Equality Impact Assessment

Validation Decision Notice

EIA Reference Number | 12/2010
---|---
Service, policy, or strategy | Joint contract for waste & recycling
Element(s) assessed | Administration Employment & Management of joint client team
Names of Assessors | Karen Brumacomb, June Dakonka, Martin Allen

Consider:

Was discrimination or disadvantage identified? Yes [x] No

Was the service promoting equality? Yes [x] No

Could the service be improved in promoting equality? Yes [x] No

Are the customers' needs understood and met? Yes [x] No

Is there good evidence and/or reasoning to support the decisions on whether groups are/aren't affected? Yes [x] No

Does the summary report properly reflect the key findings of the assessment? Yes [x] No

Is the summary report clear and easy to understand? Yes [x] No

If improvements have been identified, do they reflect and deal with the key findings? Yes [x] No

The decision is to: Validate [x] Not validate

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

Validation given – information correct [x]

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

Tim Boschi

Designation

HEAD OF NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT

Date
Summary Report

| Name of service, policy, or strategy | • Joint contract for waste and recycling issued and administered by Hart DC  
• Joint client team for waste and recycling services (employing authority being Hart DC) |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| Element(s) being assessed           | • Administration of contract  
• Employment and management of joint client team |
| Date of assessment                  | 8 March 2011 |
| Name of assessors                   | Karen Brimacombe/June Balcombe/Martin Allen |

The Assessment

The team considered two aspects of joint working on waste and recycling with Hart DC. Firstly the issuing and administration of the contract. This was believed to be an administrative process issue which did not pose any equality issues to be scoped or screened. The establishment, employment and management of a joint client team was also covered and was put forward for scoping and screening.

In summary, it was concluded that there will be no change to the current level/nature of service provided and while there are employment issues for the organisation and staff involved, there were no negative equality impacts identified. As such a more detailed assessment was not required. No quick fixes were identified.