

# 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"> <li>• It involves considering the aims of the duty in a way that is proportionate to the issue at hand</li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> <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"> <li>• <b>Knowledge</b> – the need to be aware of the requirements of the Equality Duty with a conscious approach and state of mind.</li> <li>• <b>Sufficient Information</b> – must be made available to the decision maker</li> <li>• <b>Timeliness</b> – 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.</li> <li>• <b>Real consideration</b> – 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.</li> <li>• <b>Sufficient information</b> – 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</li> <li>• <b>No delegation</b> - 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.</li> <li>• <b>Review</b> – the duty is continuing applying when a policy is developed and decided upon, but also when it is implemented and reviewed.</li> </ul>

**However there is no requirement to:**

- Produce equality analysis or an equality impact assessment
- Indiscriminately collect diversity data where equality 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: All Change at Bank**

**2. Brief summary (include main aims, proposed outcomes, recommendations / decisions sought):**

The All Change at Bank sits separate to the Bank on Safety scheme and seeks to bring transformative change to Bank Junction for the longer term. The project is currently at feasibility stage. This document assess the broad aims, objectives and direction of travel of the project as the work is focused on closing/restricting further two to three arms of the junction to achieve project objectives. Regardless of which two or three arms are closed, there is similarity of impact on the protected characteristic groups which can be refined as decisions about which arms to close/restrict are taken and designs emerge. The information in this document will be used to focus design measures to reducing the negative impacts identified and to focus discussions with groups of people representing those protected characteristics that may be negatively impacted.

**The aims of the project are as follows;**

An improvement in safety at the junction

An improvement in air quality at the junction

An improvement in pedestrian experience at Bank Junction (in terms of comfort and the experience as a place to spend time in)

**Direction of travel**

The general direction in feasibility work undertaken thus far has centred around further restricting vehicle (including bus) movements, through the junction, increasing space and potential permeability for pedestrians and cyclists and maintaining access for local businesses. Work has also taken into account the operational constraints at local junctions and the budget allocated to the project at the time of writing this document (which is £5.6m).

**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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The elderly are more likely to suffer from slight mobility impairments related to their age which do not fall within the disabled protected characteristic. These impairments are likely to include slower movement and slower reactions as well and in some cases the use of mobility aids such as sticks.</p> <p>The scheme is likely to improve conditions for all pedestrians using the street by reducing interaction over and above the current situation. This is likely to provide more, safe space for pedestrians and increase comfort when moving through or</p>

stopping at the junction. This benefit will disproportionately benefit the aged when using the streets as pedestrians.

The scheme may negatively impact the aged who feel the only way they can safely and comfortably travel is by motor vehicle or bus. The scheme is likely to restrict transport by motor vehicles and buses and require people to walk more or adjust their bus or car journey to a different route than they currently take.

Disability




Those who identify as having a disability are more likely to find difficulty in using City streets and may feel excluded at different points. There are a large range of ways in which this could happen, with examples including poor tactile facilities for people with visual impairments or a lack of dropped kerbs for people with mobility impairments.

Transport for London research indicates that 78% of Londoners with a disability walk at least once a week. The scheme will improve conditions for these people by providing greater comfort through increasing available space for pedestrians when streets are busiest. There is lift access to Bank station DLR and Waterloo and City line platforms, so as the number of accessible platforms and other stations increase, there will be an increase in the numbers of disabled passengers able to use the tube system.

The scheme may negatively impact the disabled who feel the only way they can safely and comfortably travel is by motor vehicle or bus. The scheme is likely to restrict transport by motor vehicles and buses and require people to walk more or adjust their bus or car journey to a different route than they currently take.

Gender Reassignment




Marriage and Civil Partnership




Pregnancy and Maternity




Those who are pregnant or with children are likely to have similar difficulties experienced by the aged. This will include slower movement, impaired movement and/or the requirement for additional safe and comfortable street space.

The scheme will improve conditions for this movement by providing more, comfortable space for movement during the busiest times of day. The scheme may negatively impact this group by reducing bus permeability.

The scheme may negatively impact those who are pregnant or with children who feel the only way they can safely and comfortably travel is by motor vehicle or bus. The scheme is likely to restrict transport by motor vehicles and buses and require

people to walk more or adjust their bus or car journey to a different route than they currently take.

Race	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Religion or Belief	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Sex (i.e gender)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Sexual Orientation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**4. There are no negative/adverse impact(s)**  
Please briefly explain and provide evidence to support this decision:

The scheme does not have any impact on those who have undertaken gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, race, religion, sex or orientation. This is because the changes to how the junction will operate does not interact with any of the criteria that constitute association with any of these groups.

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

Positive impacts have been captured in section 3.

<b>6. As a result of this screening, is a full EA necessary? (Please check appropriate box using <input type="checkbox"/>)</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Briefly explain your answer:</b> The scale of the changes to existing vehicle and bus routes and permeability through Bank Junction are likely to result in negative impacts to the protected characteristics set out in this document.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

**7. Name of Lead Officer:** Neil West      **Job title:** Project Manager      **Date of completion:** 03 April 2020

**Signed off by Department Director :**

**Name:**

**Date:**