

TEST OF RELEVANCE: EQUALITY ANALYSIS (EA)

The screening process of using the Test of Relevance template aims to assist in determining whether a full Equality Analysis (EA) is required. The EA template and guidance plus information on the Equality Act and the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) can be found on Colnet at: <http://colnet/Departments/Pages/News/Equality-and-Diversity.aspx>

Introduction

The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) is set out in the Equality Act 2010 (s.149). This requires public authorities, in the exercise of their functions, to have 'due regard' to the need to:

- Eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation
- Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not, and
- Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not

The characteristics protected by the Equality Act 2010 are:

- Age
- Disability
- Gender reassignment
- Marriage and civil partnership.
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race
- Religion or belief
- Sex (gender)
- Sexual orientation

What is due regard?	How to demonstrate compliance
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It involves considering the aims of the duty in a way that is proportionate to the issue at hand • Ensuring that real consideration is given to the aims and the impact of policies with rigour and with an open mind in such a way that it influences the final decision • Due regard should be given before and during policy formation and when a decision is taken including cross cutting ones as the impact can be cumulative. <p>The general equality duty does not specify how public authorities should analyse the effect of their business activities on different groups of people. However, case law has established that equality analysis is an important way public authorities can demonstrate that they are meeting the requirements.</p> <p>Even in cases where it is considered that there are no implications of proposed policy and decision making on the PSED it is good practice to record the reasons why and to include these in reports to committees where decisions are being taken.</p> <p>It is also good practice to consider the duty in relation to current policies, services and procedures, even if there is no plan to change them.</p>	<p>Case law has established the following principles apply to the PSED:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge – the need to be aware of the requirements of the Equality Duty with a conscious approach and state of mind. • Sufficient Information – must be made available to the decision maker • Timeliness – the Duty must be complied with before and at the time that a particular policy is under consideration or decision is taken not after it has been taken. • Real consideration – consideration must form an integral part of the decision-making process. It is not a matter of box-ticking; it must be exercised in substance, with rigour and with an open mind in such a way that it influences the final decision. • Sufficient information – the decision maker must consider what information he or she has and what further information may be needed in order to give proper consideration to the Equality Duty • No delegation - public bodies are responsible for ensuring that any third parties which exercise functions on their behalf are capable of complying with the Equality Duty, are required to comply with it, and that they do so in practice. It is a duty that cannot be delegated. • Review – the duty is continuing applying when a policy is developed and decided upon, but also when it is implemented and reviewed. <p>However there is no requirement to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Produce equality analysis or an equality impact assessment • Indiscriminately collect diversity data where equalities issues are not significant

- Publish lengthy documents to show compliance
- Treat everyone the same. Rather, it requires public bodies to think about people's different needs and how these can be met
- Make services homogeneous or to try to remove or ignore differences between people.

The key points about demonstrating compliance with the duty are to:

- Collate sufficient evidence to determine whether changes being considered will have a potential impact on different groups
- Ensure decision makers are aware of the analysis that has been undertaken and what conclusions have been reached on the possible implications
- Keep adequate records of the full decision making process

Test of Relevance screening

The Test of Relevance screening is a short exercise that involves looking at the overall proposal and deciding if it is relevant to the PSED.

Note: If the proposal is of a significant nature and it is apparent from the outset that a full equality analysis will be required, then it is not necessary to complete the Test of Relevance screening template and the full equality analysis and be completed.

The questions in the Test of Relevance Screening Template to help decide if the proposal is equality relevant and whether a detailed equality analysis is required. The key question is whether the proposal is likely to be relevant to any of the protected characteristics.

Quite often, the answer may not be so obvious and service-user or provider information will need to be considered to make a preliminary judgment. For example, in considering licensing arrangements, the location of the premises in question and the demographics of the area could affect whether section 149 considerations come into play.

There is no one size fits all approach but the screening process is designed to help fully consider the circumstances.

What to do

In general, the following questions all feed into whether an equality analysis is required:

- How many people is the proposal likely to affect?
- How significant is its impact?
- Does it relate to an area where there are known inequalities?

At this initial screening stage, the point is to try to assess obvious negative or positive impact.

If a negative/adverse impact has been identified (actual or potential) during completion of the screening tool, a full equality analysis must be undertaken.

If no negative / adverse impacts arising from the proposal it is not necessary to undertake a full equality analysis.

On completion of the Test of Relevance screening, officers should:

- Ensure they have fully completed and the Director has signed off the Test of Relevance Screening Template.
- Store the screening template safely so that it can be retrieved if for example, Members request to see it, or there is a freedom of information request or there is a legal challenge.
- If the outcome of the Test of Relevance Screening identifies no or minimal impact refer to it in the Implications section of the report and include reference to it in Background Papers when reporting to Committee or other decision making process.

1. Proposal / Project Title: Burnham Beeches Management plan 2020-2030

2. Brief summary (include main aims, proposed outcomes, recommendations / decisions sought): This is the main document to drive the management of Burnham Beeches Site Of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) for the next ten years. It covers all aspects of environmental, heritage and recreation management for that period. It has been produced following extensive consultation with Natural England and other conservation, recreation experts, City of London Corporation Members, the Burnham Beeches and Stoke Common Consultation Group, site volunteers and members of local communities.

3. Considering the equality aims (eliminate unlawful discrimination; advance equality of opportunity; foster good relations), indicate for each protected group whether there may be a positive impact, negative (adverse) impact or no impact arising from the proposal:

Protected Characteristic (Equality Group) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	No Impact	Briefly explain your answer. Consider evidence, data and any consultation.
Age	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Access remains across the site, as has been the case for the previous 10 years when significant improvements took place. Access furniture now accommodates a wide range of user needs including pedestrians, cyclists, horse riders and wheel chair users. Major paths are user friendly whilst reflecting the need to provide natural surfaces across the SSSI. All Site based literature produced to meet accessibility design guidance. The new management plan will maintain and improve these standards where possible.
Disability	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	See above.
Gender Reassignment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	This equality issue is not significant with regard to the Management Plan Provision of the site is non-specific in terms of gender reassignment. No facilities are provided that would require any form of gender specification.
Marriage and Civil Partnership	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	This equality issue is not significant with regard to the Management Plan. Provision of the site including the management plan is non-specific in this respect.
Pregnancy and Maternity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	This equality issue is not significant with regard to the Management Plan Provision of the site including the management plan is non-specific in this respect See also comments re accessibility.
Race	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Provision of the site is non-specific in this respect
Religion or Belief	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Provision of the site is non-specific in this respect.
Sex (i.e gender)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Provision of the site via the management plan is non-specific in this respect.
Sexual Orientation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Provision of the site via the management plan is non-specific in this respect.

4. There are no negative/adverse impact(s)

Please briefly explain and provide evidence to support this decision:

Consultation undertaken to produce the management plan with none of the above issues raised as being problematic. Site surveys undertaken in recent years that provides a good understanding of our visitor profile that generally reflects the local situation - no issues identified. See below:

Participant profiles

358 participants took part in the consultation:

56% were female%, 43% were male, and 1% 'other'.
 77% of participants were over 45. 3% were under 16.
 89% identified as White British. 6% as White Other, 3% Asian/Asian British.
 3% identified as having a disability.

Best practice is followed on provision of access furniture, path surfacing. Accessibility design guidance followed for site based information/literature/events etc.

5. Are there positive impacts of the proposal on any equality groups? Please briefly explain how these are in line with the equality aims:

Maintenance of the current recreation and information standards coupled to an improving environment/ visitor experience. Management of the site and the management plan document, is benign in terms of equality issues. Management plan recommends provision of access furniture and improved path surfacing which would be an improvement that has greatest impact on age and disability equality characteristic groups.

6. As a result of this screening, is a full EA necessary? (Please check appropriate box using <input type="checkbox"/>)	Yes	No	Briefly explain your answer: No negative issues identified.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

7. Name of Lead Officer: Andy Barnard	Job title: Superintendent of The Commons	Date of completion: 05 December 2019
--	---	---

Signed off by Department Director :		Name:	Date:
--	--	--------------	--------------