forms of special measure are defined as unusual, and thus SLAB's approval is required for such work to be undertaken. Similarly, with regards to race, in certain circumstances, where the work involved is not of a standard nature, interpreting or translating may require prior approval for unusual work.

However, other than the example above, SLAB's policy on approval for unusual work does not necessarily appear to be more important for some equality groups rather than others; nor does it appear to impact unevenly on equality groups based on the limited evidence considered at this stage. There are various forms of request which have no equalities aspect at all – for instance relating to shorthand writers and the recovery of documents. However, with regards to equalities, the definition and the factors used (in particular, whether the work will advance the case) are broad enough to enable consideration of any unusual work – including work which may be sought in relation to applicants' protected characteristics - where that can be shown to be relevant to our policy position. An applicant's protected characteristics in and of themselves will not be relevant to our decision-making.

The evidence above attempts to identify the range of circumstances in which our policy on unusual work may be relevant to different protected characteristic groups. The fairly low volumes of applications in this area mean that we are unable to test for statistical significance with regards to variation in the grant rate, but on the face of the data seen, we do not believe that it indicates obvious differences in outcome which would arise as a direct result of applicants' protected characteristics.

### **2.3. Outcome of Step 2 and next steps. Select the outcome below to inform the next stage of the EqIA process.**

**Please select your decision:** Proceed to Step 3 - complete full EqIA.

**Please outline the reasoning behind your decision:**

As noted above, given we are aware of requests which do have a direct relevance to applicants' protected characteristics, a full equality impact assessment is required.

## **Step 3: Stakeholder involvement and consultation**

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

No.

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

No consultation planned.

### **3.3. What did you learn from the consultation/involvement?**

N/A.

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

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

## Cross-cutting observations

SLAB has a wide degree of discretion available in terms of its policy on prior approval for unusual work. The factors that appear in the agreed policy are broadly framed: our assessment is that they are framed in such a way that – where relevance to the factors is demonstrated – issues relating to any of the protected characteristics with regards to a possible need to undertake unusual work can be considered. By incorporating such a degree of flexibility, our view is that the policy position advances equality of opportunity.

### Age

**Potential for discrimination:** No impact.

**Potential for developing good relations:** No impact.

**Potential to advance equality:** Positive impact(s).

In terms of relevance, as noted above, there are some forms of special measures – for instance the use of commissioners – which may be directly related to an applicant’s age and vulnerability. However, the data shows relatively few requests made by children. More broadly, age does not appear to be obviously relevant to many requests made.

Our view is that on the evidence available to us, there is no change required to the policy. While there appears to be a degree of variation in the grant rate, which we are unable to check for statistical significance, our experience indicates that any variation in grant rate is unlikely to reflect discriminatory impacts arising from our policy position.

As noted above, in the ‘[cross cutting](#)’ section, our assessment is that the factors set out within the policy are broad enough to allow for issues relating to any protected characteristic to be considered where relevance can be demonstrated; and that this means that the policy has a positive impact with regards to equality of opportunity.

### Disability

**Potential for discrimination:** No impact.

**Potential for developing good relations:** No impact.

**Potential to advance equality:** Positive impact(s).

In terms of relevance, we note above that some requests for unusual work appeared to have a linkage to issues relating to an applicant’s mental health. Our view is that on the evidence available to us, there is no change required to the policy. While there appears to be a small degree of variation in the grant rate – with the grant rate for disabled persons being higher – which we are unable to check for statistical significance, our experience indicates that any variation in grant rate is unlikely to reflect discriminatory impacts arising from our policy position.

As noted above, in the ‘[cross cutting](#)’ section, our assessment is that the factors set out within the policy are broad enough to allow for issues relating to any protected characteristic to be considered where relevance can be demonstrated; and that this means that the policy has a positive impact with regards to equality of opportunity.

### Sex

**Potential for discrimination:** No impact.

**Potential for developing good relations:** No impact.

**Potential to advance equality:** Positive impact(s).

Our view is that on the evidence available to us, there is no change required to the policy. Our experience indicates that any slight variation in grant rate is unlikely to reflect discriminatory impacts arising from our policy position.

As noted above, in the '[cross cutting](#)' section, our assessment is that the factors set out within the policy are broad enough to allow for issues relating to any protected characteristic to be considered where relevance can be demonstrated; and that this means that the policy has a positive impact with regards to equality of opportunity.

## Race

**Potential for discrimination:** No impact.

**Potential for developing good relations:** No impact.

**Potential to advance equality:** Positive impact(s).

Our view is that on the evidence available to us, there is no change required to the policy. Given the volume of data available, it was not possible to determine whether the variation seen in the grant rate by race was significant: however, our view is that there is no obvious basis on which to conclude that there are discriminatory impacts arising from our policy position.

As noted above, in the '[cross cutting](#)' section, our assessment is that the factors set out within the policy are broad enough to allow for issues relating to any protected characteristic to be considered where relevance can be demonstrated; and that this means that the policy has a positive impact with regards to equality of opportunity.

## Gender reassignment

**Potential for discrimination:** No impact.

**Potential for developing good relations:** No impact.

**Potential to advance equality:** Positive impact(s).

We did not find any evidence that indicated a specific relevance of our policy on unusual work with regards to this protected characteristic, or which suggests that applicants are more or less likely to seek and to be granted approval to undertake unusual work depending on their gender reassignment status. However, nor are we aware of any current issues. There are no known adverse impacts to be mitigated.

As noted above, in the '[cross cutting](#)' section, our assessment is that the factors set out within the policy are broad enough to allow for issues relating to any protected characteristic to be considered where relevance can be demonstrated; and that this means that the policy has a positive impact with regards to equality of opportunity.

## Sexual orientation

**Potential for discrimination:** No impact.

**Potential for developing good relations:** No impact.

**Potential to advance equality:** Positive impact(s).

We did not find any evidence that indicated a specific relevance of our policy on unusual work with regards to applicants' sexual orientation, or which suggests that applicants from particular sexual orientations are more or less likely to seek and to be granted approval to undertake unusual work. However, nor are we aware of any current issues. There are no known adverse impacts to be mitigated.

As noted above, in the '[cross cutting](#)' section, our assessment is that the factors set out within the policy are broad enough to allow for issues relating to any protected characteristic to be considered where relevance can be demonstrated; and that this means that the policy has a positive impact with regards to equality of opportunity.

## Religion or Belief

**Potential for discrimination:** No impact.

**Potential for developing good relations:** No impact.

**Potential to advance equality:** Positive impact(s).

We did not find any evidence that indicated a specific relevance of our policy on unusual work with regards to applicants' religion or belief, or which suggests that applicants from particular religious backgrounds are more or less likely to seek and to be granted approval to undertake such work. However, nor are we aware of any current issues. There are no known adverse impacts to be mitigated.

As noted above, in the '[cross cutting](#)' section, our assessment is that the factors set out within the policy are broad enough to allow for issues relating to any protected characteristic to be considered where relevance can be demonstrated; and that this means that the policy has a positive impact with regards to equality of opportunity.

## Pregnancy & Maternity

**Potential for discrimination:** No impact.

**Potential for developing good relations:** No impact.

**Potential to advance equality:** Positive impact(s).

We did not find any evidence that indicated a specific relevance of our policy on unusual work with regards to pregnancy or maternity, or which suggests that applicants within this protected characteristic group are more or less likely to seek and to be granted approval to undertake such work. However, nor are we aware of any current issues. There are no known adverse impacts to be mitigated.

As noted above, in the '[cross cutting](#)' section, our assessment is that the factors set out within the policy are broad enough to allow for issues relating to any protected characteristic to be considered where relevance can be demonstrated; and that this means that the policy has a positive impact with regards to equality of opportunity.

## Marriage & Civil Partnership (only applies to policies related to employment)

**Potential for discrimination:** No impact.

**Potential for developing good relations:** No impact.

**Potential to advance equality:** No impact.

This protected characteristic is not relevant for consideration under this policy.

## Care experience

**Potential for discrimination:** No impact.

**Potential for developing good relations:** No impact.

**Potential to advance equality:** Positive impact(s).

As noted above, we found no specific evidence or data that allows us to see a clear linkage between applicants with this protected characteristic, requests to undertake unusual work, and grant rate. However, nor are we aware of any current issues. There are no known adverse impacts to be mitigated.

As noted above, in the '[cross cutting](#)' section, our assessment is that the factors set out within the policy are broad enough to allow for issues relating to any protected characteristic to be considered where relevance can be demonstrated; and that this means that the policy has a positive impact with regards to equality of opportunity.

## 4.2. Which actions have you taken as part of this assessment?

**Please select the outcome of the assessment:** Confirm that the policy/practice/process/service described in section 1.1 was robust.

**Please explain the changes that have been made:** Given the conclusion that the policy is robust, no changes have been identified.

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

**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.**

In the development of this assessment, we discussed the available evidence with key operational decision-makers and sought their insights as to their experiences of applying the policy.

The policy was considered by senior leadership staff at the GALA Review Group session at the end of February 2026.

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

**6.1. Record any ongoing actions below**

No current actions.

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

Measure	Lead department or individual	Reporting (where and frequency)
Analysis of numbers of requests, grants and refusals for prior approval to undertake unusual work by assisted person protected characteristic, by case type if possible, ensuring unusual work can be split out more broadly. Also attempt to specifically identify equality focused requests, relating to special measures (for example).	AMI (data extraction) with Policy (analysis).	Yearly – to Head of Civil and Children’s Legal Assistance.

### 6.3. EqIA review date

26/02/2029

## Step 7: Assessment sign off and approval

**Director/SRO sign off:** 26/02/2026.

**Chief Executive approval:** 26/02/2026.