

# Equality Analysis (EA)

Financial Year  
**2015/16**

## Section 1 – General Information (Aims and Objectives)

Name of the proposal including aims, objectives and purpose  
*(Please note – for the purpose of this doc, 'proposal' refers to a policy, function, strategy or project)*

See Appendix  
**A**

Current decision  
rating



### Animal Warden Services

The service deals with about 250 stray dogs requests per year and it costs about £116,000 annually. The service is proposing to maintain a £50 charge to retrieve a dog from the pound. However, an additional daily fee of £12 is being proposed as well as a charge for ancillary vet costs. £12 per night is on par with other Boroughs and private kennels. The charge is being introduced to address the real cost of keeping dogs and the associated ancillary vet costs. This will ensure costs are properly recovered and the price is still affordable for owners.

### Conclusion - To be completed at the end of the Equality Analysis process

*(the exec summary will provide an update on the findings of the EA and what outcome there has been as a result. For example, based on the findings of the EA, the proposal was rejected as the impact on a particular group was unreasonable and did not give due regard. Or, based on the EA, the proposal was amended and alternative steps taken)*

**Name:** Andrew Weaver  
(signed off by)

**Date signed off:** 17 Dec 2014  
(approved)

Service area:  
Safer Communities

Team name:  
Environmental Health and Environmental Protection

Service manager:  
Andrew Weaver

Name and role of the officer completing the EA:  
Andrew Weaver, Head of EHEP

## Section 2 – Evidence (Consideration of Data and Information)

What initial evidence do we have which may help us think about the impacts or likely impacts on service users or staff?

- The number of stray dogs that the service protected in 2014/15 (year to date), 2012/13 and 2013/14
- The number of stray dogs that were reclaimed in 2014/15 (year to date), 2012/13 and 2013/14
- The annual cost of the service.

	<b>Stray reports</b>	<b>Dogs seized</b>	<b>Dogs reclaimed</b>
<b>Year to date</b>	120	74	40
<b>2013/14</b>	232	140	51
<b>2012/13</b>	244	176	70

The charges were paid by 51 dog owners in 2013/14 and 70 in 2012/13. There will be no set limit on the number of days that stray dogs are kept in kennels. However, the service arranges rehoming of dogs that may have stayed in kennels for some time, since the longer dogs are protected, the more likely it is that owners will not show up.

The service does not collect equalities data of the owners of the reclaimed dogs that the service protected. However, based on the experience of the service, it appears that the service has been used universally, although Muslim people are less likely to own a dog.

### **Section 3 – Assessing the Impacts on the 9 Groups**

Please refer to the guidance notes below and evidence how you're proposal impact upon the nine Protected Characteristics in the table on page 3?

**For the nine protected characteristics detailed in the table below please consider:-**

- **What is the equality profile of service users or beneficiaries that will or are likely to be affected?**

Use the Council's approved diversity monitoring categories and provide data by target group of users or beneficiaries to determine whether the service user profile reflects the local population or relevant target group or if there is over or under representation of these groups

- **What qualitative or quantitative data do we have?**

List all examples of quantitative and qualitative data available  
(include information where appropriate from other directorates, Census 2001 etc)

- *Data trends – how does current practice ensure equality*

- **Equalities profile of staff?**

Indicate profile by target groups and assess relevance to policy aims and objectives e.g. Workforce to Reflect the Community. Identify staff responsible for delivering the service including where they are not directly employed by the council.

- **Barriers?**

What are the potential or known barriers to participation for the different equality target groups? Eg- communication, access, locality etc.

- **Recent consultation exercises carried out?**

Detail consultation with relevant interest groups, other public bodies, voluntary organisations, community groups, trade unions, focus groups and other groups, surveys and questionnaires undertaken etc. Focus in particular on the findings of views expressed by the equality target groups.

Such consultation exercises should be appropriate and proportionate and may range from assembling focus groups to a one to one meeting.

- **Additional factors which may influence disproportionate or adverse impact?**

Management Arrangements - How is the Service managed, are there any management arrangements which may have a disproportionate impact on the equality target groups

- **The Process of Service Delivery?**

In particular look at the arrangements for the service being provided including opening times, custom and practice, awareness of the service to local people, communication

Please also consider how the proposal will impact upon the 3 One Tower Hamlets objectives:-

- Reduce inequalities
- Ensure strong community cohesion
- Strengthen community leadership.

**Please Note -**

Reports/stats/data can be added as Appendix

<b>Target Groups</b>	<b>Impact – Positive or Adverse</b>	<b>Reason(s)</b>
	What impact will the proposal have on specific groups of service users or staff?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please add a narrative to justify your claims around impacts and,</li> <li>• Please describe the analysis and interpretation of evidence to support your conclusion as this will inform decision making</li> </ul> <p>Please also how the proposal will promote the three One Tower Hamlets objectives?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Reducing inequalities</li> <li>-Ensuring strong community cohesion</li> <li>-Strengthening community leadership</li> </ul>
Race	Neutral	This group will not be adversely affected by this proposal due to its characteristics.
Disability	Neutral	This group will not be adversely affected by this proposal due to its characteristics.
Gender	Neutral	This group will not be adversely affected by this proposal due to its characteristics directly or indirectly.
Gender Reassignment	Neutral	This group will not be adversely affected by this proposal due to its characteristics directly or indirectly.
Sexual Orientation	Neutral	This group will not be adversely affected by this proposal due to its characteristics directly or indirectly.
Religion or Belief	Neutral	This group will not be adversely affected by this proposal due to its characteristics directly or indirectly. Muslim people are less likely to be affected by this proposal, because it is said that they are less likely to own a dog.
Age	Neutral	This group will not be adversely affected by this proposal due to its characteristics directly or indirectly.
Marriage and Civil Partnerships.	Neutral	This group will not be adversely affected by this proposal due to its characteristics directly or indirectly.
Pregnancy and	Neutral	This group will not be adversely affected by this proposal due to its characteristics directly or indirectly.

Maternity		
Other Socio-economic Carers		

## Section 4 – Mitigating Impacts and Alternative Options

From the analysis and interpretation of evidence in section 2 and 3 - Is there any evidence or view that suggests that different equality or other protected groups (inc' staff) could be adversely and/or disproportionately impacted by the proposal?

**No**

If yes, please detail below how evidence influenced and formed the proposal? For example, why parts of the proposal were added / removed?

*(Please note – a key part of the EA process is to show that we have made reasonable and informed attempts to mitigate any negative impacts. An EA is a service improvement tool and as such you may wish to consider a number of alternative options or mitigation in terms of the proposal.)*

*Where you believe the proposal discriminates but not unlawfully, you must set out below your objective justification for continuing with the proposal, without mitigating action.*

## Section 5 – Quality Assurance and Monitoring

Have monitoring systems been put in place to check the implementation of the proposal and recommendations?

**Yes**

How will the monitoring systems further assess the impact on the equality target groups?

n/a

Does the policy/function comply with equalities legislation?

(Please consider the [OTH objectives](#) and [Public Sector Equality Duty](#) criteria)

**Yes**

If there are gaps in information or areas for further improvement, please list them below:

How will the results of this Equality Analysis feed into the performance planning process?

The service will continue monitoring the service take-up.

## Section 6 - Action Plan




*As a result of these conclusions and recommendations what actions (if any) **will** be included in your business planning and wider review processes (team plan)? Please consider any gaps or areas needing further attention in the table below the example.*

Recommendation	Key activity	Progress milestones including target dates for either completion or progress	Officer responsible	Progress
<p><b>Example</b></p> <p>1. Better collection of feedback, consultation and data sources</p> <p>2. Non-discriminatory behaviour</p>	<p>1. Create and use feedback forms. Consult other providers and experts</p> <p>2. Regular awareness at staff meetings. Train staff in specialist courses</p>	<p>1. Forms ready for January 2010 Start consultations Jan 2010</p> <p>2. Raise awareness at one staff meeting a month. At least 2 specialist courses to be run per year for staff.</p>	<p>1.NR &amp; PB</p> <p>2. NR</p>	

Recommendation	Key activity	Progress milestones including target dates for either completion or progress	Officer responsible	Progress

## Appendix A

### (Sample) Equality Assessment Criteria

Decision	Action	Risk
As a result of performing the analysis, it is evident that a risk of discrimination exists (direct, indirect, unintentional or otherwise) to one or more of the nine groups of people who share <i>Protected Characteristics</i> . It is recommended that the use of the policy be suspended until further work or analysis is performed.	<b>Suspend – Further Work Required</b>	Red 
As a result of performing the analysis, it is evident that a risk of discrimination exists (direct, indirect, unintentional or otherwise) to one or more of the nine groups of people who share <i>Protected Characteristics</i> . However, a genuine determining reason may exist that could legitimise or justify the use of this policy.	<b>Further (specialist) advice should be taken</b>	Red Amber 
As a result of performing the analysis, it is evident that a risk of discrimination (as described above) exists and this risk may be removed or reduced by implementing the actions detailed within the <i>Action Planning</i> section of this document.	<b>Proceed pending agreement of mitigating action</b>	Amber 
As a result of performing the analysis, 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.	<b>Proceed with implementation</b>	Green: 