Equality Impact Assessment
Validation Decision Notice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EIA Reference Number</th>
<th>30/2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service, policy, or strategy</td>
<td>Gender Reassignment Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element(s) assessed</td>
<td>Whole</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Names of Assessors    | Dianne Yexley (Chair – Chrysalis)  
|                       | Sarah Blohm (Equalities Officer) |

Consider:

Was discrimination or disadvantage identified?  
Was the service promoting equality?  
Could the service be improved in promoting equality?  
Are the customers' needs understood and met?  
Is there good evidence and/or reasoning to support the decisions on whether groups are/aren't affected?  
Does the summary report properly reflect the key findings of the assessment?  
Is the summary report clear and easy to understand?  
If improvements have been identified, do they reflect and deal with the key findings?

The decision is to: Validate [✓] Not validate [ ]

The reason/s for the decision are: please give details below

Validation given – information correct [✓]
Not validated – decision not to proceed as EIA incorrect [ ]
Not validated - screening error [ ]
Not validated – research/consultation error [ ]
Not validated – improvement error [ ]

Signed [Signature]

Name Karen Brumacombe

Designation Corporate Director

Date 11 August 2010
Summary Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of service, policy, or strategy</th>
<th>Gender Reassignment Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Element(s) being assessed</td>
<td>Whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of assessment</td>
<td>20 July 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of assessors</td>
<td>Sarah Blohm (Equalities Officer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dianne Yexley (Chair of Chrysalis)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The EIA briefing and scoping/screening was carried out between the council and Chrysalis, a local support agency for people with Gender Identity issues. The policy was developed in consultation with and guidance from Chrysalis. It was agreed that the policy would protect both staff and customers and that no negative impacts were identified.

Two minor adjustments were suggested to the wording of the policy—

4.1 To include chest reconstruction in list of gender reassignment surgery for female to male transsexuals

5.5 To include reference to the corporate and individual fines that may be incurred for disclosure of information

In addition to the minor amendments mentioned above, Chrysalis stated they would be able to offer further support/guidance to the council on gender reassignment issues, including bespoke training for HR staff and customer access teams.

As the only improvements identified were minor word changes it was agreed between the council and Chrysalis that no discrimination or negative impact had been identified and therefore no full equality impact assessment was needed.
### STAGE 5 - Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of service, policy, or strategy</th>
<th>Gender Reassignment Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Element(s) assessed</td>
<td>Whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date to be submitted for validation</td>
<td>11 August 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target implementation start date</td>
<td>6 August 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target completion date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Action required to achieve improvement title & brief description**

- Two minor adjustments were suggested –
  - 4.1 To include chest reconstruction in list of gender reassignment surgery for female to male transsexuals
  - 5.5 To include reference to the corporate and individual fines that may be incurred for disclosure of information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference number or code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responsibility:**

- **Lead**
  - Shella Storey

- **Support**
  - Sarah Biohm

**Resource implications**

- None

**Links**

- To business/service plan actions, policies, strategies or programmes
  - Data Breach Policy

---

The prioritisation criteria used at Stage 2 may be useful to give an overall priority and to prioritise individual actions. In either case you may need to add additional criteria such as cost, timescale, ease of implementation, etc.