

## EQUALITY ANALYSIS QUALITY ASSURANCE CHECKLIST

<b>Name of 'proposal' and how has it been implemented</b> (proposal can be a policy, service, function, strategy, project, procedure, restructure/savings proposal)	<b>New Civic Centre Whitechapel – Procurement Proposal and Programme</b>
<b>Directorate / Service</b>	<b>Corporate Property and Capital Delivery</b>
<b>Lead Officer</b>	<b>Ann Sutcliffe</b>
<b>Signed Off By (inc date)</b>	
<b>Summary – to be completed at the end of completing the QA (using Appendix A)</b> (Please provide a summary of the findings of the Quality Assurance checklist. What has happened as a result of the QA? For example, based on the QA a Full EA will be undertaken or, based on the QA a Full EA will not be undertaken as due regard to the nine protected groups is embedded in the proposal and the proposal has low relevance to equalities)	<p><b>Example</b></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Proceed with implementation</b></p> <p>Based on the findings of the QA checklist it is clear that the proposal does give regard, in line with the Public Sector Equality Duty (part of the Equality Act 2010). It is evident that although through packaging the development and disposals smaller more local and potentially BME developers may be disadvantaged in being procured, a larger developer is a key requirement to carry the larger financial risks associated with the project. Furthermore there is scope to involve smaller more local businesses through the wider procurement process throughout the supply chain.</p>

Stage	Checklist Area / Question	Yes / No / Unsure	Comment (If the answer is no/unsure, please ask the question to the SPP Service Manager or nominated equality lead to clarify)
<b>1</b>	<b>Overview of Proposal</b>		

a	Are the outcomes of the proposals clear?	Y	To proceed with packaged development and disposals delivery using a suitable and procurement compliant developer framework which delivers additional housing and is cost/time efficient while reducing programme risk to the Council
b	Is it clear who will be or is likely to be affected by what is being proposed (inc service users and staff)? Is there information about the equality profile of those affected?	Y	Due to the large scale of the packaged project, this approach is likely to ensure that the majority of developers suitable for selection are of significant size. While not impacting upon any equalities profile in particular, this is more likely to disfavour smaller developers, some of which may be more likely to be BME in composition. While there may be a disadvantage to smaller organisations successfully bidding, the procurement compliant developer framework used should provide opportunity for smaller organisations being considered and awarded contract further down the supply chain in addition to local employment and procurement opportunities, work experience placements, mentoring for businesses or entrepreneurs, apprenticeships. Additionally bids from consortia of smaller businesses could also be encouraged
<b>2</b> <b>Monitoring / Collecting Evidence / Data and Consultation</b>			
a	Is there reliable qualitative and quantitative data to support claims made about impacts?	Y	Experience and soft market testing supported the view that larger developers are likely to bid and turnover limits will inevitably do this. However soft market testing also supported the view that consortia bids are likely to come forward which will enable smaller developers to bid.
b	Is there sufficient evidence of local/regional/national research that can inform the analysis? Has a reasonable attempt been made to ensure relevant knowledge and expertise (people, teams and partners) have been involved in the analysis?	Y	As above Yes equalities checklist has been completed in partnership with originating service as well as Directorate SPP Lead
c	Is there clear evidence of consultation with stakeholders and users from groups affected by the proposal?	Y	Yes soft market testing has been undertaken to better gauge those developers likely to come forward. The selected procurement compliant developer framework should provide opportunity for smaller, potentially BME organisations to be

			considered and awarded contract further down the supply chain in addition to local employment and procurement opportunities, work experience placements, mentoring for businesses or entrepreneurs, apprenticeships
<b>3</b>	<b>Assessing Impact and Analysis</b>		
a	Are there clear links between the sources of evidence (information, data etc) and the interpretation of impact amongst the nine protected characteristics?	N	It is likely that smaller developers may not be favoured by the chosen approach which while not directly impacting upon any protected characteristic, may impact upon BME developers, many of whom may be smaller in size.
b	Is there a clear understanding of the way in which proposals applied in the same way can have unequal impact on different groups?	Y	Due to the scale and size of the programme, even if programme of delivery of broken down into discrete elements, larger organisations would be favoured to ensure successful bidders would be favoured to carry time and financial risks.
<b>4</b>	<b>Mitigation and Improvement Action Plan</b>		
a	Is there an agreed action plan?		Yes
b	Have alternative options been explored		Yes alternative options have been included within the cabinet report, due to the size and scale of the project, even if programme of delivery of broken down into discrete elements, larger organisations would be favoured to ensure successful bidders would be favoured to carry time and financial risks.
<b>5</b>	<b>Quality Assurance and Monitoring</b>		
a	Are there arrangements in place to review or audit the implementation of the proposal?		Yes - the procurement compliant developer framework should provide scope to monitor procurement opportunities for smaller organisations particularly those that are BME.
b	Is it clear how the progress will be monitored to track impact across the protected characteristics??		Yes through contract monitoring.
<b>6</b>	<b>Reporting Outcomes and Action Plan</b>		
a	Does the executive summary contain sufficient information on the key findings arising from the assessment?		Yes

## Appendix A

### (Sample) Equality Assessment Criteria

Decision	Action	Risk
As a result of performing the QA checklist, the policy, project or function does not appear to have any adverse effects on people who share <i>Protected Characteristics</i> and no further actions are recommended at this stage.	Proceed with implementation	Green: 