

## Appendix B

### DRR Consultation analysis

1. The consultation was launched citywide on 2 October 2017 and ran until 24 December 2017. The Revenues Service also wrote to each of the 101 organisations who currently receive DRR, encouraging their participation in the online consultation.
2. In total there were 80 responses to the consultation, of which 27 were from organisations currently receiving relief. A further 21 respondents identified themselves as being users of organisations receiving relief.
3. **Summary**
  - a. Option 1 – where organisations with a turnover below £100,000 are eligible for relief was the preferred choice, with 55 (72%) respondents selecting this option.
  - b. 12 respondents objected to a reduction in funding, suggesting we increase CTAX/business rates, lobby government for more funding, or make other cuts
  - c. 2 respondents proposed that we consider groups with turnover in excess of £150k, noting that their margins are still tight but they do have a wide reach in communities
  - d. 1 respondent suggested we have a policy which assessed based on an organisations impact and how they subsidise the gaps in support from public/private sector
  - e. 4 responses were not relevant to the consultation
  - f. Voscur directly emailed their view that “In addition to being a major employer, harnessing voluntary action, and bringing substantial resources into the city, VCSE (Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise organisations) contribute to building social capital and resilience, and help people to manage in these difficult times...We would like to see the DRR process opened up to the wider charity sector and the limited budget used for the greatest impact”

### 4. Equalities

27 used this field to comment generally on the impact on users/providers

8 specifically mentioned equalities groups:

- 1 - All equalities groups
- 3 - Young
- 4 - Young and old

However, this would appear to be in relation to users of their services who happen to be in these equalities groups, rather than having a wider effect on groups of people with protected characteristics

### 5. Notes

- a. This outcome is as expected – it does reflect the fact that most of the current recipients meet the criteria for option 1.
- b. There were at least 10 responses (for option 1) which identified with *one* single organisation, however this potential bias does not affect the overall outcome.
- c. There were 39 responses who did not identify with *any* organisation, and the comments suggest these broadly represent communities and organisations across the entire city; there is no indication that any one organisation (other than the one above) is unfairly weighted in the data.