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	Greater Manchester Joint Minerals and Waste Plan – Decision-Making Process
Lead Officer (SRO or Assistant Director/Director)	Cris Logue
Department/Team	Place
Proposed Implementation Date	9 July 2025
Author of the EqIA	David Wiggins
Date of the EqIA	27 May 2025

1.1 What is the main purpose of the proposed policy/project/decision and intended outcomes?
To delegate to AGMA Executive Board the formulating and preparing of the joint development plan document to cover planning for minerals and waste across Greater Manchester.

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?
Employees: **No** Community/Residents: **No** Third parties such as suppliers, providers and voluntary organisations: **No** This decision is to delegate responsibility for the preparation of the Plan to the AGMA Executive Board. The approval of the Plan itself will be subject to further reports and any impacts on the above will be considered at that stage.

If the answer to all three questions is 'no' there is no need to continue with this analysis.

2.2 Evidence to support the analysis. Include documentary evidence, data and stakeholder information/consultation
Documentary Evidence:
Data:
Stakeholder information/consultation:

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.

- Could the proposal prevent the promotion of equality of opportunity or good relations between different equality groups?
- Could the proposal create barriers to accessing a service or obtaining employment because of a protected characteristic?
- Could the proposal affect the usage or experience of a service because of a protected characteristic?
- Could a protected characteristic be disproportionately advantaged or disadvantaged by the proposal?
- Could the proposal make it more or less likely that a protected characteristic will be at risk of harassment or victimisation?
- Could the proposal affect public attitudes towards a protected characteristic (e.g. by increasing or reducing their presence in the community)?
- Could the proposal prevent or limit a protected characteristic contributing to the democratic running of the council?

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
Age				
Disability				

Gender Reassignment				
Marriage and Civil Partnership				
Pregnancy and Maternity				
Race				
Religion and Belief				
Sex				
Sexual Orientation				
Carers				
Care Experienced Children and Care Leavers				
Socio-economically vulnerable				
Veterans				

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	
3.3 Reasons for risk level calculation	

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		
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	David Wiggins	27/05/25	
Responsible Asst. Director/Director	Cris Logue	27/05/25	
EDI			

EqIA Revision Log

5.2 Revision Date	Revision By	Revision Details