

# EQUALITY ANALYSIS (EA) TEMPLATE

Decision

Date

## What is the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED)? [Double click here for more information / Hide](#)

**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?

- 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.

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.

Case law has established the following principles apply to the PSED:

- **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 not only applied when a policy is developed and decided upon, but also when it is implemented and reviewed.

## What is an Equality Analysis (EA)?

[Double click here for more information / Hide](#)

An equality analysis is a risk assessment tool that examines whether different groups of people are, or could be, disadvantaged by service provision and decisions made. It involves using equality information, and the results of any engagement or consultation with particular reference to the protected characteristics to understand the actual effect or the potential impact of policy and decision making decisions taken.

**The equality analysis should be conducted at the outset of a project and should inform policy formulation/proposals. It cannot be left until the end of the process.**

**The purpose of the equality analysis process is to:**

- Identify unintended consequences and mitigate against them as far as possible, and
- Actively consider ways to advance equality and foster good relations.

**The objectives of the equality analysis are to:**

- Identify opportunities for action to be taken to advance equality of opportunity in the widest sense;
- Try and anticipate the requirements of all service users potentially impacted;
- Find out whether or not proposals can or do have any negative impact on any particular group or community and to find ways to avoid or minimise them;
- Integrate equality diversity and inclusion considerations into the everyday business and enhance service planning;
- Improve the reputation of the City Corporation as an organisation that listens to all of its communities;
- Encourage greater openness and public involvement.

**However there is no requirement to:**

- Produce an 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.

An equality analysis should indicate improvements in the way policy and services are formulated. Even modest changes that lead to service improvements are important. If it is not possible to mitigate against any identified negative impact, then clear justification should be provided for this.

By undertaking an equality analysis officers will be able to:

- Explore the potential impact of proposals before implementation and improve them by eliminating any adverse effects and increasing the positive effects for equality groups
- Contribute to community cohesion by identifying opportunities to foster good relations between different groups
- Target resources more effectively
- Identify direct or indirect discrimination in current policies and services and improve them by removing or reducing barriers to equality

## How to demonstrate compliance

[Double click here for more information / Hide](#)

**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

In addition to the protected groups, it may be relevant to consider the impact of a policy, decision or service on other disadvantaged groups that do not readily fall within the protected characteristics, such as children in care, people who are affected by socio-economic disadvantage or who experience significant exclusion or isolation because of poverty or income, education, locality, social class or poor health, ex-offenders, asylum seekers, people who are unemployed, homeless or on a low income.

Complying with the Equality Duty may involve treating some people better than others, as far as this is allowed by discrimination law. For example, it may involve making use of an exception or the positive action provisions in order to provide a service in a way which is appropriate for people who share a protected characteristic – such as providing computer training to older people to help them access information and services.

**Taking account of disabled people's disabilities**

The Equality Duty also explicitly recognises that disabled people's needs may be different from those of non-disabled people. Public bodies should therefore take account of disabled people's impairments when making decisions about policies or services. This might mean making reasonable adjustments or treating disabled people better than non-disabled people in order to meet their needs.

**Deciding what needs to be assessed** [Double click here for more information / Hide](#)

The following questions can help determine relevance to equality:

- Does the policy affect service users, employees or the wider community, including City businesses?
- How many people are affected and how significant is the impact on them?
- Is it likely to affect people with particular protected characteristics differently?
- Is it a major policy, significantly affecting how functions are delivered?
- Will the policy have a significant impact on how other organisations operate in terms of equality?
- Does the policy relate to functions that engagement has identified as being important to people with particular protected characteristics?
- Does the policy relate to an area with known inequalities?
- Does the policy relate to any equality objectives that have been set?

Consider:

- How the aims of the policy relate to equality.
- Which aspects of the policy are most relevant to equality?
- Aims of the general equality duty and which protected characteristics the policy is most relevant to

If it is not clear if a policy or decision needs to be assessed through an equality analysis, a Test of Relevance screening tool has been designed to assist officers in determining whether or not a policy or decision will benefit from a full equality analysis.

Completing the Test of Relevance screening also provides a formal record of decision making and reasoning. It should be noted that the PSED continues up to and after the final decision is taken and so any Test of Relevance and/or full Equality Analysis should be reviewed and evidenced again if there is a change in strategy or decision.

### Role of the assessor [Double click here for more information / Hide](#)

An assessor's role is to make sure that an appropriate analysis is undertaken. This can be achieved by making sure that the analysis is documented by focussing on identifying the real impact of a decision and set out any mitigation or improvements that can be delivered where necessary.

#### Who else is involved?

Chief Officers are responsible for overseeing the equality analysis process within departments to ensure that equality analysis exercises are conducted according to the agreed format and to a consistent standard. Departmental equality representatives are key people to consult when undertaking an equality analysis.

Depending on the subject it may be helpful and easier to involve others. Input from another service area or from a related area might bring a fresh perspective and challenge aspects differently.

In addition, those working in the customer facing roles will have a particularly helpful perspective. Some proposals will be cross-departmental and need a joint approach to the equality analysis.

### How to carry out an Equality Analysis (EA) [Double click here for more information / Hide](#)

There are five stages to completing an Equality Analysis, which are outlined in detail in the Equality Analysis toolkit and flowchart:

**2.1 Completing the information gathering and research stage** - gather as much relevant equality-related information, data or research as possible in relation to the policy or proposal, including any engagement or consultation with those affected;

**2.2 Analyse the evidence** - make an assessment of the impact or effects on different equality groups;

**2.3 – Developing an action plan** – set out the action you will take to improve the positive impact and / or the mitigation action needed to eliminate or reduce any adverse impact that you have identified;

**2.4 Director approval and sign off of the equality analysis** - include the findings from the EA in your report or add as an appendix including the action plan;

**2.5. Monitor and review** – monitor the delivery of the action plan & ensure that changes arising from the assessment are implemented.

## The Proposal *Click and hover over the questions to find more details on what is required*

**Assessor name:** Ali Burlington

**Contact details:** ali.burlington@cityoflondon.gov.uk

### 1. What is the Proposal?

Prevent and Channel Policy and Guidance for all stakeholders within the City of London.

### 2. What are the recommendations?

Guidance for partners duties under the Prevent agenda.

Details for the Channel referral process/ making a referral to channel.

The threshold for channel referrals, focusing on a vulnerability assessment framework.

Promoting information sharing and recording.

Ensure staff and partners receive regular Prevent training.

### 3. Who is affected by the Proposal? *Identify the main groups most likely to be directly or indirectly affected by the recommendations.*

Stakeholders and communities within the square mile

## Age *Double click here to add impact / Hide*

Check box if NOT applicable ☐

#### Key borough statistics:

The City has proportionately more people aged between 25 and 69 living in the Square Mile than Greater London. Conversely there are fewer young people. Approximately 955 children and young people under the age of 18 years live in the City. This is 11.8% of the total population in the area. Summaries of the City of London [age profiles from the 2011 Census can be found on our website](#)

A number of demographics and projections for demographics can be found on the [Greater London Authority website in the London DataStore](#). The site details statistics for the City of London and other London authorities at a ward level:

- [Population projections](#)

NB: These statistics provide general data for these protected characteristics. You need to ensure you have sufficient data about those affected by the proposals – see below under “additional equalities data”.

*Double click here to show borough wide statistics / hide statistics*

## Age

### Additional Equalities Data (Service level or Corporate) *Include data analysis of the impact of the proposals*

Home Office - Individuals referred to and supported through the Prevent Programme, April 2019 to March 2020

Total number of National Prevent referrals – 6,287

**Age**

Age	Prevent referrals	Discussed at Channel Panel	Adopted as a Channel Case
Under 15	1559	354	178
15-20	1864	435	224
21-30	1104	258	131
31-40	869	183	77
41-50	475	97	44
51-60	290	79	38
61+	97	18	5
Unknown	29	0	0

HM Government Prevent Strategy 2011: Equality Impact Assessment.

*Online consultation – responses to specific EIA questions*

*When respondents were asked whether the strategy would have a negative impact on age, the majority of respondents (77%) answered no - it would not have a negative impact on age. When asked whether the proposed strategy would have a positive impact on age, the majority (77%) again answered no – that the strategy would not have a positive impact either.*

*The prevailing sentiment amongst those who explained their initial response was that the young are most affected by Prevent. The effect is considered to be both negative and positive. Those who felt that the previous Prevent strategy had had a negative impact stated that the young had been stigmatised and presumptions had been made because of their age. More positively, others felt that the young are being targeted by radicalisers and will suffer most if Prevent does not focus on them. It was noted that the proposed strategy could promote active engagement and raise awareness of the risks. Indeed, several respondents felt it important to target the young to produce balanced and empowered individuals who could better challenge terrorist ideology in the future. Some went further to state that focusing on the young could help raise their aspirations and help them to make positive career choices. It is important to note that whilst many references are made to the 'young', very few respondents actually qualified it with a specific age group. Where respondents did offer a definition of 'young', the range tended to be from 11 to 35 years old. A number of respondents also expressed concern that Prevent should be age neutral; arguing that Prevent should apply to all age groups as there is no single profile.*

For full details, please see here - [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/97979/prevent-review-eia.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/97979/prevent-review-eia.pdf)

**What is the proposal's impact on the equalities aims?** Look for **direct impact** but also evidence of **disproportionate impact** i.e. where a decision affects a protected group more than the general population, including **indirect impact**

The City of London has fewer people aged under 25. This is the age category which most referrals fall under nationally.

**What actions can be taken to avoid or mitigate any negative impact or to better advance equality and foster good relations?**

Increased training and support for the education sector including higher and further education providers.

Increase training with commissioned services and internal departments who work with the elder population to ensure this isn't an area where referrals are being missed.

Promote prevent messages within schools.

Age

**Disability** [Double click here to add impact / Hide](#)[Check box if NOT applicable](#) ☐**Key borough statistics:**

Day-to-day activities can be limited by disability or long term illness - In the City of London as a whole, 89% of the residents feel they have no limitations in their activities – this is higher than both in England and Wales (82%) and Greater London (86%). In the areas outside the main housing estates, around 95% of the residents responded that their activities were not limited. Extract from summary of the [2011 Census relating to resident population health for the City of London can be found on our website](#).

The 2011 Census identified that for the City of London's population:

- 4.4% (328) had a disability that limited their day-to-day activities a lot
- 7.1% (520) had a disability that limited their day-to-day activities a little.

Source: 2011 Census: [Long-term health problem or disability, local authorities in England and Wales](#)

NB: These statistics provide general data for these protected characteristics. You need to ensure you have sufficient data about those affected by the proposals – see below under “additional equalities data”.

[Double click here to show borough wide statistics / hide statistics](#)

**Disability**

**Additional Equalities Data (Service level or Corporate)** *Include data analysis of the impact of the proposals*

HM Government, Prevent Strategy 2011: Equality Impact Assessment

*‘The overwhelming majority of respondents did not perceive there to be a negative (96%) or a positive (85%) impact on the proposed strategy in terms of disability.’*

For full details, please see here - [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/97979/prevent-review-eia.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/97979/prevent-review-eia.pdf)

**What is the proposal's impact on the equalities aims?** *Look for **direct impact** but also evidence of **disproportionate impact** i.e. where a decision affects a protected group more than the general population, including **indirect impact***

None identified.

**What actions can be taken to avoid or mitigate any negative impact or to better advance equality and foster good relations?**

Ensure partners identify the appropriate level of support to an individual who may be referred if they have a disability. Ensure the relevant social care team are involved.



**Pregnancy and Maternity** Double click here to add impact / HideCheck box if NOT applicable ☒**Key borough statistics:**

Under the theme of population, the [ONS website](#) has a large number of data collections grouped under:

- [Conception and Fertility Rates](#)
- [Live Births and Still Births](#)
- [Maternities](#)

NB: These statistics provide general data for these protected characteristics. You need to ensure you have sufficient data about those affected by the proposals – see below under “additional equalities data”.

[Double click here to show borough wide statistics / hide statistics](#)

**Pregnancy and Maternity**

HM Government, Prevent Strategy 2011: Equality Impact Assessment:

*‘The vast majority of online respondents did not deem there to be either a negative (97%) or positive (91%) impact of the strategy in terms of pregnancy and maternity.’*

For full details, please see here - [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/97979/prevent-review-eia.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/97979/prevent-review-eia.pdf)

**What is the proposal’s impact on the equalities aims?** Look for **direct impact** but also evidence of **disproportionate impact** i.e. where a decision affects a protected group more than the general population, including **indirect impact**

None identified.

**What actions can be taken to avoid or mitigate any negative impact or to better advance equality and foster good relations?**

None identified.

**Race** Double click here to add impact / HideCheck box if NOT applicable ☐**Key Borough Statistics:**

Our resident population is predominantly white. The largest minority ethnic groups of children and young people in the area are Asian/Bangladeshi and Mixed – Asian and White. The City has a relatively small Black population, less than London and England and Wales. Children and young people from minority ethnic groups account for 41.71% of all children living in the area, compared with 21.11% nationally. White British residents comprise 57.5% of the total population, followed by White – Other at 19%.

The second largest ethnic group in the resident population is Asian, which totals 12.7% - this group is fairly evenly divided between Asian/Indian at 2.9%; Asian/Bangladeshi at 3.1%; Asian/Chinese at 3.6% and Asian/Other at 2.9%. The City of London has the highest percentage of Chinese people of any local authority in London and the second highest percentage in England and Wales. The City of London has a relatively small Black population comprising 2.6% of residents. This is considerably lower than the Greater London wide percentage of 13.3% and also smaller than the percentage for England and Wales of 3.3%.

[See ONS Census information](#) or [Greater London Authority projections](#)

NB: These statistics provide general data for these protected characteristics. You need to ensure you have sufficient data about those affected by the proposals – see below

[Double click here to show borough wide statistics / hide statistics](#)

**Race**

**Additional Equalities Data (Service level or Corporate)** Include data analysis of the impact of the proposals



## Race

HM Government, Prevent Strategy 2011: Equality Impact Assessment.

*'When respondents were asked whether the proposed strategy would have a negative impact on race, the majority of respondents (55%) answered no - it would not have a negative impact on race.*

*When asked whether the strategy would have a positive impact on race, the majority (63%) again answered no – that the strategy would not have a positive impact either.'*

For full details please see here - [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/97979/prevent-review-eia.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/97979/prevent-review-eia.pdf)

**What is the proposal's impact on the equalities aims?** Look for **direct impact** but also evidence of **disproportionate impact** i.e. where a decision affects a protected group more than the general population, including **indirect impact**

The impact of racism and the rise in far-right groups in the UK this potentially has an impact for the City of London.

There is a geographical biased to north and west of the city with regards to ethnic groups.

**What actions can be taken to avoid or mitigate any negative impact or to better advance equality and foster good relations?**

Utilise resources and colleagues who engage with various communities e.g. Bengali Support worker to promote community cohesion and the Prevent agenda.  
Provide training and updates for partners so they are aware of emerging trends such as the rise in far-right groups.  
Ensure engagement with the identified geographic areas where diverse communities live.

## Religion or Belief [Double click here to add impact / Hide](#)

Check box if NOT applicable ☐

### Key borough statistics – sources include:

The ONS website has a number of data collections on [religion and belief](#), grouped under the theme of religion and identity.

[Religion in England and Wales provides a summary of the Census 2011 by ward level](#)

NB: These statistics provide general data for these protected characteristics. You need to ensure you have sufficient data about those affected by the proposals – see below under “additional equalities data”.

[Double click here to show borough wide statistics / hide statistics](#)

## Religion or Belief

**Additional Equalities Data (Service level or Corporate)** Include data analysis of the impact of the proposals

HM Government, Prevent Strategy 2011: Equality Impact Assessment.

### Religion and belief

*When respondents were asked whether the proposed strategy would have a negative impact on religion/belief, the majority of respondents (59%) answered yes – the strategy would have a negative impact on religion/belief. This category is the strongest area whereby online respondents envisaged a negative impact of the strategy.*

*When asked whether the proposed strategy would have a positive impact on religion/belief, the majority (57%) answered no – the strategy would not have a positive impact on religion/belief. The main theme dominating the online comments in terms of perceived negative impact of the Prevent strategy on race/religion/belief, was that*

## Religion or Belief

*the previous Prevent strategy was too Islam focused and only aimed at Muslims. Respondents felt strongly that the focus on Al Qa'ida-influenced terrorism had led to the stigmatising and stereotyping of Muslims, especially those of South Asian (e.g Pakistani), Middle Eastern and African descent*

*A small number of respondents also commented that the previous strategy had provided further fuel to extreme-right wing groups to marginalise Muslims in the UK. Some respondents felt that there should be a clearer methodology for assessing risk which should be known nationally. A small number of respondents also stated that lessons should be learned from the previous strategy in terms of language and terminology. Also that the new strategy should be mindful of stereotyping Muslims. More positively, a number of online respondents felt that an effective strategy which encouraged dialogue and joint activity between all communities would have a beneficial impact on integration and race relations as it would aid understanding of not only the problem but also of different cultures.*

*Online consultation – responses to wider Prevent review questions A number of responses from the wider online consultation process also referred to a disproportionate impact on religion in terms of a perceived stigmatisation of Muslims under the previous Prevent strategy. It was felt that expanding the strategy to address a wider range of threats (e.g. terrorism by the extreme right wing or other ethnic or religious organisations) would help to mitigate this issue. However, there was a minority who argued that, as a counter-terrorism strategy, Prevent should focus exclusively on the greatest threat and not divert scarce resources to tackle other threats.*

### Consultation events

*A minority of participants from the consultation events also referenced an impact on religion/belief in relation to a perceived stigmatisation of Muslims. Expanding the strategy to address a wider range of threats and also a stronger communication strategy were cited as areas which could mitigate such negative impact.*

### Focus groups

*The majority of Muslim respondents within the focus group sessions expressed concern that a strategy which focused solely on Al Qa'ida-inspired terrorism would have a negative impact on individuals of the Muslim faith. This was set out in terms of negative stereotyping of Muslims and Muslim communities and resentment from wider society regarding preferential treatment e.g. in relation to resources. These concerns were also noted by approximately one third of the non-Muslim sample*

### Prevent review (electronic) mailbox

*Responses received via the Prevent review electronic mailbox further highlighted concerns regarding the stigmatisation of Muslim communities and a perceived lack of transparency in allocating public resources. It was felt that these factors had served to undermine community cohesion in some parts of the country and fuel anti-Muslim sentiments.*

For full details, please see here - [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/97979/prevent-review-eia.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/97979/prevent-review-eia.pdf)

**What is the proposal's impact on the equalities aims? Look for *direct impact* but also evidence of *disproportionate impact* i.e. where a decision affects a protected group more than the general population, including *indirect impact***

There is a geographical bias to north and west of the city with regards to residents with Islamic beliefs.

The impact of the rise in far-right groups in the UK this potentially has an impact for the City of London.

**What actions can be taken to avoid or mitigate any negative impact or to better advance equality and foster good relations?**

Increased engagement and community building for our Islamic communities and other faith networks.

Utilise resources and colleagues who engage with various communities e.g. Bengali Support worker to promote community cohesion and the Prevent agenda.

Provide training and updates for partners so they are aware of emerging trends such

## Religion or Belief

as the rise in far-right groups.  
Ensure engagement with the identified geographic areas where diverse communities live.

**Sex** Double click here to add impact / Hide

Check box if NOT applicable ☐

**Key borough statistics:**

At the time of the [2011 Census the usual resident population of the City of London](#) could be broken up into:

- 4,091 males (55.5%)
- 3,284 females (44.5%)

A number of demographics and projections for demographics can be found on the [Greater London Authority website in the London DataStore](#). The site details statistics for the City of London and other London authorities at a ward level:

- [Population projections](#)

NB: These statistics provide general data for these protected characteristics. You need to ensure you have sufficient data about those affected by the proposals – see below under “additional equalities data”.

Double click here to show borough wide statistics / hide statistics

## Sex

**Additional Equalities Data (Service level or Corporate)** *Include data analysis of the impact of the proposals*

Home Office - Individuals referred to and supported through the Prevent Programme, April 2019 to March 2020

Nationally a higher number of males were referred into Prevent – 5,514 males compared to 754 females, 19 other.

Nationally a higher number of males were discussed at Channel Panel – 1,273 compared to 148 females, 3 other.

Nationally a higher number of males were adopted as a Channel Case – 625 males, compared to 70 female, 2 other.

HM Government Prevent Strategy 2011: Equality Impact Assessment

*When respondents were asked whether the strategy would have a negative impact on gender, the majority of respondents (78%) answered no - it would not have a negative impact on gender. When asked whether the proposed strategy would have a positive impact on gender, the majority (77%) again answered no – that the strategy would not have a positive impact either.*

*However, where respondents explained their initial response, it was overwhelmingly felt that men would be most negatively impacted by the Prevent strategy on the basis that they are perceived to be at greatest risk of radicalisation. Arguably this had resulted in them feeling stereotyped and targeted (e.g. under “stop-and-search” counter-terrorism powers). A smaller group felt that women have been negatively impacted by virtue of perceptions (underlying in the strategy) of male dominance and more should be done to redress the balance. However, there was also the view that it is difficult to reach into some groups without encountering gender issues. For example, Prevent aimed at women could be seen as an attempt to undermine traditional relationships between genders within certain cultures. Conversely, some respondents felt that Prevent had had a positive impact on women. Some perceived that women are not treated equally within some groups and Prevent had the potential to remove the constraints that block their participation in the agenda, by empowering them to tackle intolerance and play a more active role in society.*

## Sex

For full details, please see here - [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/97979/prevent-review-eia.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/97979/prevent-review-eia.pdf)

**What is the proposal's impact on the equalities aims?** Look for **direct impact** but also evidence of **disproportionate impact** i.e. where a decision affects a protected group more than the general population, including **indirect impact**

The Cities population is relatively equal with regards to male and females.

**What actions can be taken to avoid or mitigate any negative impact or to better advance equality and foster good relations?**

Ensure training encompasses the equal risk to both male, females and others.

## Sexual Orientation and Gender Reassignment [Double click here to add impact / Hide](#)

[Check box if NOT applicable](#) ☒

### Key borough statistics – suggested sources include:

- [Sexual Identity in the UK – ONS 2014](#)
- [Measuring Sexual Identity – ONS](#)

NB: These statistics provide general data for these protected characteristics. You need to ensure you have sufficient data about those affected by the proposals – see below under “additional equalities data”.

[Double click here to show borough wide statistics / hide statistics](#)

## Sexual Orientation and Gender Reassignment

**Additional Equalities Data (Service level or Corporate)** Include data analysis of the impact of the proposals

HM Government, Prevent Strategy 2011: Equality Impact Assessment

*‘The overwhelming majority of respondents participating in the online EIA consultation process did not perceive there to be a negative (95%) or a positive (86%) impact of the strategy in terms of gender reassignment.’*

For full details, please see here: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/97979/prevent-review-eia.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/97979/prevent-review-eia.pdf)

**What is the proposal's impact on the equalities aims?** Look for **direct impact** but also evidence of **disproportionate impact** i.e. where a decision affects a protected group more than the general population, including **indirect impact**

None identified.

**What actions can be taken to avoid or mitigate any negative impact or to better advance equality and foster good relations?**

None identified.

## Marriage and Civil Partnership [Double click here to add impact / Hide](#)

[Check box if NOT applicable](#) ☒

### Key borough statistics - sources include:

- [The 2011 Census contain data broken up by local authority on marital and civil partnership status](#)

NB: These statistics provide general data for these protected characteristics. You need to ensure you have sufficient data about those affected by the proposals – see below under “additional equalities data”.

[Double click here to show borough wide statistics / hide statistics](#)

## Marriage and Civil Partnership

**Additional Equalities Data (Service level or Corporate)** *Include data analysis of the impact of the proposals*

HM Government, Prevent Strategy 2011: Equality Impact Assessment

*'The majority of respondents did not envisage there to be either a negative (96%) or positive (87%) impact of the strategy in terms of marriage and civil partnership. A small number stated the strategy could have a positive impact on integration if it was inclusive of all communities and addressed a wider range of threats.'*

For full details, please see here: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/97979/prevent-review-eia.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/97979/prevent-review-eia.pdf)

**What is the proposal's impact on the equalities aims?** *Look for **direct impact** but also evidence of **disproportionate impact** i.e. where a decision affects a protected group more than the general population, including **indirect impact***

None identified.

**What actions can be taken to avoid or mitigate any negative impact or to better advance equality and foster good relations?**

None identified.

## Additional Impacts on Advancing Equality & Fostering Good Relations [Double click here to add impact / Hide](#)

[Check box if NOT applicable](#) ☒

This section seeks to identify what additional steps can be taken to promote these aims or to mitigate any adverse impact. Analysis should be based on the data you have collected above for the protected characteristics covered by these aims. In addition to the sources of information highlighted above – you may also want to consider using:

- Equality monitoring data in relation to take-up and satisfaction of the service

- Equality related employment data where relevant
- Generic or targeted consultation results or research that is available locally, London-wide or nationally
- Complaints and feedback from different groups.

[Double click here to show borough wide statistics / hide statistics](#)

## Additional Impacts on Advancing Equality & Fostering Good Relations

**Additional Equalities Data (Service level or Corporate)**

N/A

**Are there any additional benefits or risks of the proposals on advancing equality and fostering good relations not considered above?**

N/A

**What actions can be taken to avoid or mitigate any negative impact on advancing equality or fostering good relations not considered above?** Provide details of how effective the mitigation will be and how it will be monitored.

N/A

## Conclusion and Reporting Guidance

*Set out your conclusions below using the EA of the protected characteristics and submit to your Director for approval.*

*If you have identified any negative impacts, please attach your action plan to the EA which addresses any negative impacts identified when submitting for approval.*

*If you have identified any positive impacts for any equality groups, please explain how these are in line with the equality aims.*

*Review your EA and action plan as necessary through the development and at the end of your proposal/project and beyond.*

*Retain your EA as it may be requested by Members or as an FOI request. As a minimum, refer to any completed EA in background papers on reports, but also include any appropriate references to the EA in the body of the report or as an appendix.*

### **This analysis has concluded that...**

This policy has considered all aspects of equality and ensures that training provided to partners around Prevent is inclusive. Prevent training details both the threat from international terrorism and extreme far right, as well as the fact that radicalisation does not discriminate and there is not clear single profile of someone acceptable to engaging in terrorist activity. The main aim of concerns and the threshold of channel or prevent referrals centres around a person or groups vulnerabilities. Following from the policy, an action plan will be developed with community safety partners to ensure all aspects of equality are considered and we can work to support our communities as a whole.

### **Outcome of analysis** - check the one that applies

#### ☐ **Outcome 1**

No change required where the assessment has not identified any potential for discrimination or adverse impact and all opportunities to advance equality have been taken.

#### ☒ **Outcome 2**

Adjustments to remove barriers identified by the assessment or to better advance equality. Are you satisfied that the proposed adjustments will remove the barriers identified?

#### ☐ **Outcome 3**

Continue despite having identified some potential adverse impacts or missed opportunities to advance equality. In this case, the justification should be included in the assessment and should in line with the duty have 'due regard'. For the most important relevant policies, compelling reasons will be needed. You should consider whether there are sufficient plans to reduce the negative impact and/or plans to monitor the actual impact.

#### ☐ **Outcome 4**

Stop and rethink when an assessment shows actual or potential unlawful discrimination.

**Signed off by Director:**

**Name:**

**Date:**