

## Annex C: Equality Impact Assessment

### SECTION 1: Programme details

Name of the policy, project, service, or strategy being assessed	<b>Award of Borough-wide Information, Advice and Guidance Contract April 2024</b>
Give a brief overview of your works aims and objectives	The proposed activity is the award of a 7-year contract, after a competitive process to identify a suitable provider, of the borough-wide Information, Advice, and Guidance (IAG) service, to deliver IAG services to residents in Kensington and Chelsea. The open market procurement process led to IAG suppliers (including the currently grant funded IAG providers) to competitively tender for a 7-year IAG contract arrangement of up to £1,016,000 per annum.
Name of person completing this EqIA	Mohammed Mukit
Name of Director	Moira Ugoji
Team	VCS Partnerships Team
Directorate	Communities
Contact Email	<a href="mailto:Mohammed.Mukit@rbkc.gov.uk">Mohammed.Mukit@rbkc.gov.uk</a>
Where is this EqIA stored. (This is to ensure colleagues can pick this up in your absence. )	SharePoint <a href="#">Link</a>
Is this EqIA accompanying a report that is going through a formal decision process?  If so which meeting, is it going to for decision?	KD06529 will be discussed at the Leadership Team meeting on 17 January 2024.

## Annex C: Equality Impact Assessment

### SECTION 2: EqIA Screening – Do you need to complete a full EqIA?

Please complete the checklist below, including impact to help determine if a full EqIA is necessary.

Please see table in Section 3 for a breakdown of the protected characteristics

Question	Answer (Yes, No, Unclear)	Impact (Positive, Negative or Neutral)
<b>Does your programme have the potential to disproportionately affect men, women or those who identify as non-binary?</b>	No	Neutral
<b>Does your programme have the potential to disproportionately affect people of a particular race or ethnicity?</b> This includes refugees, asylum seekers, migrants and gypsies and travellers.	No	Neutral
<b>Does your programme have the potential to disproportionately affect people with a disability?</b> Consider physical and learning disabilities and mental health conditions.	No	Neutral
<b>Does your programme have the potential to disproportionately affect people of certain sexual orientations?</b>	No	Neutral
<b>Does your programme have the potential to disproportionately affect people of different age groups?</b> Consider children and elderly populations.	No	Neutral
<b>Does your programme have the potential to disproportionately affect those undergoing or intending to undergo the process of gender reassignment?</b>	No	Neutral
<b>Does your programme have the potential to disproportionately affect those due to pregnancy or maternity?</b> The Equality Act protects women or birthing people from discrimination from when you become pregnant until your right to maternity leave ends and you return to work. If you do not have the right to maternity leave this is 2 weeks after the child is born.	No	Neutral
<b>Does your programme have the potential to disproportionately affect those who are married or in a civil partnership?</b>	No	Neutral
<b>Does your programme have the potential to disproportionately affect people of different faiths and beliefs?</b>	No	Neutral

## Annex C: Equality Impact Assessment

Does your programme have the potential to disproportionately affect people on low incomes or living in poverty?	Yes	Positive
Does your programme have the potential to disproportionately affect people living in the most deprived areas of RBKC? Think about North Kensington, in particular Golborne, Notting Dale, Dalgarno and those living on the Worlds End Estate. There is further detail in Section 3 below in the socioeconomic and geographical box.	Yes	Positive

**If you have assessed the impact to any of the above questions to be Negative, Neutral or Unclear, then you will need to complete Sections 3, 4 and 5. If you have assessed the impact as Positive, explain the rationale for this in the box below and then go to Section 5.**

*Please use this box to outline how residents are positively impacted. Include the following information:*

- *Data on services users or people potential impacted*
- *Consultation information with service users and how this has evidenced a positive impact*
- *Explain if your proposal takes steps to meet the needs of people from protected groups, where these are different from the needs of other people; and encourages people from protected groups to participate in public life or in other activities where their participation is disproportionately low*

The Council forecasts around 9,000 residents will use IAG services provided by the consortium each year, based on existing data from Citizens Advice Kensington and Chelsea, Nucleus Legal Advice, North Kensington Law Centre and the World's End Neighbourhood Advice Centre, the Council can make a fair judgement that the majority of these residents will be on low incomes, unemployed and/or insecure employment, in debt, on welfare benefits and/or in temporary housing.

The Council ran a consultation exercise in the summer of 2023. The findings of this engagement have been used to determine the specification and inform the assessment process.

The service proposed by the winning bidder is a universal, open access IAG service available free to every resident who cannot afford to pay for legal advice.

### **Socio-economic and deprivation**

#### Summary

#### Risks

## Annex C: Equality Impact Assessment

The Council is providing c£1m per annum of discretionary funding to support the most vulnerable residents access IAG services across the borough. While this is materially positive, the delivery of services has two main risks:

- a. The services are not accessible to residents.
- b. The services are not to the required standard.

Other risks may emerge during the mobilisation, which the Council will address if/as/when these become apparent.

### Mitigation

The Council, and residents, will be involved in the mobilisation stage before the contract begins to ensure the service can deliver to the desired standard and is delivering in localities with the highest levels of deprivation. Additionally, the Council will ensure the consortium is delivering in line with the tender submission i.e. delivering from community settings.

The contract will be monitored by expert Council officers in the VCS Partnerships Team using an industry-standard measurement. Reports will be submitted on a quarterly basis and measured against pre-agreed expectations. A performance management framework will underpin any performance issue, backed by the Service Contract.

### Conclusion

The continuing impact of the cost of living and high inflation may see steady or even increased demand from residents for legal advice services. The continuation of discretionary support for IAG will have a positive impact on the boroughs residents by enabling providers to run services for residents in accessible settings. Additionally, being a fundamental criterion for funding – contributing towards making the borough fairer - means any recommendation on funding beyond 2024-25 will be partly based on the analysis of performance of each of the organisations that support residents in this protected characteristic. For the reasons outlined above the overall impact is therefore deemed to be positive.

## Annex C: Equality Impact Assessment

### SECTION 3: Assessing the Impact

Please use this section to assess the impact of the programme on those with protected characteristics. Please answer the following questions in your assessment for each characteristic.

1. **How many people currently use the service? Or who and how many people will be affected by the policy or strategy?** We have provided data from the latest census on the population of RBKC for each protected characteristic. Additional Census data can also be accessed from the RBKC Census Dashboard. Please add data about your service users/populations in the relevant boxes.
2. **What consultation have you completed to gather feedback from service users? Or what other relevant data have you gathered to support your work?** Include the findings in each relevant group.  
For more information on consultation please refer to the [12 principles of good governance and consultation in the Constitution](#). You can also speak with the Consultations Team for further advice.
3. **How will you ensure that the policy, project, service, or strategy will be accessible to all groups? and how will you address or breakdown any barriers to achieving this.** Explain if your proposal takes steps to meet the needs of people from protected groups, where these are different from the needs of other people; and encourages people from protected groups to participate in public life or in other activities where their participation is disproportionately low?
4. **How is this group impacted and determine whether the proposed activity will have a positive, neutral or negative impact.**
5. **If the impact is negative, what mitigations will you put in place to reduce the impact?**
6. **If the impact is positive, what actions have you taken to achieve a positive impact?**

Protected characteristic	Analysis	Impact (Positive, Negative or Neutral)
Age	See Section 2 above.	Neutral
Disability	See Section 2 above.	Neutral
Gender reassignment	<p><i>The 2021 census captured this information for those aged 16 and above.</i></p> <p><i>Approximately 90% of our residents stated that their sex is the same as it was at birth. Nearly 9% of residents did not answer the question. The remaining identified themselves as:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• 0.2% said that their sex is different to that registered at birth.</i></li> <li><i>• 0.1% identify as Trans woman.</i></li> <li><i>• 0.1% as Trans man.</i></li> </ul>	Neutral

## Annex C: Equality Impact Assessment

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Less than 0.1% identify as non-binary.</i></li> <li>• <i>0.1% identify as other.</i></li> </ul> <p><u>Summary</u> The VSSF 2024-27 did not consult residents or prospective applicants regarding this protected characteristic because the VSSF does not fund organisations that work with residents that are or have undergone gender reassignment. However, it is acknowledged that service users for any of the 19 funded organisations may fall within this protected characteristic.</p> <p>The VCS Partnerships Team, who manage the current programme, do not ask funded organisations to collect data on this protected characteristic. We are therefore unable to assess the impact for this protected group.</p> <p>No organisation has been excluded as a result of working with - pre-dominantly or exclusively - residents who identify with a particular gender or are in the process of transitioning from one gender to another.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u> The impact of new allocations for VSSF 2024-27 are therefore deemed to be unclear overall for this protected characteristic, though not negative for the reasons outlined above.</p>	
<p><b>Marriage and Civil Partnership</b></p>	<p><i>2021 Census data shows 49.24% of residents are single. Nearly 35% of residents are married to someone of the opposite sex and 0.5% are married to someone of the same sex. The remaining 0.15% of our residents are in a civil partnership with someone of the opposite sex and 0.39% are in a civil partnership with someone of the same sex.</i></p> <p><u>Summary</u> The VSSF 2024-27 did not consult residents or prospective applicants regarding this protected characteristic because the VSSF programme does not fund organisations that work with married residents and/or those in civil partnerships. Funded organisations can work with residents from this protected group without discrimination.</p> <p>No organisation has been excluded as a result of working with married couples or those in a civil partnership.</p>	<p>Neutral</p>

## Annex C: Equality Impact Assessment

	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The impact of new allocations for VSSF 2024-27 are therefore deemed to be unclear overall for this protected characteristic, though not negative for the reasons outlined above.</p>	
<p><b>Pregnancy and maternity</b></p>	<p><i>In 2019 a joint strategic needs assessment showed there were 1,612 births in the borough. It also showed an estimated 335 cases perinatal mental illness.</i></p> <p><u>Summary</u> The VSSF 2024-27 programme does not fund specialist organisations that work with pregnancy and maternity. The Dalgarno Trust and The Chelsea Theatre do deliver the Maternity Champions which works with mothers from its buildings, separately funded by Public Health.</p> <p>The VSSF supports projects indirectly by covering the costs of some core functions. However, the Fund does not ask The Dalgarno Trust (£55,412), The Chelsea Theatre (£80,996) or any other funded organisations to collect data on this protected characteristic. We are therefore unable to assess the full impact for this protected group.</p> <p>We acknowledge service users of other organisations may benefit from other related projects, such as childcare facilities, Stay &amp; Play, support groups or exercise. We are also aware that general service users may fall within this protected group.</p> <p><u>Risk</u> The Council has not made the support of this protected group a priority under this grant. This may risk services that are currently stretched. But this is not immediately apparent and fall outside of the purview of VSSF.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> No organisation has been excluded as a result of working with pregnant residents and/or those in their maternity period.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u> The impact of the proposed awards, which do have a negative impact, but may have a positive impact, is therefore deemed to be neutral overall for this protected characteristic.</p>	<p>Neutral</p>

## Annex C: Equality Impact Assessment

<b>Race</b>	<p>2021 Census: The broad ethnic breakdown of the borough's population is White at 70.6%; Asian, Asian British at 11.8%; Black, Black British at 7.9%; Mixed or multiple ethnicities at 6.6%; and Other at 9.9%. A more detailed breakdown is:</p>		Neutral
	Asian Bangladeshi	1%	Mixed White and Asian
	Asian Chinese	2.7%	Mixed White and Black African
	Asian Indian	2.2%	Mixed White and Black Caribbean
	Asian Pakistani	0.9%	Mixed Other
	Asian Other	5%	White English, Welsh, Scottish Northern Irish British
	Black African	4.8%	White Irish
	Black Caribbean	2.3%	White Gypsy or Irish Traveller
	Black Other	0.8%	White Roma
			White Other
			Other Arab
			Other ethnicities
	<p><u>Summary</u> Several organisations funded through VSSF 2024-27 have a high number of multiethnic service users. For example, Al-Hasaniya and Al Manaar see a large number of Moroccan users. Similarly, Midaye and Baraka Community Association work with a large number of residents from an African background.</p> <p>The Council is aware multiethnic groups are disproportionately affected when it comes to educational attainment, employment, crime, health and life expectancy. The organisations proposed for funding (particular those that have been funded in previous rounds) have taken the initiative to work with these affected groups and the Council can be pleased with the reach and the breadth of the services delivered in addressing some of the issues mentioned above, with the core funding support provided by VSSF.</p> <p>Currently funded organisations do collect data on this protected characteristic. We are therefore able to make a reasonable assessment of the impact of</p>		



## Annex C: Equality Impact Assessment

	<p>funding allocations for organisations that work with this protected group.</p> <p>The VSSF does not exclude any organisation working predominantly with a race.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A significant number of recommended organisations in <b>Appendix A</b> are multiethnic led</li><li>• We expect organisations to address the realities of Cost of Living, inflation and lingering impact of Covid, which will continue to impact Race, Age, Disability and Sex in the months and years to come.</li><li>• Census 2021 data will feed into the future monitoring and reporting regime for organisations.</li></ul> <p>Average percentage of African and Caribbean service users in VSSF 2021-24 programme:</p> <p>Baraka Community Association – 87% Midaye – 75%</p> <p><u>Negative implications of recommendations</u> Two currently funded organisations (VSSF 2021-24) are not recommended for funding under the VSSF 2024-27 programme – Making Communities Work and Grow and Response Community Projects. Both organisations are known to work with residents that may identify with this protected characteristic.</p> <p><u>Mitigations</u> The Council recognise there may be some impact in funds not continuing to be provided to these two organisations. However, there is alternative provision available in the areas where both organisations operate and the end of discretionary funding is not deemed to be a withdrawal of support. The Council will work with both organisations between December and March 2024 to understand potential impacts better, agree actions and support the organisations in other ways where appropriate.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u> No organisation has been excluded as a result of working with residents from this protected characteristic. The majority of grantees are working positively with large portions of residents identifying with this protected characteristic. Mitigations have been considered as a result of MCWG and Response not receiving grants in 2024-25. The impact of the</p>	
--	--	--

## Annex C: Equality Impact Assessment

	proposed grants on this protected characteristic is therefore deemed to be neutral overall.																
<b>Religion/belief</b>	<p><i>A breakdown of religious groups in RBKC from the 2021 census are:</i></p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Buddhist</td> <td>1.1%</td> <td>Jewish</td> <td>1.9%</td> <td>Other</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Christian</td> <td>48.4%</td> <td>Muslim</td> <td>11.8%</td> <td>No religion</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hindu</td> <td>1.1%</td> <td>Sikh</td> <td>0.2%</td> <td>did not answer</td> </tr> </table> <p><u>Summary</u> No organisation is being recommended for funding based on their religious affiliation or activities. The VSSF 2024-27 does recommend a grant to Al Manaar, MCHC (£30,434). However, Al Manaar does not have an exclusive user policy for their community centre activities. It is these operations that are supported by the core grant.</p> <p>The Council also acknowledges services provided by all 19 proposed grantees will benefit residents of all religions / beliefs (including non-belief).</p> <p>The VCS Partnerships Team does not ask currently funded organisations to collect data from residents about this protected characteristic. We are therefore unable to assess the full impact for this protected group.</p> <p>However, no organisation has been excluded solely based on being a religious group or affiliated to a belief, unless it is deemed funding will be exclusionary. There were no such examples in this round.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u> The impact of the proposed grants is therefore deemed to be neutral overall for this protected characteristic.</p>	Buddhist	1.1%	Jewish	1.9%	Other	Christian	48.4%	Muslim	11.8%	No religion	Hindu	1.1%	Sikh	0.2%	did not answer	Neutral
Buddhist	1.1%	Jewish	1.9%	Other													
Christian	48.4%	Muslim	11.8%	No religion													
Hindu	1.1%	Sikh	0.2%	did not answer													
<b>Sex</b>	<p><i>2021 Census: Female 53.2% and Male 46.8%.</i></p> <p><u>Summary</u> No single funded organisation works with men or women specifically. However, organisations like Al-Hasaniya (£76,000) and Midaye (£83,000) do run projects relating to VAWG. Other organisations like Dalgarno Trust (£100,000) are known to have projects working with young men/women.</p> <p>Like Race, Disability and Age, Sex will be another one of the protected characteristics we have asked some</p>	Neutral															

## Annex C: Equality Impact Assessment

	<p>organisations to address as part of their grant funding agreement. This is likely to continue in 2024-27.</p> <p><u>Risks</u> There are very limited to no risks identified. The organisations listed above will receive the full amount they have applied for. The Council will need to work with Midaye to identify any impact from April 2024 as it is a recommendation for the organisation to work in partnership with Hodan Somali Community and Dadihiye Somali Development Project.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> No organisation has been excluded from submitting a grant nor recommendation for award for 2024-27 as a result of working in part or exclusively with men or women if they can demonstrate this is necessary for positive outcomes in RBKC.</p> <p>For organisations not recommended for funding it is not deemed to have a significant impact on service delivery for this protected characteristic. For example, other organisations that support this protected characteristic in the borough will continue to provide services and could absorb reasonable increases or fluctuations in demand. In addition, the VCS Partnerships Team will provide relevant capacity-building support to funded organisations who support this protected characteristic.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u> The impact of the proposed activity is deemed to be neutral overall for this protected characteristic. Several organisations provide services that support residents in this protected characteristic. Funding the organisations would add (or at least maintain) the level service delivery available. During delivery the VCS Partnerships team would take into consideration the benefit of maintaining support for organisations that provide services to residents in this protected characteristic. The Council will continue to deliver on its own statutory duties in regard to this protected characteristic. The VCS partnerships team will support all funded organisations before, during and after this process.</p>	
<p><b>Sexual Orientation</b></p>	<p><i>2021 census information on sexual orientation is only captured for people aged 16 and above. Approximately 85% identify as Heterosexual, nearly 3% identify as</i></p>	<p>Neutral</p>

## Annex C: Equality Impact Assessment

	<p><i>Gay or Lesbian, 1.3% as Bisexual and 0.3% as other, the remaining 10.4% did not answer this question.</i></p> <p><u>Summary</u> The VSSF does not fund organisations based on its work with a certain sexual orientation. The Council acknowledges residents accessing services provided by all funded organisations may have different sexual orientations.</p> <p>It is not a measure the Council have taken for residents accessing currently funded organisations / services. We are therefore unable to assess the impact for this protected group. However, all funded organisations are required to have an equalities policy and a defined complaints procedure to guard against discrimination against this protected characteristic.</p> <p><u>Risks</u> There are very limited to no risks identified with VSSF 2024-27 funding. The Council does not propose to add or reduce services for this protected group.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> The VSSF does not discriminate against a group as a result of working pre-dominantly or exclusively with residents with a particular sexual orientation if they can demonstrate this is necessary for positive outcomes in RBKC.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u> The impact of the proposed activity is therefore deemed to be neutral overall for this protected characteristic.</p>	
<p><b>In addition to the nine protected characteristics, where relevant we ask that you also think about the socio-economic and geographical considerations of our residents. Some data has been included below for your reference.</b></p>		
<p><b>Socio-economic and Geographical</b></p>	<p><i>A recent report on data from the Index of Multiple Deprivation for 2019 showed that a high concentration of the most deprived Lower Super Output Areas being found in the Golborne, Notting Dale and Dalgarno wards.</i></p> <p><i>North Kensington also has higher numbers of people on low incomes, who are unemployed or who have no qualifications than the rest of the borough and has a higher proportion of social housing. There are also pockets of low income, higher unemployment, and lower skills levels in parts of the south and west of the</i></p>	<p>Positive</p>

## Annex C: Equality Impact Assessment

	<p><i>borough, again in areas where there are greater proportions of social housing.</i></p> <p><i>According to recent ONS data RBKC continues to have the highest life expectancy in the country, however this varies between the north and the south, between people from different ethnic minorities, and between homeowners, private renters, and those in social housing.</i></p> <p><i>ONS data also shows that life expectancy in the borough can vary significantly by different wards. There are larger gaps between the least and most deprived wards, these are as much as 14.8 years for males and 11.9 years for females. Females in Notting Dale live on average 15 years less than their neighbours in Holland Ward.</i></p> <p><i>The 2021 census data on general health of our residents shows that 58% of all residents, reported being in 'very good' health, 29.6 reported 'good' health, 10.1% reported 'fair health', 3.7% reported 'bad health' and 1.1% of residents reported 'very bad' health. However, these figures vary greatly across the Borough. Campden residents had the highest proportion reporting 'very good' health, 67.4% and Dalgarno in the north of the Borough had the lowest, 48.5%.</i></p> <p>See Section 2 above.</p>	
<p><b>Other Groups</b></p>	<p><i>Please consider groups that may be affected by your work, such as Grenfell Bereaved and Survivors, Carers and Members of the Armed Forces etc.</i></p> <p>The IAG contract award provides discretionary funding to a consortium of providers delivering free to access legal advice in the most deprived areas in Kensington and Chelsea.</p> <p>The services are, by requirement, open to all and without discrimination. Where services are more appropriately delivered by other organisations outside of the consortium, it is a contractual obligation for the consortium to make reasonable effort to signpost residents to these alternative provisions.</p> <p>The Council is not providing the IAG consortium to provide services to specific groups. The impact on</p>	<p>Neutral</p>

## Annex C: Equality Impact Assessment

	such other groups is therefore unaffected (neutral) by this funding.	
--	--	--

## Annex C: Equality Impact Assessment

### SECTION 4: Action Plan

Have you identified the need to reduce or remove any negative impacts, conduct work with those from protected groups to participate where their participation is disproportionately low, or fill any data gaps? If so, complete the Action Plan below to show the work that is planned.

None identified

Issue identified	Planned Action	Lead Officer and Timeframe

### SECTION 5: Sign-off

Director/ Head of Service Name	Gabin Sinclair-Constance
Contact Email	Gabin.Sinclair-Constance.rbkc.gov.uk
Date of sign off	20 November 2023
<p><b>Review</b>  <b>It is important to consider equalities issues at every stage of the process. Remember an EqIA is a live document which means it must be regularly reviewed and updated considering new evidence or information, for example, have you now completed your consultation or has there been news on funding. Please ask your Director or Head of Service to sign-off at every review stage. You can have as many reviews as are appropriate for your work.</b></p>	
Date of 1 <sup>st</sup> Review	By 30 September 2024
Name of Reviewer	Mohammed Mukit
Director signature	
Date of 2 <sup>nd</sup> Review	
Name of Reviewer	
Director signature	
Date of 3 <sup>rd</sup> Review	
Name of Reviewer	
Director signature	