

Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA)

| | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|---|------------|
| Name of Project | Reimbursement of Business Mileage | Cabinet meeting date If applicable | N/A |
| Service area responsible | Chief Operating Officer | | |
| Name of completing officer | Christiana Kyriacou | Date EqIA created | 10/01/2017 |
| Approved by Director / Assistant Director | Richard Grice | Date of approval | |

The Equality Act 2010 places a ‘**General Duty**’ on all public bodies to have ‘**due regard**’ to:

- **Eliminating discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct prohibited under the Act**
- **Advancing equality of opportunity between those with relevant ‘protected characteristics’ and those without them**
- **Fostering good relations between those with relevant ‘protected characteristics’ and those without them.**

In addition the Council complies with the Marriage (same sex couples) Act 2013.

Haringey Council also has a ‘**Specific Duty**’ to publish information about people affected by our policies and practices.

All assessments must be published on the Haringey equalities web pages. All Cabinet papers MUST include a link to the web page where this assessment will be published.

This Equality Impact Assessment provides evidence for meeting the Council’s commitment to equality and the responsibilities outlined above, for more information about the Council’s commitment to equality; please visit the Council’s website.

| | |
|---|----|
| 1. Project Lead: Ian Morgan | 5. |
| 2. Equalities / HR: Christiana Kyriacou | 6. |
| 3. Legal Adviser (where necessary): David Hodge/ Edmund Jankowski | 7. |
| 4. | 8. |

Stage 2 - Description of proposal including the relevance of the proposal to the general equality duties and protected groups. Also carry out your preliminary screening (Use the questions in the Step by Step Guide (The screening process) and document your reasoning for deciding whether or not a full EqIA is required. If a full EqIA is required move on to Stage 3.

The aim of the Modern Reward Strategy is to have a modern, sustainable, fair and transparent pay and grading structure, aligned to equalities and business goals, which rewards people fairly for their contribution to the Council.

The Modern Reward Strategy Project Main Objectives and Outcomes are:

- A review of the Council's pay and grading structure with the objective of implementing a single pay and grading structure using one job evaluation scheme.
- A review of all the Council's terms and conditions including allowances for all employees (except Teachers and employees on Soulbury terms and conditions).
- A review of Chief Officer and Senior Managers pay and grading arrangements.
- The development and implementation of job families and generic role profiles.
- Implementation of Senior Managers' Pay & Grading Arrangements.
- Conduct of the Senior Managers' Pay Review for 2016.
- New Senior Manager Contract.

As outlined above one of the aims of the Modern Reward Strategy was to review all allowances paid to Council staff including the reimbursement of out of pocket expenses while on Council business. A review of business mileage has now been undertaken and recommendations to go out for consultation have been put forward.

The Council currently operate four different schemes to reimburse expenses incurred for business mileage. Both a casual and essential user scheme for people who started on or after the 13th July 1993; and a historic scheme for people who started before that date.

In summary, the essential user scheme consists of an annual lump sum payment and mileage claimed is paid at a rate according to miles undertaken and car

engine size. The casual user scheme is similar to the essential user scheme but a lump sum is not paid and mileage claimed is paid at a higher rate.

As part of the Modern Reward Strategy initiative we are recommending to replace these schemes with a single scheme as per Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs (HMRC) authorised rates, which will only be paid for on a claims basis.

Any changes agreed to business mileage will impact existing essential car user and casual car user claimants as well as the rest of the Council workforce across all protected characteristics, Therefore it is necessary to conduct an EqIA. An EqIA will allow the Council to consider the potential impact of the proposal and identify any unintended consequences that could impact on equality and risk the Council failing to meet its statutory equality duties. The assessment will allow the Council to reduce where possible any adverse impact identified and ensure that alternatives can be considered.

Financial savings:

It is estimated that by paying mileage rates as proposed will save the Council upward of £200,000 each year, even given a margin for underreporting.

Stage 3 – Scoping Exercise - Employee data used in this Equality Impact Assessment
Identify the main sources of the evidence, both quantitative and qualitative, that supports your analysis. This could include for example, data on the Council's workforce, equalities profile of service users, recent surveys, research, results of recent relevant consultations, Haringey Borough Profile, Haringey Joint Strategic Needs Assessment and any other sources of relevant information, local, regional or national.

| Data Source (include link where published) | What does this data include? |
|---|--|
| EqIA Workforce Profile (December 2016) | Age, gender, ethnicity, disability information – for the Council and the Borough |
| External benchmarking of other London Boroughs' approach to car business mileage rates. | Information on car business mileage rates of other London Boroughs including neighbouring boroughs such as Waltham Forrest, Camden, Hackney, Islington and Barnet. |

Stage 4 – Scoping Exercise - Service data used in this Equality Impact Assessment

This section to be completed where there is a change to the service provided

| | |
|---|---|
| Data Source (include link where published) | What does this data include? |
| Data of affected employees obtained from SAP HR System. | Data includes information on protected characteristics of affected employees including age, gender, disability, faith, sexual orientation and race. |

Stage 5a – Considering the above information, what impact will this proposal have on the following groups in terms of impact on residents and service delivery:

Positive and negative impacts identified will need to form part of your action plan.

| | Positive | Negative | Details | None – why? |
|--|---|-----------------|----------------|--------------------|
| Sex | Establishing one car user scheme will harmonise car mileage rates for all staff and will ensure that mileage rates paid are fair, transparent and consistent for all staff. | | | |
| Gender Reassignment | As above. | | | |
| Age | As above. | | | |
| Disability | As above. | | | |
| Race & Ethnicity | As above. | | | |
| Sexual Orientation | As above. | | | |
| Religion or Belief (or No Belief) | As above. | | | |
| Pregnancy & Maternity | As above. | | | |
| Marriage and Civil Partnership (note this only applies in relation to eliminating unlawful discrimination (limb 1)) | As above. | | | |

Stage 5b – For your employees and considering the above information, what impact will this proposal have on the following groups: Positive and negative impacts identified will need to form part of your action plan.

| | Positive | Negative | Details | None – why? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--------|-----|----|----|------|-----|----|----|-------|-----|-----|-----|--------|-----|------------------------|----------------|--------|----|----|----|------|----|----|----|-------|----|-----|-----|--|--|----------------------|--------------------------|
| <p>Sex</p> <p>The gender breakdown of employees affected by the proposal shows that for the essential car user group the gender breakdown is broadly aligned with the Council profile and for the casual car user group women are overrepresented. The Council profile does not include Council employees based in school.</p> <p>Essential Car Users</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Gender</th> <th>No.</th> <th>% affected by proposal</th> <th>% Council Wide</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Female</td> <td>206</td> <td>64</td> <td>66</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Male</td> <td>118</td> <td>36</td> <td>34</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>324</td> <td>100</td> <td>100</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Table 1a: Gender analysis of employees affected by proposal</p> <p>Casual Car Users</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Gender</th> <th>No.</th> <th>% affected by proposal</th> <th>% Council Wide</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Female</td> <td>72</td> <td>77</td> <td>66</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Male</td> <td>21</td> <td>23</td> <td>34</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>93</td> <td>100</td> <td>100</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Table 1b: Gender analysis of employees affected by proposal</p> | Gender | No. | % affected by proposal | % Council Wide | Female | 206 | 64 | 66 | Male | 118 | 36 | 34 | Total | 324 | 100 | 100 | Gender | No. | % affected by proposal | % Council Wide | Female | 72 | 77 | 66 | Male | 21 | 23 | 34 | Total | 93 | 100 | 100 | | | See text on the left | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Gender | No. | % affected by proposal | % Council Wide | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Female | 206 | 64 | 66 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 118 | 36 | 34 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | 324 | 100 | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gender | No. | % affected by proposal | % Council Wide | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Female | 72 | 77 | 66 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 21 | 23 | 34 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | 93 | 100 | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Gender Reassignment</p> <p>The Council currently does not hold sufficient information on gender reassignment. There is no evidence to suggest that the proposal would have a negative effect on this group, as it has been designed to treat all groups consistently and there is no evidence this group are overrepresented in the affected group, comparing it with the Council workforce as a whole.</p> | | | See text on the left | <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Age

The age group analysis of those affected by the proposal shows employees aged 55+ (37%) are overrepresented in the essential car user group when compared with the Council profile (25%). The age breakdown of employees in the casual car user group are broadly aligned with the Council profile.

Essential Car Users

| Age Band | % affected by proposal | % Council Wide |
|-------------|------------------------|----------------|
| 16 to 24 | 0 | 1 |
| 25 to 34 | 7 | 14 |
| 35 to 44 | 22 | 24 |
| 45 to 54 | 33 | 35 |
| 55 to 64 | 33 | 23 |
| 65 and over | 4 | 2 |

Table 2a: Age analysis of employees affected by proposal

Casual Car Users

| Age Band | % affected by proposal | % Council Wide |
|-------------|------------------------|----------------|
| 16 to 24 | 0 | 1 |
| 25 to 34 | 16 | 14 |
| 35 to 44 | 17 | 24 |
| 45 to 54 | 38 | 35 |
| 55 to 64 | 26 | 23 |
| 65 and over | 3 | 2 |

Table 2b: Age analysis of employees affected by proposal

See text on the left

**Disability**

The disability analysis of those affected by the proposal shows that of the essential car user group 10% have a disability which is aligned with the Council profile of

See text on the left

9%. However 34% of employees in the former population have not declared their disability status.

Essential Car Users

| % Disabled | % Not Disabled | % Not Declared | % Refused | % Disabled Council Wide |
|------------|----------------|----------------|-----------|-------------------------|
| 10 | 56 | 33 | 1.0 | 9 |

Table 3a: Disabled analysis of employees affected by proposal

Casual Car Users

| % Disabled | % Not Disabled | % Not Declared | % Refused | % Disabled Council Wide |
|------------|----------------|----------------|-----------|-------------------------|
| 6 | 59 | 34 | 0 | 9 |

Table 3b: Disabled analysis of employees affected by proposal



Race & Ethnicity

The ethnicity analysis of those affected by the proposal shows the ethnicity breakdown of employees in the essential car user group is broadly aligned with the Council profile ,with a slight overrepresentation in the White group. However, the ethnicity breakdown of employees in the casual car user group shows the BAME group (61%) are overrepresented when compared with the Council profile of 50%.

Essential Car Users

| Ethnic Group | % affected by proposal | % Council Wide |
|--------------|------------------------|----------------|
| BAME | 47 | 50 |
| White Other | 18 | 16 |
| White | 34 | 30 |
| Not Declared | 1 | 3 |

Table 4a: Race analysis of employees affected by proposal

Casual Car Users

See text on the left



| Ethnic Group | % affected by proposal | % Council Wide |
|--------------|------------------------|----------------|
| BAME | 61 | 50 |
| White Other | 13 | 16 |
| White | 24 | 30 |
| Not Declared | 2 | 3 |

Table 4b: Race analysis of employees affected by proposal

Sexual Orientation

The sexual orientation analysis of those affected by the proposal does not indicate any overrepresentation in any specific group when compared with the Council profile. However it should be noted that 84% of the essential car user group, 74% of the casual car user group, and 70.5% of the Council profile, have not declared their sexual orientation .

Essential Car Users

| Sexual Orientation | % affected by proposal | % Council Wide |
|--------------------|------------------------|----------------|
| Not Recorded | 79 | 61.2 |
| Bi-Sexual | 0 | 0.6 |
| Gay Man | 0 | 0.7 |
| Heterosexual | 16 | 27.8 |
| Lesbian | 0 | 0.6 |
| Prefer not to say | 5 | 9.3 |

Table 5a: Sexual orientation analysis of employees affected by proposal

Casual Car Users

See text on the left



| Sexual Orientation | % affected by proposal | % Council Wide |
|--------------------|------------------------|----------------|
| Not Recorded | 68 | 61.2 |
| Bi-Sexual | 1 | 0.6 |
| Gay Man | 0 | 0.7 |
| Heterosexual | 25 | 27.8 |
| Lesbian | 0 | 0.6 |
| Prefer not to say | 6 | 9.3 |

Table 5b: Sexual orientation analysis of employees affected by proposal

Religion or Belief (or No Belief)

The Religion/Belief analysis of those affected by the proposal does not indicate any overrepresentation in any specific group when compared with the Council profile. However it should be noted that 83% of the essential car user group, 76% of the casual car user group, and 68.7% of the Council profile, have chosen not to record their religion/belief.

Essential Car Users

| Religion/Belief | % affected by proposal | % Council Wide |
|-------------------|------------------------|----------------|
| Not Recorded | 79 | 61.1 |
| Christian | 11 | 17.1 |
| Hindu | 1 | 0.7 |
| Jewish | 0 | 0.4 |
| Muslim | 1 | 2.8 |
| None | 4 | 9.0 |
| Other | 0 | 1.2 |
| Prefer not to say | 4 | 7.6 |

Table 6a: Religion/Belief analysis of employees affect by proposal

Casual Car Users

See text on the left



| Religion/Belief | % affected by proposal | % Council Wide |
|-------------------|------------------------|----------------|
| Not Recorded | 68 | 61.1 |
| Christian | 15 | 17.1 |
| Hindu | 1 | 0.7 |
| Jewish | 0 | 0.4 |
| Muslim | 3 | 2.8 |
| None | 5 | 9.0 |
| Other | 0 | 1.2 |
| Prefer not to say | 8 | 7.6 |

Table 6b: Religion/Belief analysis of employees affect by proposal

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|----------------------|---|
| <p>Pregnancy & Maternity</p> <p>1% of those affected by the proposal are on maternity leave compared to 1% Council wide.</p> | | | See text on the left | □ |
| <p>Marriage and Civil Partnership (note this only applies in relation to eliminating unlawful discrimination (limb 1))</p> <p>7% of those affected by the proposal have indicated they are married compared to 8% Council wide.</p> <p>It should be noted that 84% of those affected by the proposal have not indicated their marital status ,compared with 73% of the Council profile.</p> | | | See text on the left | |

| Stage 6 - Initial Impact analysis | Actions to mitigate, advance equality or fill gaps in information |
|--|--|
| <p>This analysis assesses the potential impact of the proposal on the affected population. The Reward team have kept Trade Unions fully informed of progress and highlighted any issues to their attention through regular communication.</p> <p>The analysis of current post holders have been drawn from records held on SAP. It should be noted however, as this Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) is a public document, there are no details disclosed that could reveal an employee's identity.</p> <p>In summary there is evidence to suggest that some people that share protected characteristics are more likely to be affected by the proposal, for example employees aged 55+ who are overrepresented amongst essential car users when that group is compared with the Council workforce as a whole. Women and BAME employees are overrepresented amongst casual car users when that group is compared with the Council workforce as a whole.</p> <p>Overall there is no evidence to suggest that any group will be disadvantaged by the proposal, as overall the proposal to adopt HMRC rates will harmonise the existing schemes and there will be no differentiation between staff groups if the proposal is agreed.</p> | <p>There is a gap in the religion/belief, marital status and sexual orientation information of the affected employees as well as Council wide. The analysis identified that 81% of the employees affected by the proposal have not declared a particular religion/belief, 82% of the employees affected by the proposal have not declared a particular sexual orientation and 84% of the employees affected by the proposal have not indicated their marital status. Further 34% of the affected employees have not declared their disability status.</p> <p>It is intended that we will seek to address the gaps by running a Council wide exercise. This exercise requires sufficient resources to administer and therefore, most be thought through accordingly.</p> <p>HR will consult and seek to negotiate an agreement with the recognised trade unions.</p> <p>The proposal to have one car/van/motorcycle/bicycle user scheme for all staff seeks to resolve the inequality amongst staff, who are subject to different car user mileage schemes, which is determined by their date of commencement with the Council. Therefore, if the proposal is agreed all staff in the Council will be entitled to the same reimbursement rate for car/van/motorcycle/bicycle mileage claimed.</p> |

| Stage 7 - Consultation and follow up data from actions set above | |
|--|--------------------------------------|
| Data Source (include link where published) | What does this data include? |
| Trade Unions HR | Holding weekly meetings with unions. |

Stage 8 - Final impact analysis

A final assessment will be completed after consultation and implementation of any changes to reimbursement of business mileage.

Stage 9 - Equality Impact Assessment Review Log

Review approved by Director / Assistant Director

Date of review

Review approved by Director / Assistant Director

Date of review

Stage 10 – Publication

Ensure the completed EqlA is published in accordance with the Council's policy.