

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Option Saving 1 Education School Turnover Budget

Policy Lead Officer : Linda McAulay-Griffiths

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-26-2024

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : School budgets will be assigned a turnover target to achieve. This will be managed by Head Teachers to ensure that children and young people are not impacted. Will be achieved through means such as internal cover arrangements while posts are

Assessing for Relevance

vacant etc.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Saving Options 2 Education Efficiency External Funding

Policy Lead Officer : Linda McAulay-Griffiths

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-26-2024

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : Utilisation of external funding for administrative support. This proposal will support the continued development of the Skills and Learning Hubs and consequently improve the life chances of young people.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Saving Option 3 Education Alternative Funding Stream

Policy Lead Officer : Linda McAulay-Griffiths

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-26-2024

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : No impact on children and young people â€œ change of budget for a central role.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Saving Option 4 Education Deletion of Post

Policy Lead Officer : Linda McAulay-Griffiths

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-26-2024

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : Deletion of centrally held languages post will have no impact on children and young people “ temporary funding was utilised to ensure sustainable resources were purchased and developed.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Saving Option 5 FICT Deletion of a Finance post

Policy Lead Officer : Colin Hastings

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-26-2024

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : Post deleted as part of the Finance & ICT Service Redesign, which has already undergone a full Equality Impact Assessment.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Option Saving 6 FICT Deletion of IT post

Policy Lead Officer : Paul Toland

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-26-2024

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : This represents the deletion of a 0.6FTE within the service. Post-holder is seeking retirement and the roles and workload have been reviewed, elements removed and other parts transferred to the Business Support function within the service.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Saving Option 7 Governance Deleting Consumer Advisor Post

Policy Lead Officer : Elaine Cavanagh

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-26-2024

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : Decision to delete the vacant Consumer Advisor post was taken as part of the Best Value Service Review

approved by Council in October. The service provided is now available to consumers via Advice Direct Scotland, so to provide this service

Assessing for Relevance

is local duplication. We receive notifications from Advice Direct Scotland to allow us to monitor effects and focus on criminal activities affecting East Ayrshire Residents. It also allows us to focus on prevention activities with Police and other partners.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Saving Option 8 Governance Deletion of Paralegal Vacant Hours

Policy Lead Officer : Craig Young

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-26-2024

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : yes

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : Whilst the current postholder is a woman, the policy decision to reduce her permanent hours is considered proportionate to achieve a legitimate aim. It reflects the current, and ongoing, position regarding the paralegal's working hours and is

Assessing for Relevance

therefore proportionate. It also achieves the legitimate aim of meeting service efficiency targets for 24/25 whilst continuing to maintain appropriate service levels.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Saving Option 9 - Deletion of Post

Policy Lead Officer : Iain Tough, Head of Corporate Support

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-26-2024

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : The 2023/24 budget saving for the Corporate Support Service- Business Assistant relates to the deletion of a post previously aligned to Depute Chief Executive (Economy & Skills). The position of Depute Chief Executive (Economy and Skills) was

Assessing for Relevance

removed as part of the Council's Management Review in 2021/22 and the post in the Corporate Support Service is currently vacant and deemed non-essential.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Saving Option 10 Corporate Support Deletion of Hours

Policy Lead Officer : Iain Tough, Head of Corporate Support

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-26-2024

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : The budget savings proposals will have no direct impact on any groups of people with protected characteristics.

The proposals relate to management action and the reallocation of grant funding to specific posts.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Saving Option 11 Staff Savings

Policy Lead Officer : Blair Millar Head of Housing and Communities

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-23-2024

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : This is an action already approved by Cabinet and has been implemented with no adverse impact on service deliver or staff.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Saving Option 12 ARA Efficiencies

Policy Lead Officer : Kevin Braidwood

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-23-2024

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : This is the deletion of 5 vacancies which are not required within the service.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Saving Option 13 ARA Deletion of a Vacant Post

Policy Lead Officer : Kevin Braidwood

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-23-2024

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : Deletion of vacant post as there is sufficient capacity within the team, there will be no impact on staff or service delivery

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Saving Option 14 FPM School Crossing

Policy Lead Officer : Mark Hunter

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-26-2024

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : Review of School Crossing, staffing at various locations will be reviewed under service review and recruitment, assessment of crossing areas conducted by roads will identify areas for review and efficiencies.

Assessing for Relevance

The service continues to work with education and road safety teams to review and identify improvements around schools to enhance road safety and promote active travel.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Saving Option 15 Economic Growth Deletion of Post

Policy Lead Officer : David McDowall

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-23-2024

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : Deletion of Admin Officer Post - service growth efficiencies with no equalities impact.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Saving Option 16 People and Culture Salary Sacrifice

Policy Lead Officer : Amanda Lowe, Head of People and Culture

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-26-2024

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : By maximising the income from Salary Sacrifice schemes this will result in a budget efficiencies saving of Â£72,000 with no risk to people or other Services.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Saving Option 17 Governance Services - Increase Planning Income Targets

Policy Lead Officer : David

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-26-2024

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : The internal increase in the planning income target in itself has no impact on any groups or people and relates solely to planning application income received through submission of planning applications and other associated processes.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Saving Option 18 Governance Registrars Same Day Certificates

Policy Lead Officer : Julie McGarry

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-26-2024

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : yes

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : yes

Women and men (boys and girls) : yes

Older people, children and young people : yes

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : yes

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : yes

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : yes

People who are married or in a civil partnership : yes

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : If customers do not want to pay for same day certificates, they can collect them free of charge the next day or the service will post them to them first class for no charge to the customer.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Saving Option 20 Greener Communities

Policy Lead Officer : Blair Millar Head of Housing and Communities

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-23-2024

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : A redesign of the service was undertaken and Team Coordinators post was created to develop our workshop that would bring work in-house. This brings income into the service through the work they do which generates an income from other services

Assessing for Relevance

such as Housing HRA and Ayrshire Roads Alliance. This additional income is created internally and has no impact on any of the equality groups.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Saving Option 24 Housing and Communities

Policy Lead Officer : Blair Millar

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-26-2024

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : Increase income target for Council Helpline Charge within Community Safety budget.

Assessing for Relevance

Recharge to the Housing Revenue Account, included in estimates for 24-25.

Services continue to be delivered and costs met from within the Housing Revenue Account

No requirement to undertake a full EQIA as no impact to service delivery or people receiving the service.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Saving Option 25 ARA Increase Charge of Permits

Policy Lead Officer : Kevin Braidwood

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-23-2024

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : This is an increase in charges for permits to volume housebuilders, contractors and utility companies who require to work on the public road and for members of the public carrying out works to their properties where a footway crossing, H bar or skip

Assessing for Relevance

permit is required.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Saving Option 26 ARA Efficiencies

Policy Lead Officer : Kevin Braidwood

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-23-2024

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : introduction of charging tariff at existing EV Chargers.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Saving Option 27 FPM Support for community food arrangements

Policy Lead Officer : Mark Hunter

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-26-2024

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : Review the FPM support activity for community food arrangements to ensure a greater sustainable model going forward. this includes larder support, social care activity and Lunch clubs.

Assessing for Relevance

Ongoing support within the community continues to be provided by EAC catering services, building on best practice, sustainability and coordination between all community groups and EAC partners.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Saving Option 28 Education Review Central Support Provision

Policy Lead Officer : Linda McAulay-Griffiths

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-26-2024

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : The review of central support provision will have no reduction in overall service as will be managed carefully through efficient timetabling and a number of currently stored musical instruments will be re-circulated following a programme of repairs.

Assessing for Relevance

The inventory is being carefully managed by the service manager.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Saving Option 29 FPM Cleaning and Facilities Staffing Hours

Policy Lead Officer : Mark Hunter

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-26-2024

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : a. Client group will not change as a result of this review. Client group will be all service users, external and internal customers.

Assessing for Relevance

- b. There are no direct equality beneficiaries/discriminations as a result of this saving.
- c. All areas of savings can be rationalised by efficiencies within the service with no direct or indirect impact on any equality groups

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Saving Option 30 FMP Projection for Estates Income

Policy Lead Officer : angela graham

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-26-2024

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : Current projections for estates income will incorporate new facilities as well as ongoing review of market rents will increase overall income levels.

Assessing for Relevance

Capital investment including Moorfield has resulted in increased commercial income and where existing agreements have resulted in stepped up levels of income.

No impact anticipated

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Saving Option 31 FPM Office Accommodation Costs

Policy Lead Officer : angela graham

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-26-2024

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : Current corporate office accommodation costs continue to cover unbudgeted costs and costs associated with other organisations. Savings will be made by Invoice other organisations and take further action to reduce the estate.

Assessing for Relevance

â€¢ Review will not have benefits to any current or intended client group

â€¢ There are no direct equality beneficiaries/discriminations as a result of this review, it will impact equally on all diversity groups.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Saving Option 32 FPM General Repairs

Policy Lead Officer : angela graham

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-26-2024

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : Following appointment of the new maintenance contractor review the General repair criteria to target essential works and work with internal FM teams to identifying where further works can be delivered more effectively

Assessing for Relevance

Overall budget of Â£3m. This saving will be achieved by removing Â£0.100m from CRA budgets and doing less cyclical and planned maintenance. This may impact on reactive maintenance in future years

â€¢ Review will not have benefits to any current or intended client group

â€¢ There are no direct equality beneficiaries/discriminations as a result of this review, it will impact equally on all diversity groups.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Option Saving 33 FICT Review of ICT Contracts

Policy Lead Officer : Paul Toland

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-26-2024

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : No anticipated change to end user experience. The proposed saving is as a result of specific contracts no longer being required, as the necessary functionality can be consolidated into the Microsoft 365 product suite and other products which are

Assessing for Relevance

currently being introduced across the Council.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Saving Option 34 Housing and Communities Reduction in Supplies and Services

Policy Lead Officer : Blair Millar Head of Housing and Communities

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-23-2024

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : This is result of our more efficient practice including the transition to hybrid working and digitalisation. There will be no impact on communities or services.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Saving Option 35 Education Reduction in Staff Travel Budget

Policy Lead Officer : Linda McAulay-Griffiths

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-26-2024

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : No impact on children and young people â€œ staff travel budget reducing in line with reduced demand.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Option Saving 36 People and Culture Budget

Policy Lead Officer : Amanda Lowe, Head of People and Culture

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-26-2024

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : A reduction in the People and Culture staff travel budget of Â£20,000 will have no impact, noting that there has been a historical underspend on this budget line due to Flexible Working.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

User : eac\mcseveneym

Policy : Budget Saving Option 37 Education Arts and Enterprise

Policy Lead Officer : Linda McAulay-Griffiths

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-26-2024

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : Reduce Arts and Enterprise budgets for musical instruments and staffing adjustments. No reduction in overall service to pupils and all pupils who require a musical instrument to support their lessons will still have access to this.

Assessing for Relevance

No impact on staff as this is a deletion of a vacant post.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Saving Option 38 Education Review of Flexible Resources

Policy Lead Officer : Linda McAulay-Griffiths

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-26-2024

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : The review of allocation of additional flexible resources across all sectors was always a temporary or one-off funding to support a particular initiative or challenge so no impact on core budgets for children and young people.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Saving Option 39 Education PEF

Policy Lead Officer : Linda McAulay-Griffiths

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-26-2024

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : EAC's total Pupil Equity Funding this year and next will be £ 3,659,120.

Assessing for Relevance

The plan is to recharge a proportionate amount across schools to provide Â£42,000 centrally to support the continued employment of a PEF Officer. The role of the officer is to support school in managing this considerable resource to ensure it is all accounted for and spent in the academic year to best support the needs of learners who are socio-economically disadvantaged. A significant part of this role is in managing and reviewing the new PEF tracker and in disseminating good practice to ensure that successful interventions are shared. It is intended that this role will have a positive impact on the outcomes for children and young people.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Saving Option 40 FICT Reduction of Supplies & Services Budgets

Policy Lead Officer : Colin Hastings

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-26-2024

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : Decision made on this suggested efficiency saving as a result of intelligence gathered over the last year based on actual spend to date, which suggests that planned spend against these budgets is likely to reduce longer-term.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Option Saving 41 FICT Application of appropriate costs against Barclay Review funding

Policy Lead Officer : Colin Hastings

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-26-2024

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : The allocation of funding from the Scottish Government to support the recommendations contained within the Barclay Review on Non-Domestic Rates means that costs currently attributed to the Finance & ICT Budget can be met from the new

Assessing for Relevance

recurring funding.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Saving Option 42 FICT Application of appropriate costs against funding for Council Tax Regulation requirements

Policy Lead Officer : Colin Hastings

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-26-2024

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : The allocation of funding from the Scottish Government to support Council Tax Regulation requirements means that costs which are being charged against the Finance & ICT Budget can be set against this new recurring funding.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Saving Option 43 Governance Reduce Supplies and Services budget

Policy Lead Officer : David Mitchell

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-26-2024

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : Saving was based on underspend on this provision in previous years, following work with Finance colleague.

The saving should therefore have little or no impact going forward.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Saving Option 44 Governance Community Grants Scheme

Policy Lead Officer : Julie McGarry

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-26-2024

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : yes

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : yes

Women and men (boys and girls) : yes

Older people, children and young people : yes

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : yes

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : As part of the savings for Governance for 2024/25, it is proposed to cut the budget for the community grants scheme by £20,000. There will be no impact on any of the groups as (1) the budget is underspent every year and (2) the new funding from

Assessing for Relevance

the 9CC group will attract applications that would normally come through the community grants scheme. The eligible area is most of the South of East Ayrshire area. There will also be opportunity for support from the council to access alternative streams of funding.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Saving Option 45 Governance - Reduce Budget Bottled Water

Policy Lead Officer : Lesley McLean

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-26-2024

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : As part of the 2024/25 savings options exercise, a proposal to reduce recurring budget for bottled water (Â£29,2100 with an annual rental of units is circa Â£13.5k per annum. Propose to save Â£9k from annual budget.

Assessing for Relevance

The impact of people is considered low as - Employees have access to mains fed tap water which is available within Council premises,

Employees will still have access to water from the water cooler devices installed at various locations across Council premises and

Employees can bring their own refreshments to work

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Saving Option 46 Governance Efficiencies -Reduce Transport Budget, non-renewal of subscription and reduction of supplies

Policy Lead Officer : Craig Young

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-26-2024

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : yes

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : The proposed saving relates to a recurring underspend and is considered to be proportionate to achieve the legitimate aim of contributing to savings in Financial Year 24/25.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Saving Option 47 Governance Reduce Supplies and Services

Policy Lead Officer : Julie McGarry

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-26-2024

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : Following a line by line budget review, taking small savings across various budget heads (ie stationery, staff travel budgets) which have been underspent in the last few years. There is no impact to staff or services.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Saving Option 48 Governance Reduce Bad Debt Provision

Policy Lead Officer : Craig Young

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-26-2024

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : The proposed efficiency saving reflects a recurring underspend on this particular budget item and is considered proportionate to achieve the legitimate aim of contributing to Governance Efficiency savings for 24/25.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Saving Option 49 Governance Reduce other employee related expenses

Policy Lead Officer : Craig Young

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-26-2024

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : yes

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : The Efficiency Saving relates to a recurring underspend in employee related expenses and takes account of changes in the way we provide services, and the way that we attend Court hearings on behalf of the Council. This includes greater use of

Assessing for Relevance

technology to minimise travelling times and mileage to meetings and court hearings. The Efficiency Saving is therefore considered to be a proportionate means of achieving the legitimate aim of securing efficiency savings.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Saving Options 50 Reduction to Sports Council and Youth Work Network Annual Funding

Policy Lead Officer : Blair Millar Head of Housing and Communities

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-23-2024

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : `This is reducing the grant award to both organisations, who have significant reserves. Both organisations have seen the accrual of reserves and can see years when their award not being fully spent in year, therefore it is anticipated that this saving

Assessing for Relevance

would not impede their work or impact their sectors.

They will also be supported as and when required by the Council to access alternative streams of funding.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Saving Option 51 Removal of Kilmarnock Community Trust Funding

Policy Lead Officer : Blair Millar Head of Housing and Communities

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-23-2024

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : Now that Kilmarnock Community Trust is well established there should be less reliance on the Council's contribution. The Community Trust has matured and is securing funding from numerous streams, it is not believed that our Â£10,000

Assessing for Relevance

would have a significant impact on their operations. This represents a very small aspect of their operations.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Saving Option 53 Economic Growth Reduction of Supplies and Services

Policy Lead Officer : David McDowall

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-26-2024

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : Reduction of Supplies and Services - service economic growth efficiencies with no equalities impact.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Saving Option 54 Economic Growth Efficiencies Reduction in Consultancy

Policy Lead Officer : David McDowall

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-23-2024

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : Reduction in Consultancy - Service economic growth efficiencies with no equalities impact.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Saving Option 55 Economic Growth Reduce Centrally Held Resources

Policy Lead Officer : David McDowall

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-23-2024

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : Reduce centrally held reserves - service economic growth efficiencies with no equalities impact.