

Immigration and Asylum: Impacts of the Graduated Fee Scheme – Technical Amendment

Introduction

This document comprises a technical amendment to Appendix B of the “Final Regulatory Impact Assessment: Immigration and Asylum Final Fee Scheme” that was published on 20th March 2007.

There was an error within the NfP provider costs data used in the original provider impact analysis.

This error and the resulting analysis have been corrected and the revised impacts are reported here.

Key Revisions

The corrected analysis indicates that if all the assumptions are correct the scheme could positively impact on providers to a greater extent than originally published. The table below shows the percentage of providers predicted to experience an increase in income for cases falling within the scheme as reported in the published RIA and compares this to the percentage of providers predicted to experience an increase in income for cases falling within the scheme in the revised analysis. The data is split by region and by asylum and immigration non-asylum cases.

Region	Immigration Published	Immigration Revised	Difference	Asylum Published	Asylum Revised	Difference
BIRMINGHAM	80.00%	80.00%	+0.00%	87.18%	92.31%	+5.13%
BRIGHTON	62.50%	50.00%	-12.50%	55.56%	55.56%	+0.00%
BRISTOL	46.15%	46.15%	+0.00%	71.43%	85.71%	+14.29%
CAMBRIDGE	38.46%	53.85%	+15.38%	64.29%	85.71%	+21.43%
CARDIFF	83.33%	92.31%	+8.97%	92.31%	92.86%	+0.55%
LEEDS	65.00%	80.95%	+15.95%	77.27%	81.82%	+4.55%
LIVERPOOL	50.00%	50.00%	+0.00%	75.00%	66.67%	-8.33%
LONDON	54.44%	53.08%	-1.36%	70.33%	71.53%	+1.20%
MANCHESTER	77.42%	81.82%	+4.40%	76.67%	87.10%	+10.43%
NEWCASTLE	57.14%	64.29%	+7.14%	82.35%	82.35%	+0.00%
NOTTINGHAM	60.00%	66.67%	+6.67%	68.75%	87.50%	+18.75%
READING	53.33%	68.75%	+15.42%	83.33%	89.47%	+6.14%
Total	59.00%	60.85%	+1.85%	73.56%	77.47%	+3.91%

There are differences but only three are negative:

- Brighton, Immigration non-asylum
- Liverpool, Asylum
- London, Immigration non-asylum

The difference in London is less than 1.5%. Although the revised impacts are more significant in Brighton and Liverpool, the low volumes in these areas mean that the difference represents only around one provider.

Furthermore, the incorrect data resulted in erroneously inflated spend figures within the financial impact tables published at Appendix B. However, it should be noted that the impact analysis attempts to predict the impact on the income for providers for the cases that will fall under the new scheme and for which claims were made during the data sample period. The totalled claim values are not directly comparable to other fund expenditure figures or forecasts for controlled work.

Appendix B

Immigration and Asylum: Impacts of the Graduated Fee Scheme (amended)

Background

The immigration and asylum reform programme is not aimed at reducing costs and has been modelled to be cost-neutral as compared to the forecast spend for 2007/08 based on current arrangements.

The fees have been calculated by working back from the forecast spend for 2007/08 and mapping the processes that an immigration or asylum application would routinely follow and the corresponding services that we would expect to be provided in relation to those applications.

Exceptional cases are those that cost 3 times the fees claimed. The costs of these have been removed for calculation.

The analysis is of 18-months of data from April 2005 and all financial figures reflect this.

The analysis combines both solicitor and NfP providers.

Caveats

We do not have complete and fully reliable data in the immigration and asylum category and we have been unable to base fee values on historical claim data.

The major reason for this is that there have been substantive changes in the way that applications and appeals have been processed in recent years as well as in the legal aid remuneration arrangements for this work. Furthermore, Home Office processes continue to change with the introduction of the New Asylum Model.

Significant assumptions have had to be made to allow impact modelling and therefore analysis can be considered as an approximate indicator only.

Approximately 25% of asylum cases as well as other services to underpin the provision of advice and representation will be remunerated by way of separate arrangements and will be subject to exclusive contracts or panels. As contracts for this remaining work are yet to be awarded we cannot include the impacts within the analysis.

It should also be noted that the historical data used in this analysis includes two national NfP providers who account for approximately 85% of total NfP spend. This has a significant effect on the impacts reported. The effect is particularly marked in some regions for example: Brighton, Cambridge and Leeds.

Any comparisons need to be treated with caution as they assume that providers will spend exactly the same amount of time on cases as they did in the past, and that they will conduct exactly the same number and type of cases. Changes to these assumptions would impact on the assessment. It may, for example, be open to providers to increase the numbers of cases undertaken, which would increase their legal aid income overall. Equally some providers may make efficiency savings in a fixed fee environment.

Furthermore, with the Home Office introduction of the New Asylum Model for processing asylum applicants, changing dispersal practice and faster decision

making the LSC plans to introduce an advice and referral service at the Asylum Screening Unit to ensure that clients can quickly obtain access to a provider local to the area in which they will be accommodated whilst their application is being processed. The LSC also intends to provide specialist services incorporating the principle of exclusivity for certain client groups where a particular need has been identified such as Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children and clients in detention. These developments will potentially change the case mix of providers to ensure that the needs of clients are being met.

Combined Financial Impact

Overall, our analysis indicates that if the graduated fee scheme had been in place in 2005/06 we could, if all our assumptions are correct, have spent up to 5.85% more on the combined asylum and immigration; non-asylum claims covered by the analysis. The analysis covers 18-months of reported claims from April 2005 and uses various assumptions to identify the cases that are likely to fall under the new fee scheme and the likely total value of these cases under the new arrangements.

The following two sections detail the impacts of the two schemes separately.

Asylum

Financial Impacts over 18-months

Region	Current Projected Spend	New Projected Spend	Over/Underspend	As a % of Total Spend
BIRMINGHAM	£3,283,522.61	£4,181,172.99	£897,650.38	27.34%
BRIGHTON	£2,649,818.82	£2,207,391.67	-£442,427.15	-16.70%
BRISTOL	£636,455.20	£767,486.69	£131,031.49	20.59%
CAMBRIDGE	£2,173,951.01	£2,033,632.25	-£140,318.77	-6.45%
CARDIFF	£597,702.38	£786,872.53	£189,170.15	31.65%
LEEDS	£2,960,821.90	£3,366,348.24	£405,526.33	13.70%
LIVERPOOL	£864,866.48	£987,573.52	£122,707.04	14.19%
LONDON	£38,488,245.73	£40,635,119.25	£2,146,873.51	5.58%
MANCHESTER	£2,356,354.49	£2,813,284.08	£456,929.59	19.39%
NEWCASTLE	£3,200,179.91	£3,404,782.78	£204,602.87	6.39%
NOTTINGHAM	£1,740,714.20	£2,081,650.00	£340,935.80	19.59%
READING	£806,934.18	£964,071.15	£157,136.97	19.47%
Total	£59,759,566.92	£64,229,385.15	£4,469,818.23	7.48%

Overall, this analysis suggests that if the graduated fee scheme had been in place in 2005/06 we could, if all our assumptions are correct, have spent around 7.5% more under the scheme than in 2005/06 for the volume and range of cases covered by the analysis, with 10 of the 12 LSC regions expected to see an increase in income.

Regional Provider Impacts

Region	Current Number of Providers	% of Providers whose Income is expected to Increase	% of Providers whose Income is expected to Decrease	Current Volume of Cases	% of Cases Conducted by Whose Income Would Increase	% of Cases Conducted by Whose Income Would Decrease
BIRMINGHAM	39	92.31%	7.69%	5676	93.82%	6.18%
BRIGHTON	9	55.56%	44.44%	3287	16.12%	83.88%
BRISTOL	14	85.71%	14.29%	1005	88.96%	11.04%
CAMBRIDGE	14	85.71%	14.29%	2575	58.06%	41.94%
CARDIFF	14	92.86%	7.14%	1118	99.46%	0.54%
LEEDS	22	81.82%	18.18%	4475	77.36%	22.64%
LIVERPOOL	6	66.67%	33.33%	1231	93.83%	6.17%
LONDON	274	71.53%	28.47%	50687	67.74%	32.26%
MANCHESTER	31	87.10%	12.90%	4000	93.85%	6.15%
NEWCASTLE	17	82.35%	17.65%	4258	44.67%	55.33%
NOTTINGHAM	16	87.50%	12.50%	2611	83.15%	16.85%
READING	19	89.47%	10.53%	1421	77.76%	22.24%
Total	475	77.47%	22.53%	82344	69.52%	30.48%

Overall, 77% of providers, with responsibility for 70% of cases, may expect to increase their income under the scheme. There are no regions in which a majority of providers would be expected to see a decrease in income.

Rural/Urban Coverage

There are only two rural providers of asylum law, one of whom may expect to see an increase in their income.

Client Ethnicity

Region	Projection of Current Number of Claims Reported			% Reported Served by Providers whose Income is expected to Increase			% Reported Served by Providers whose Income is expected to Decrease		
	White	BME	Unknown	White	BME	Unknown	White	BME	Unknown
BIRMINGHAM	142	5102	421	100.00%	97.04%	52.50%	0.00%	2.96%	47.50%
BRIGHTON	212	3070	3	5.76%	16.87%	0.00%	94.24%	83.13%	100.00%
BRISTOL	117	876	2	86.80%	89.09%	100.00%	13.20%	10.91%	0.00%
CAMBRIDGE	81	1446	1049	89.26%	88.72%	13.39%	10.74%	11.28%	86.61%
CARDIFF	170	890	53	100.00%	99.55%	96.21%	0.00%	0.45%	3.79%
LEEDS	130	4164	177	81.48%	79.72%	18.64%	18.52%	20.28%	81.36%
LIVERPOOL	7	1216	7	63.48%	94.05%	83.33%	36.52%	5.95%	16.67%
LONDON	5560	44591	256	76.79%	66.65%	73.99%	23.21%	33.35%	26.01%
MANCHESTER	245	3600	155	99.53%	93.38%	95.90%	0.47%	6.62%	4.10%
NEWCASTLE	391	3692	79	21.14%	46.23%	97.36%	78.86%	53.77%	2.64%
NOTTINGHAM	165	2438	8	68.91%	84.05%	100.00%	31.09%	15.95%	0.00%
READING	249	1142	29	55.33%	83.62%	38.93%	44.67%	16.38%	61.07%
Total	7469	72227	2239	73.04%	70.16%	39.65%	26.96%	29.84%	60.35%

Overall, the impact is consistent when comparing white to BME clients served by providers whose income is expected to increase. Regionally, the proportions of white clients are too low to draw any meaningful conclusions.

Client Age

Region	Projection of Current Number of Claims Reported							% Reported by Providers whose Income is Expected to Increase							% Reported by Providers whose Income is Expected to Decrease						
	0-16	17-24	25-34	35-49	50-64	65+	Unknown	0-16	17-24	25-34	35-49	50-64	65+	Unknown	0-16	17-24	25-34	35-49	50-64	65+	Unknown
BIRMINGHAM	0	1743	2530	1223	120	49	0	N/A	93.52%	95.42%	91.91%	85.83%	89.80%	N/A	N/A	6.48%	4.62%	8.09%	15.00%	10.20%	N/A
BRIGHTON	0	1133	1478	578	89	8	0	N/A	15.98%	16.64%	14.01%	22.47%	25.00%	N/A	N/A	84.11%	83.29%	85.81%	77.53%	75.00%	N/A
BRISTOL	0	338	493	137	24	4	0	N/A	86.98%	89.86%	91.97%	75.00%	100.00%	N/A	N/A	13.02%	10.14%	8.03%	25.00%	0.00%	N/A
CAMBRIDGE	0	934	1090	452	83	13	2	N/A	54.50%	58.99%	57.74%	80.72%	100.00%	100.00%	N/A	45.61%	41.01%	42.48%	18.07%	0.00%	0.00%
CARDIFF	0	320	467	269	49	7	0	N/A	100.00%	98.72%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	N/A	N/A	0.00%	1.28%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	N/A
LEEDS	0	1205	2184	920	121	41	0	N/A	73.86%	77.88%	79.89%	81.82%	82.93%	N/A	N/A	26.14%	22.12%	20.22%	18.18%	17.07%	N/A
LIVERPOOL	0	526	459	198	36	10	0	N/A	85.74%	99.78%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	N/A	N/A	14.26%	0.22%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	N/A
LONDON	0	13326	22580	11868	2049	556	27	N/A	65.42%	69.66%	67.30%	67.55%	60.61%	85.19%	N/A	34.59%	30.34%	32.70%	32.50%	39.39%	14.81%
MANCHESTER	0	1138	1827	891	122	22	0	N/A	93.41%	92.56%	96.52%	96.72%	100.00%	N/A	N/A	6.59%	7.39%	3.48%	4.10%	0.00%	N/A
NEWCASTLE	0	1051	2009	940	140	21	3	N/A	44.05%	45.50%	43.40%	47.14%	61.90%	100.00%	N/A	55.85%	54.50%	56.49%	52.86%	42.86%	0.00%
NOTTINGHAM	0	523	1389	573	77	45	4	N/A	66.92%	87.26%	89.01%	71.43%	88.89%	100.00%	N/A	33.08%	12.74%	10.99%	28.57%	11.11%	0.00%
READING	0	397	587	348	82	6	0	N/A	67.51%	80.75%	81.03%	90.24%	100.00%	N/A	N/A	32.49%	19.25%	18.97%	9.76%	0.00%	N/A
Total	0	22634	37093	18397	2992	782	36	N/A	66.87%	71.14%	69.80%	69.80%	67.94%	88.57%	N/A	33.13%	28.86%	30.20%	30.20%	32.06%	11.43%

The fee scheme does not cover cases involving clients aged 0-16. The impacts are consistent throughout all other age groups.

Client Gender

Region	Number of Cases Undertaken			% Reported Served by Providers whose Income is expected to Increase			% Reported Served by Providers whose Income is expected to Decrease		
	Male	Female	Unknown	Male	Female	Unknown	Male	Female	Unknown
BIRMINGHAM	4306	1360	0	93.51%	94.73%	N/A	6.49%	5.27%	N/A
BRIGHTON	2648	638	0	16.73%	13.63%	N/A	83.27%	86.37%	N/A
BRISTOL	759	236	0	89.60%	86.42%	N/A	10.40%	13.58%	N/A
CAMBRIDGE	2045	530	2	59.32%	53.19%	100.00%	40.68%	46.81%	0.00%
CARDIFF	797	316	0	99.25%	100.00%	N/A	0.75%	0.00%	N/A
LEEDS	3124	1347	0	76.20%	79.99%	N/A	23.80%	20.01%	N/A
LIVERPOOL	877	352	0	94.48%	92.17%	N/A	5.52%	7.83%	N/A
LONDON	34515	15892	27	68.11%	67.14%	86.29%	31.89%	32.86%	13.71%
MANCHESTER	2729	1271	0	94.50%	92.46%	N/A	5.50%	7.54%	N/A
NEWCASTLE	2952	1211	3	45.05%	44.35%	100.00%	54.95%	55.65%	0.00%
NOTTINGHAM	1847	764	4	81.69%	86.68%	100.00%	18.31%	13.32%	0.00%
READING	996	424	0	77.39%	78.58%	N/A	22.61%	21.42%	N/A
Total	57595	24341	36	69.56%	69.66%	89.43%	30.44%	30.34%	10.57%

The impact is very consistent when comparing male and female clients served by providers whose fees may increase.

Immigration, non-asylum

Financial Impacts over 18-months

Region	Current Projected Spend	New Projected Spend	Over/Underspend	As a % of Total Spend
BIRMINGHAM	£1,484,161.58	£1,698,560.04	£214,398.47	14.45%
BRIGHTON	£195,312.42	£210,128.68	£14,816.26	7.59%
BRISTOL	£437,550.17	£450,380.89	£12,830.72	2.93%
CAMBRIDGE	£501,299.29	£525,902.62	£24,603.33	4.91%
CARDIFF	£355,476.56	£429,704.69	£74,228.13	20.88%
LEEDS	£587,117.37	£672,526.69	£85,409.32	14.55%
LIVERPOOL	£206,531.25	£219,567.50	£13,036.25	6.31%
LONDON	£11,856,985.33	£11,500,104.22	-£356,881.10	-3.01%
MANCHESTER	£1,196,376.70	£1,418,041.18	£221,664.48	18.53%
NEWCASTLE	£1,041,582.77	£904,057.78	-£137,524.99	-13.20%
NOTTINGHAM	£1,076,094.43	£1,080,051.33	£3,956.90	0.37%
READING	£600,156.05	£599,212.82	-£943.23	-0.16%
Total	£19,538,643.89	£19,708,238.43	£169,594.54	0.87%

Overall, this analysis suggests that if the graduated fee scheme had been in place in 2005/06 we could, if all our assumptions are correct, have spent around 0.9% more under the scheme than in 2005/06 for the volume and range of cases covered by the analysis, with 9 of the 12 LSC regions expected to see an increase in income.

Regional Provider Impacts

Region	Current Number of Providers	% of Providers whose Income is expected to Increase	% of Providers whose Income is expected to Decrease	Current Volume of Cases	% of Cases Conducted by Whose Income Would Increase	% of Cases Conducted by Whose Income Would Decrease
BIRMINGHAM	35	80.00%	20.00%	5004	87.75%	12.25%
BRIGHTON	8	50.00%	50.00%	663	78.13%	21.87%
BRISTOL	13	46.15%	53.85%	1252	52.24%	47.76%
CAMBRIDGE	13	53.85%	46.15%	1388	67.58%	32.42%
CARDIFF	13	92.31%	7.69%	1433	93.93%	6.07%
LEEDS	21	80.95%	19.05%	2183	80.81%	19.19%
LIVERPOOL	6	50.00%	50.00%	735	92.79%	7.21%
LONDON	260	53.08%	46.92%	32796	42.98%	57.02%
MANCHESTER	33	81.82%	18.18%	4446	90.82%	9.18%
NEWCASTLE	14	64.29%	35.71%	2618	35.29%	64.71%
NOTTINGHAM	15	66.67%	33.33%	2813	60.26%	39.74%
READING	16	68.75%	31.25%	1814	52.65%	47.35%
Total	447	60.85%	39.15%	57145	56.00%	44.00%

Overall, 61% of providers, with responsibility for 56% of cases, may expect to see their income increase under the proposals. Bristol is the only LSC region in which a majority of providers could expect to see a decrease in their income, although this majority is slight.

Rural/Urban Coverage

There are only three rural providers of immigration law, one of whom may expect to see an increase in their income.

Client Ethnicity

Region	Number of Cases Undertaken			% Reported Served by Providers whose Income is expected to Increase			% Reported Served by Providers whose Income is expected to Decrease		
	White	BME	Unknown	White	BME	Unknown	White	BME	Unknown
BIRMINGHAM	155	4524	323	92.97%	92.71%	15.80%	7.03%	7.29%	84.20%
BRIGHTON	77	586	0	83.72%	77.39%	N/A	16.28%	22.61%	N/A
BRISTOL	211	1035	0	59.01%	51.14%	N/A	40.99%	48.86%	N/A
CAMBRIDGE	152	1008	228	66.75%	60.39%	100.00%	33.25%	39.61%	0.00%
CARDIFF	189	1180	64	87.56%	94.62%	100.00%	12.44%	5.38%	0.00%
LEEDS	112	2046	25	87.23%	80.52%	75.83%	12.77%	19.48%	24.17%
LIVERPOOL	33	699	4	90.71%	93.06%	59.96%	9.29%	6.94%	40.04%
LONDON	3289	29230	229	47.70%	42.53%	40.69%	52.30%	57.47%	59.31%
MANCHESTER	182	4157	107	92.39%	90.61%	96.59%	7.61%	9.39%	3.41%
NEWCASTLE	492	2081	40	13.67%	39.92%	65.16%	86.33%	60.08%	34.84%
NOTTINGHAM	104	2682	27	47.80%	60.51%	82.39%	52.20%	39.49%	17.61%
READING	436	1337	39	53.46%	53.69%	9.90%	46.54%	46.31%	90.10%
Total	5432	50565	1086	51.81%	56.50%	56.44%	48.19%	43.50%	43.56%

Overall, the impact is consistent when comparing white to BME clients served by providers who may expect their income to increase. Regionally, the proportions of white clients are too low to draw any meaningful conclusions.

Client Age

Region	Projection of Current Number of Claims Reported							% Reported by Providers whose Income is Expected to Increase						% Reported by Providers whose Income is Expected to Decrease							
	0-16	17-24	25-34	35-49	50-64	65+	Unknown	0-16	17-24	25-34	35-49	50-64	65+	Unknown	0-16	17-24	25-34	35-49	50-64	65+	Unknown
BIRMINGHAM	0	927	2226	1410	300	139	1	N/A	87.27%	89.58%	87.94%	76.00%	N/A	100.00%	N/A	12.73%	10.42%	12.06%	24.00%	16.55%	0.00%
BRIGHTON	0	184	234	188	36	21	0	N/A	83.70%	67.95%	81.38%	88.89%	93.57%	N/A	N/A	16.30%	32.05%	18.09%	11.11%	4.76%	N/A
BRISTOL	0	224	574	370	60	18	0	N/A	52.23%	52.79%	51.35%	53.33%	60.51%	N/A	N/A	47.77%	47.04%	48.65%	46.67%	38.89%	N/A
CAMBRIDGE	0	247	641	378	97	26	0	N/A	75.30%	67.08%	66.93%	54.64%	68.07%	N/A	N/A	24.70%	33.07%	33.07%	45.36%	30.77%	N/A
CARDIFF	0	316	623	331	95	51	17	N/A	95.57%	93.90%	92.15%	92.63%	97.32%	100.00%	N/A	4.43%	6.26%	7.85%	7.37%	1.96%	0.00%
LEEDS	0	415	1043	574	113	38	0	N/A	79.76%	84.47%	76.31%	74.34%	80.31%	N/A	N/A	20.48%	15.53%	23.87%	24.78%	18.42%	N/A
LIVERPOOL	0	119	321	220	43	32	0	N/A	90.76%	93.15%	91.36%	100.00%	100.00%	N/A	N/A	10.08%	6.85%	8.64%	0.00%	0.00%	N/A
LONDON	0	5396	12618	11492	2205	1033	5	N/A	44.96%	40.73%	43.27%	46.30%	51.68%	0.00%	N/A	55.04%	59.27%	56.73%	53.70%	48.31%	100.00%
MANCHESTER	0	851	2024	1285	188	98	0	N/A	95.30%	84.58%	96.96%	93.09%	96.05%	N/A	N/A	4.70%	15.46%	2.96%	6.91%	4.08%	N/A
NEWCASTLE	0	526	1233	713	110	27	4	N/A	31.56%	32.52%	42.78%	35.45%	49.87%	0.00%	N/A	68.44%	67.56%	57.22%	64.55%	48.15%	100.00%
NOTTINGHAM	0	375	1380	746	169	145	0	N/A	51.47%	66.88%	63.40%	39.05%	28.02%	N/A	N/A	48.53%	33.12%	36.60%	60.95%	71.72%	N/A
READING	0	326	799	546	98	42	0	N/A	49.08%	55.19%	49.63%	59.18%	60.55%	N/A	N/A	50.92%	44.81%	50.37%	40.82%	40.48%	N/A
Total	0	9906	23716	18253	3514	1670	27	N/A	58.16%	55.94%	55.05%	54.60%	58.93%	68.50%	N/A	41.84%	44.06%	44.95%	45.40%	41.04%	30.77%

The fee scheme does not cover cases involving clients aged 0-16. The impacts are consistent throughout all other age groups.

Client Gender

Region	Number of Cases Undertaken			% Reported Served by Providers whose Income is expected to Increase			% Reported Served by Providers whose Income is expected to Decrease		
	Male	Female	Unknown	Male	Female	Unknown	Male	Female	Unknown
BIRMINGHAM	2860	2142	1	88.23%	87.09%	100.00%	11.77%	12.91%	0.00%
BRIGHTON	454	209	0	79.47%	75.22%	N/A	20.53%	24.78%	N/A
BRISTOL	798	449	0	50.06%	56.75%	N/A	49.94%	43.25%	N/A
CAMBRIDGE	808	580	0	67.40%	67.83%	N/A	32.60%	32.17%	N/A
CARDIFF	947	486	17	94.02%	93.75%	100.00%	5.98%	6.25%	0.00%
LEEDS	1344	839	0	83.50%	76.49%	N/A	16.50%	23.51%	N/A
LIVERPOOL	458	277	0	93.16%	92.18%	N/A	6.84%	7.82%	N/A
LONDON	17116	15633	5	43.29%	42.75%	0.00%	56.71%	57.25%	100.00%
MANCHESTER	2824	1622	0	92.84%	87.32%	N/A	7.16%	12.68%	N/A
NEWCASTLE	1943	670	4	32.26%	44.34%	0.00%	67.74%	55.66%	100.00%
NOTTINGHAM	1735	1078	0	59.72%	61.13%	N/A	40.28%	38.87%	N/A
READING	1136	676	0	52.83%	52.48%	N/A	47.17%	47.52%	N/A
Total	32423	24661	27	57.25%	54.48%	68.50%	42.75%	45.52%	31.50%

The impact is very consistent when comparing male and female clients served by providers whose fees may increase.