

Equality & Poverty Impact Assessment 00007 (Version 1)

SECTION ONE: ESSENTIAL INFORMATION

Service & Division:	Development Services Environmental Services	Lead Officer Name:	Douglas Gardiner
		Team:	Waste Services
		Tel:	01324590437
		Email:	douglas.gardiner@falkirk.gov.uk
Proposal:	Transformation of Operational Services: Revised special uplift arrangements	Reference No:	DV03

What is the Proposal?	Budget & Other Financial Decision	Policy (New or Change)	HR Policy & Practice	Change to Service Delivery / Service Design
	Yes	No	No	Yes
Who does the Proposal affect?	Service Users	Members of the Public	Employees	Job Applicants
	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Other, please specify:				

Identify the main aims and projected outcome of this proposal (please add date of each update):	
27/02/2019	Current service arrangement of one free uplift ends. Service reverts to chargeable service for all uplifts based on fees and charges policy.

SECTION TWO: FINANCIAL INFORMATION

For budget changes ONLY please include information below:			Benchmark, e.g. Scottish Average
Current spend on this service (£'0000s)	Total:	300	Net of income
Reduction to this service budget (£'0000s)	Per Annum:	300	
Increase to this service budget (£'000s)	Per Annum:	N/A	
If this is a change to a charge or concession please complete.	Current Annual Income Total:	12	
	Expected Annual Income Total:	180	Neighbouring authorities currently charge: Clack: £37.00, Stirling currently charge £40.90
If this is a budget decision, when will the saving be achieved?	Start Date:	01/04/2019	
	End Date (if any):		

SECTION THREE: EVIDENCE Please include any evidence or relevant information that has influenced the decisions contained in this EPIA. (This could include demographic profiles; audits; research; health needs assessments; national guidance or legislative requirements and how this relates to the protected characteristic groups.)

A - Quantitative Evidence This is evidence which is numerical and should include the number people who use the service and the number of people from the protected characteristic groups who might be affected by changes to the service.

B - Qualitative Evidence This is data which describes the effect or impact of a change on a group of people, e.g. some information provided as part of performance reporting.

Social - case studies; personal / group feedback / other

Special uplift was a chargeable service in 2016/17. Data obtained during this period and used to assess impact.

Best Judgement:	
Has best judgement been used in place of data/research/evidence?	Yes
Who provided the best judgement and what was this based on?	Waste Manager and Coordinator
What gaps in data / information were identified?	
Is further research necessary?	No
If NO, please state why.	Data available from other Councils who have implemented a charge for special uplifts

SECTION FOUR: ENGAGEMENT

Engagement with individuals or organisations affected by the policy or proposal must take place

Has the proposal / policy / project been subject to engagement or consultation with service users taking into account their protected characteristics and socio-economic status?	Yes	
If YES, please state who was engagement with.	Service users via public consultation in 2018 on Council's savings options. This survey also carried out equality monitoring.	
If NO engagement has been conducted, please state why.		
How was the engagement carried out?	What were the results from the engagement? Please list...	
Focus Group	No	
Survey	Yes	36% of service users prepared to pay new or increased charge for uplifts 19% no opinion and 45% disagree sample size 1061
Display / Exhibitions	No	
User Panels	No	
Public Event	No	
Other: please specify		
Has the proposal / policy/ project been reviewed / changed as a result of the engagement?	No	
Have the results of the engagement been fed back to the consultees?	No	
Is further engagement recommended?	No	

SECTION FIVE: ASSESSING THE IMPACT

Equality Protected Characteristics: What will the impact of implementing this proposal be on people who share characteristics protected by the Equality Act 2010 or are likely to be affected by the proposal / policy / project? This section allows you to consider other impacts, e.g. poverty, health inequalities, community justice, public protection etc.

Protected Characteristic	Neutral Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	Please provide evidence of the impact on this protected characteristic.
Age				
Disability				
Sex				
Ethnicity				
Religion / Belief / non-Belief				
Sexual Orientation				
Transgender				
Pregnancy / Maternity				
Marriage / Civil Partnership				
Poverty			✓	Uplifts services still available by ourselves (although would be chargeable on cost recovery basis), private companies provide collections and reuse charities collect items free of charge. HWRC also accept materials free of charge.
Other, health, community justice, public protection etc.				
Risk (Identify other risks associated with this change)				

Public Sector Equality Duty: Scottish Public Authorities must have 'due regard' to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, advance quality of opportunity and foster good relations. Scottish specific duties include:

	Evidence of Due Regard
Eliminate Unlawful Discrimination (harassment, victimisation and other prohibited conduct):	
Advance Equality of Opportunity:	
Foster Good Relations (promoting understanding and reducing prejudice):	

SECTION SIX: PARTNERS / OTHER STAKEHOLDERS

Which sectors are likely to have an interest in or be affected by the proposal / policy / project?		Describe the interest / affect.
Business	Yes	Business may see opportunity in collecting items in place of Council
Councils	No	
Education Sector	No	
Fire	No	
NHS	No	
Integration Joint Board	No	
Police	No	
Third Sector	Yes	Third sector providers do collect some of the materials that the public want uplifting usually free of charge
Other(s): please list and describe the nature of the relationship / impact.		

SECTION SEVEN: ACTION PLANNING

Mitigating Actions: If you have identified impacts on protected characteristic groups in Section 5 please summarise these in the table below detailing the actions you are taking to mitigate or support this impact. If you are not taking any action to support or mitigate the impact you should complete the No Mitigating Actions section below instead.

Identified Impact	To Who	Action(s)	Lead Officer	Evaluation and Review Date	Strategic Reference to Corporate Plan / Service Plan / Quality Outcomes
Cost of service	Lower income groups	Private sector alternative available. Promotion of reuse schemes were charities provide uplift free of charge. HWRC accept material free of charge.	Douglas Gardiner	01/04/2019	

No Mitigating Actions

Please explain why you do not need to take any action to mitigate or support the impact of your proposals.

Are actions being reported to Members?	Yes
If yes when and how ?	At full Council at meeting in February 2019

SECTION EIGHT: ASSESSMENT OUTCOME

Only one of following statements best matches your assessment of this proposal / policy / project. Please select one and provide your reasons.

No major change required	No	
The proposal has to be adjusted to reduce impact on protected characteristic groups	No	
Continue with the proposal but it is not possible to remove all the risk to protected characteristic groups	Yes	Risk still exists for those on lower income not to be able to access service although there may be private sector/ third sector (free of charge collection) alternatives.
Stop the proposal as it is potentially in breach of equality legislation	No	

SECTION NINE: LEAD OFFICER SIGN OFF

Lead Officer:

Signature:	<i>Carl Bullough</i>	Date:	07/01/2019
------------	----------------------	-------	------------

SECTION TEN: EPIA TASK GROUP ONLY

OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF EPIA:	Has the EPIA demonstrated the use of data, appropriate engagement, identified mitigating actions as well as ownership and appropriate review of actions to confidently demonstrate compliance with the general and public sector equality duties?	Yes
------------------------------------	--	-----

ASSESSMENT FINDINGS	The lead officer has used evidence from other Councils. The public consultation showed a mixed response to the proposal.	
If YES, use this box to highlight evidence in support of the assessment of the EPIA		
If NO, use this box to highlight actions needed to improve the EPIA		

Where adverse impact on diverse communities has been identified and it is intended to continue with the proposal / policy / project, has justification for continuing <u>without making changes been made</u>?	Yes	If YES, please describe: The status of service users in terms of protected characteristics is not known. The assessment recognises that people in poverty, who require this service, may be disproportionately impacted. Justification for continuing is based on the mitigating factor that alternatives are available including reuse schemes were charities provide uplift free of charge.
---	-----	--

LEVEL OF IMPACT: The EPIA Task Group has agreed the following level of impact on the protected characteristic groups highlighted within the EPIA

LEVEL		COMMENTS
HIGH	Yes / No	
MEDIUM	Yes / No	
LOW	Yes	

SECTION ELEVEN: CHIEF OFFICER SIGN OFF

Director / Head of Service:			
Signature:	<i>Rhona Geisler</i>	Date:	05/02/2019