

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)	Contractual arrangements for commercial and community events
Directorate / Service	Communities, Localities & Culture / Arts, Parks & Events
Lead Officer	Stephen Murray
Signed Off By (inc date)	Shazia Hussain
Summary – to be completed at the end of completing the QA (using Appendix A)	<div style="display: flex; align-items: flex-start;"> <div style="width: 20px; height: 20px; background-color: #90EE90; margin-right: 10px;"></div> <p>Proceed with implementation</p> </div> <p>As a result of performing the QA checklist, the proposal 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. There is some limited impact on residents around the event site as well as parks users. This impact is on all users and residents and there are effective impact mitigation measures in place. The new contract is proposed to be let within the same parameters as the existing contract. There is no change in policy or approach.</p>

Stage	Checklist Area / Question	Yes / No /	Comment (If the answer is no/unsure, please ask the question to the SPP Service Manager or
-------	---------------------------	------------	--

		Unsure	nominated equality lead to clarify)
1	Overview of Proposal		
a	Are the outcomes of the proposals clear?	Yes	The proposals are set out clearly in the associated Cabinet report.
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	<p>If agreed, a new contract for Victoria Park will be let on the basis of the parameters set out in the report. This suggests that the impact on of the contract on the service users and the local residents will remain broadly unchanged.</p> <p>The report highlights that the number of complaints has decreased since the introduction of the Executive oversight measures in 2015. The most recent Annual Residents' Survey 2015-16 shows more respondents (69%) rated the parks and open spaces service as good, very good or excellent than the previous years (64% in 2014-15; 61% in 2013-14; 60% between 2010-11 and 2012-13).</p> <p>Parks users and nearby residents may be affected by the events on a small number of days as there will be some disruption. However, as the disruption has been limited to parts of sites and a small number of days, it is not considered that any impact of an ongoing events programme would have a disproportionate impact on specific protected characteristics.</p> <p>Income from commercial events provides a significant contribution to the parks maintenance budget. A reduction or termination of the events programme would lead to a reduction in the budget (unless general fund was reinstated) and could have an impact on parks users across the borough.</p>
2	Monitoring / Collecting Evidence / Data and Consultation		
a	Is there reliable qualitative and quantitative data to support claims made about impacts?	Yes	Complaints data and Annual Residents' Surveys are reviewed and considered.

			<p>The income makes a significant contribution to the parks budget as part of MTFS savings. The budget reduction is quantified. All park users would be affected equally. The Annual Residents' Survey 2015-16 shows that 69% of the respondents rated the parks and open spaces service as good, very good or excellent. This was an improvement from 64% in 2014-15, 61% in 2013-14 and 60% from 2010-11 till 2012-13.</p> <p>While the disruption is limited to parts of sites and a small number of days, the closure of part of parks for short periods of time during events will impact on the users of those specific sites. No detailed user data is available. However, in line with catchment area analysis it is likely that users predominantly live within 400 metres of the site.</p>
	Is there sufficient evidence of local/regional/national research that can inform the analysis?	Yes	<p>Information on the London events market is contained in the report, including limited (as commercially sensitive) benchmarking data.</p> <p>The Annual Residents' Survey, financial information including the budget and the data on the residents from the Census 2011 are also available. The information on complaints also informs the report.</p>
b	Has a reasonable attempt been made to ensure relevant knowledge and expertise (people, teams and partners) have been involved in the analysis?	Yes	<p>The report contains information on summary information on complaints and ASB activity associated with commercial events. The report outlines how the events are managed through a partnership approach to reducing negative impact.</p> <p>All plans and contract arrangements are scrutinised during the planning stage and monitored during the event operations, including the show build, event days and show breakdown including clean up.</p>
c	Is there clear evidence of consultation with stakeholders and users from groups affected by the proposal?	Yes	<p>Public meetings have been held in the area most closely linked to the commercial events programme (Bow/Victoria Park). Regular meetings take place with the Friends of Victoria Park group and other parks user groups.</p>

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	<p>As set out above, the impact of the current level of events is limited to parts of sites (meaning users are still able to access the remainder of the site) and small numbers of days. It is proposed that a new contract will continue to be based on the existing parameters.</p> <p>Detailed parks user data is not available against protected characteristics as parks by their very nature are free to access so capturing such data is not feasible. The annual residents' survey, which includes the satisfaction rate for the parks and open spaces service, provides some breakdown for some characteristics. However, sample sizes of the equality strands are small and not statistically reliable.</p>
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 closure of parts of sites impacts on all user groups. It is proposed that a new contract will continue to be based on the existing parameters.
4	Mitigation and Improvement Action Plan		
a	Is there an agreed action plan?	Yes	Any future events programme (if agreed) would continue with existing arrangements to reduce the impact on parks users and local residents.
b	Have alternative options been explored	Yes	The report sets out the alternative options considered.
5	Quality Assurance and Monitoring		
a	Are there arrangements in place to review or audit the implementation of the proposal?	Yes	Event review group including the contractors and partners is in place for the current programme and would, if the programme is renewed, remain in place. The Executive oversight measures will continue to review feedback after events.
b	Is it clear how the progress will be monitored to track impact across the protected characteristics??	Yes	<p>Complaints and Annual Residents' Survey data will continue to be monitored. The Executive oversight measures will also continue reviewing feedback after events.</p> <p>Impact is considered minimal and the same for all protected</p>

			characteristics. As user data is not available other than through catchment area analysis (Census) there is no robust and statistically reliable mechanism to monitor impact consistently. However, in light of the minimal impact detailed monitoring would not be proportionate to the level of impact.
6	Reporting Outcomes and Action Plan		
a	Does the executive summary contain sufficient information on the key findings arising from the assessment?	Yes	