

EQUALITY ANALYSIS QUALITY ASSURANCE CHECKLIST

Name of 'proposal' and how has it been implemented (proposal can be a policy, service, function, strategy, project, procedure, restructure/savings proposal)	Revision to Allocations Scheme's "autobid" process – removing the blanket 2-year blanket autobid potential in favour of employing only if households have not gainfully employed their earned chronological priority by bidding for what they can reasonably expect to be offered.
Directorate / Service	Development & Renewal
Lead Officer	Rafiqul Hoque, Service Manager - Lettings
Signed Off By (inc date)	Colin Cormack, Service Head – Housing Options January 2015
Summary – to be completed at the end of completing the QA (using Appendix A)	<div data-bbox="1115 730 1189 810" style="display: inline-block; width: 20px; height: 20px; background-color: green; margin-right: 10px;"></div> Proceed with implementation Based on the findings of the QA checklist it is clear that the proposal does give due regard, in line with the Public Sector Equality Duty (part of the Equality Act 2010). It is evident that the proposal will not have a disproportionate impact on any of the nine protected disabled people. Accordingly, the proposal has low relevance to equalities and a Full Equality Analysis is not required.

APPENDIX 2


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)
1	Overview of Proposal		
a	Are the outcomes of the proposals clear?	Yes	The effect is of removing the potential for a broad brush approach of placing every household on auto bid if, after 2 years, they have not succeeded in securing an offer. Instead, the intention is to only apply this practice to households who have passed that point where, chronologically, they would have received an offer if their bidding strategy had reflected the type of offer they can reasonably expect to be offered,
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?	Yes	Clarity is about who and when. The 'who' will be any homeless household who is not maximising the opportunity to benefit from their respective chronological priority. There is no evidence to suggest one particular cohort is more likely to act in this way of not exploiting their offer potential, It follows then that the proposals, in being applied across the client groups, are not going to impose on any cohort disproportionately. The 'when' is even more significant. The current scheme allows it be applied after two years. The provision is rarely employed but, when it is, the passage of time is not consistent. The proposal is that the time factor will be both realistic, reflecting the average waiting time per property size and, importantly, will be employed consistently to every such case.
2	Monitoring / Collecting Evidence / Data and Consultation		
a	Is there reliable qualitative and quantitative data to support claims made about impacts?	Yes	We know our client profiles and we know are non-bidding household profiles. There are no particular profile differences across the protected characteristics range.
	Is there sufficient evidence of local/regional/national research that can inform the analysis?	Yes	Local data as above

APPENDIX 2

b	Has a reasonable attempt been made to ensure relevant knowledge and expertise (people, teams and partners) have been involved in the analysis?	Yes	Data is gathered and shared by persons specialising in this field and shared with CHR partners
c	Is there clear evidence of consultation with stakeholders and users from groups affected by the proposal?	Partial	Yes with partners, no with stakeholders but the significance of that is low. Remember, the proposal is to remind those who could have had an offer that they need to bid appropriately and, only if that caution is ignored with the autobid mechanism be applied. Currently it can be applied regardless.
3	Assessing Impact and Analysis		
a	Are there clear links between the sources of evidence (information, data etc) and the interpretation of impact amongst the nine protected characteristics?	Yes	But that has confirmed no disproportionate impact
b	Is there a clear understanding of the way in which proposals applied in the same way can have unequal impact on different groups?	Yes	The potential is well understood but, in the event, it is not believed that there will be any disproportionate impact
4	Mitigation and Improvement Action Plan		
a	Is there an agreed action plan?	No	But these proposals will, if implemented, be the subject of retrospective analysis and reporting in each year's Lettings Plan
b	Have alternative options been explored	Yes	To do nothing with continued and adverse consequence on similar, albeit younger (in terms of length of housing application) cohorts of people
5	Quality Assurance and Monitoring		
a	Are there arrangements in place to review or audit the implementation of the proposal?	Yes	See above
b	Is it clear how the progress will be monitored to track impact across the protected characteristics??	Yes	See above
6	Reporting Outcomes and Action Plan		
a	Does the executive summary contain sufficient information on the key findings arising from the assessment?	Yes	

Appendix A

Equality Assessment Criteria

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