

Equality Impact Assessment

The Equality Act 2010 replaces the previous anti-discrimination laws with a single Act. It simplifies the law, removing inconsistencies and making it easier for people to understand and comply with it. It also strengthens the law in important ways, to help tackle discrimination and equality. The majority of the Act came into force on 1 October 2010.

Public bodies are required in it to have due regard to the need to:

- eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct prohibited under the Act
- advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it, and
- foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it.

The public sector Equality Duty came into force on 5 April 2011. The duty ensures that all public bodies play their part in making society fairer by tackling discrimination and providing equality of opportunity for all. It ensures that public bodies consider the needs of all individuals in their day to day work – in shaping policy, delivering services and in relation to their own employees.

The Equality Duty encourages public bodies to understand how different people will be affected by their activities so that policies and services are appropriate and accessible to all and meet different people's needs. By understanding the effect of their activities on different people, and how inclusive public services can support and open up people's opportunities, public bodies are better placed to deliver policies and services that are efficient and effective.

The new equality duty replaces the three previous public sector equality duties, for race, disability and gender. The new equality duty covers the following protected characteristics:

- age
- disability
- gender reassignment
- pregnancy and maternity
- race – this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality
- religion or belief – including lack of belief
- sex
- sexual orientation.

It also applies to marriage and civil partnership, but only in respect of the requirement to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination.

Having due regard means consciously thinking about the three aims of the equality duty as part of the process of decision-making. This means that consideration of equality issues must influence the decisions reached by public bodies, including how they act as employers, how they develop, evaluate and review policies, how they design, deliver and evaluate services, and how they commission and procure from others.

Having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity involves considering the need to:

- remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by people due to their protected characteristics
- meet the needs of people with protected characteristics, and
- encourage people with protected characteristics to participate in public life or in other activities where their participation is low.

Fostering good relations involves tackling prejudice and promoting understanding between people who share a protected characteristic and others.

Complying with the equality duty may involve treating some people better than others, as far as this is allowed by discrimination law. For example, it may involve making use of an exception or the positive action provisions in order to provide a service in a way which is appropriate for people who share a protected characteristic.

The Equality Duty also explicitly recognises that disabled people's needs may be different from those of non-disabled people. Public bodies should therefore take account of disabled people's impairments when making decisions about policies or services. This might mean making reasonable adjustments or treating disabled people better than non-disabled people in order to meet their needs.

There is no explicit requirement to refer to the Equality Duty in recording the process of consideration but it is good practice to do so. Keeping a record of how decisions were reached will help public bodies demonstrate that they considered the aims of the Equality Duty. Keeping a record of how decisions were reached will help public bodies show how they considered the Equality Duty. Producing an Equality Impact Assessment after a decision has been reached will not achieve compliance with the Equality Duty.

It is recommended that assessments are carried out in respect of new or revised policies and that a copy of the assessment is included as an appendix to the report provided to the decision makers at the relevant Cabinet, Committee or Scrutiny meeting.

Where it is clear from initial consideration that a policy will not have any effect on equality for any of the protected characteristics, no further analysis or action is necessary.

Public bodies should take a proportionate approach when complying with the Equality Duty. In practice, this means giving greater consideration to the Equality Duty where a policy or function has the potential to have a discriminatory effect or impact on equality of opportunity, and less consideration where the potential effect on equality is slight. The Equality Duty requires public bodies to think about people's different needs and how these can be met.

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EIA)

Directorate:	Chief Executive's	Lead officer responsible for EIA	David Gell
Name of the policy or function to be assessed:	Dog Control Policy		
Names of the officers undertaking the assessment:	David Gell		
Is this a new or an existing policy or function?	New policy compiled from existing provisions, apart from introduction of charges for returning stray dogs		
<p>1. What are the aims and objectives of the policy or function? The aim of this policy is to ensure the needs of dogs and the responsibilities of their owners are met, and the potential for any danger, distress or nuisance that may be caused by dogs is minimised.</p>			
<p>2. What outcomes do you want to achieve from the policy or function?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More responsible dog ownership • Reduced problems caused by dogs • Consistent enforcement of relevant legislation 			
<p>3. Who is intended to benefit from the policy or function?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People who live and work in the borough • Dog owners 			
<p>4. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the policy or function?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dog owners • Council's kennelling partner • Veterinary surgeries • Residents of the borough • Officers of Broxtowe Borough Council 			
<p>5. What baseline quantitative data do you have about the policy or function relating to the different equality strands? Twenty-four percent of households were identified as dog-owning and 52% owned a pet of some type. The research suggested that households were more likely to own a dog if they had more occupants (five or more) or if they had an adult female household member. The age structure of the households was also associated with dog ownership, with households containing older children (between six and 19 years of age) and young adults (between 20 and 29 years of age), more likely to own dogs.</p> <p>(Factors associated with dog ownership and contact with dogs in a UK community. Carri Westgarth, Gina L Pinchbeck, John W S Bradshaw, Susan Dawson, Rosalind M Gaskill, Robert M Christley)</p>			

Pet ownership reported by the mother differed by ethnicity of the child at all time points: at 7 years, 72% of category 'white' owned pets, compared to 59% 'mixed', 33% 'Asian', 15% 'black' and 38% 'other'. When analysed by separate pet types, the same relationship was seen for most years.

(Family Pet Ownership during Childhood: Findings from a UK Birth Cohort and Implications for Public Health Research. Carri Westgarth, Jon Heron, Andy R Ness, Peter Bundred, Rosalind M Gaskill, Karen P Coyne, Alexander J German, Sandra McCune, Susan Dawson

6. What baseline qualitative data do you have about the policy or function relating to the different equality strands?

None available

7. What has stakeholder consultation, if carried out, revealed about the nature of the impact?

None undertaken as largely consolidation of existing.

8. From the evidence available does the policy or function affect or have the potential to affect different equality groups in different ways?

Although research indicates certain groups are more likely than others to own dogs, there is no evidence that the policy has the potential to affect different equality groups in different ways.

In assessing whether the policy or function adversely affects any particular group or presents an opportunity for promoting equality, consider the questions below in relation to each equality group:

- **Does the policy or function target or exclude a specific equality group or community? Does it affect some equality groups or communities differently? If yes, can this be justified?**

No

- **Is the policy or function likely to be equally accessed by all equality groups or communities? If no, can this be justified?**

Yes

- **Are there barriers that might make access difficult or stop different equality groups or communities accessing the policy or function?**

No

- **Could the policy or function promote or contribute to equality and good relations between different groups? If so, how?**

The policy could contribute to equality in that all dog owners would be treated exactly the same, whatever group they belong to.

- **What further evidence is needed to understand the impact on equality?**

None

9. On the basis of the analysis above what actions, if any, will you need to take in respect of each of the equality strands?

Age:

No adverse impact has been identified.

Disability:

No adverse impact has been identified.

Gender:

No adverse impact has been identified.

Gender Reassignment:

No adverse impact has been identified.

Marriage and Civil Partnership:

No adverse impact has been identified.

Pregnancy and Maternity:

No adverse impact has been identified.

Race:

No adverse impact has been identified.

Religion and Belief:

No adverse impact has been identified

Sexual Orientation:

No adverse impact has been identified.

Head of Service:

I am satisfied with the results of this EIA. I undertake to review and monitor progress against the actions proposed in response to this impact assessment.

Signature of Head of Service: D Gell