

Equality Impact Analysis

This equality impact analysis establishes the likely effects both positive and negative and potential unintended consequences that decisions, policies, projects and practices can have on people at risk of discrimination, harassment and victimisation. The analysis considers documentary evidence, data and information from stakeholder engagement/consultation to manage risk and to understand the actual or potential effect of activity, including both positive and adverse impacts, on those affected by the activity being considered.

To support completion of this analysis tool, please refer to the equality impact analysis guidance.

Section 1 – Analysis Details (Page 5 of the guidance document)

Name of Policy/Project/Decision	Social Value Strategy 2024-2027
Lead Officer (SRO or Assistant Director/Director)	Sam McVaigh
Department/Team	People & Inclusion
Proposed Implementation Date	November 2024
Author of the EqIA	Sam McVaigh
Date of the EqIA	August 2024

<p>1.1 What is the main purpose of the proposed policy/project/decision and intended outcomes?</p> <p>Local authorities and other public bodies are legally obligated to consider the social good in contracts, subject to public procurement legislation. The Council's current Social Value Policy was written in 2017 and has provided a solid framework to deliver a range of important outcomes. However, the current Policy is limited in its breadth, with a focus on the procurement specific components of Social Value as opposed to the wider strategic opportunities which a modern Social Value approach provides. The current arrangement is also not connected to Bury's LET'S Do It priorities and lacks a clear framework for prioritisation and measurement.</p> <p>A new Social Value Strategy has been developed with input from across the Council, the wider Team Bury Partnership and experts from the voluntary sector, business and public service partners. It provides a clear definition of Social Value in the context of LET'S Do It and sets out a framework for action over the coming three years.</p>
--

Section 2 – Impact Assessment (Pages 6 to 10 of the guidance document)

2.1 Who could the proposed policy/project/decision likely have an impact on?				
<p>Employees: No Community/Residents: Yes Third parties such as suppliers, providers and voluntary organisations: Yes</p> <p>If the answer to all three questions is 'no' there is no need to continue with this analysis.</p>				
2.2 Evidence to support the analysis. Include documentary evidence, data and stakeholder information/consultation				
<p>Documentary Evidence: Toolkit: Social value - Achieving community benefits Local Government Association</p>				
<p>Data: The Local Government Procurement Index (tussell.com)</p>				
<p>Stakeholder information/consultation: The Strategy has been developed with input from colleagues across the Council as well as Bury VCFA the Chair of the National Social Value Taskforce and Bruntwood.</p>				
2.3 Consider the following questions in terms of who the policy/project/decision could potentially have an impact on. Detail these in the impact assessment table (2.4) and the potential impact this could have.				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could the proposal prevent the promotion of equality of opportunity or good relations between different equality groups? No • Could the proposal create barriers to accessing a service or obtaining employment because of a protected characteristic? No • Could the proposal affect the usage or experience of a service because of a protected characteristic? No • Could a protected characteristic be disproportionately advantaged or disadvantaged by the proposal? No • Could the proposal make it more or less likely that a protected characteristic will be at risk of harassment or victimisation? No • Could the proposal affect public attitudes towards a protected characteristic (e.g. by increasing or reducing their presence in the community)? Yes (Increasing) • Could the proposal prevent or limit a protected characteristic contributing to the democratic running of the council? No 				
2.4 Characteristic	Potential Impacts	Evidence (from 2.2) to demonstrate this impact	Mitigations to reduce negative impact	Impact level with mitigations Positive, Neutral, Negative

All Characteristics	The Strategy will support inclusion in a number of ways, including its focus on Good Employment (GM Good Employment Charter) and the ability to specifically tailor priorities to specific protected characteristics through the TOM framework.	National TOMs framework and alignment in Appendix 1 of the Strategy	N/A	Positive
Age	Positive for younger people through alignment to the Council's 'improving children's lives' priority.	Appendix 1 of the Strategy	N/A	Positive
Disability	Use of specific TOMs to target impact for disabled people	Appendix 1 of the Strategy	N/A	Positive
Gender Reassignment	N/A			
Marriage and Civil Partnership	N/A			
Pregnancy and Maternity	N/A			

Race	Use of specific TOMs to target impact for ethnic minorities	Appendix 1 of the Strategy	N/A	Positive
Religion and Belief	N/A			
Sex	N/A			
Sexual Orientation	N/A			
Carers				
Care experienced children and care leavers	Use of specific TOMs to target impact for care experienced young people	Appendix 1 of the Strategy	N/A	Positive
Socio-economically vulnerable	Use of specific TOMs to target impact for those not in education, employment or training	Appendix 1 of the Strategy	N/A	Positive
Veterans	Use of specific TOMs to target impact for veterans	Appendix 1 of the Strategy	N/A	Positive

Actions required to mitigate/reduce/eliminate negative impacts or to complete the analysis

2.5 Characteristics	Action	Action Owner	Completion Date

Section 3 - Impact Risk

Establish the level of risk to people and organisations arising from identified impacts, with additional actions completed to mitigate/reduce/eliminate negative impacts.

3.1 Identifying risk level (Pages 10 - 12 of the guidance document)

Impact x Likelihood = Score			Likelihood			
			1	2	3	4
			Unlikely	Possible	Likely	Very likely
Impact	4	Very High	4	8	12	16
	3	High	3	6	9	12
	2	Medium	2	4	6	8
	1	Low	1	2	3	4
	0	Positive / No impact	0	0	0	0

Risk Level	No Risk = 0	Low Risk = 1 - 4	Medium Risk = 5 – 7	High Risk = 8 - 16
-------------------	--------------------	-------------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------

3.2 Level of risk identified	0
3.3 Reasons for risk level calculation	All impacts are positive

Section 4 - Analysis Decision (Page 11 of the guidance document)

4.1 Analysis Decision	X	Reasons for This Decision
There is no negative impact therefore the activity will proceed	X	
There are low impacts or risks identified which can be mitigated or managed to reduce the risks and activity will proceed		
There are medium to high risks identified which cannot be mitigated following careful and thorough consideration. The activity will proceed with caution and this risk recorded on the risk register, ensuring continual review		

Section 5 – Sign Off and Revisions (Page 11 of the guidance document)

5.1 Sign Off	Name	Date	Comments
Lead Officer/SRO/Project Manager	Sam McVaigh		
Responsible Asst. Director/Director	Sam McVaigh		
EDI	Lee Cawley		

EqIA Revision Log

5.2 Revision Date	Revision By	Revision Details