The Council understands that whilst its equalities duty applies to all services, it is going to be more relevant to some decisions than others. We need to be pragmatic and ensure that the detail of Equality Analyses (EAs) are proportionate to the impact of decisions on the equality duty. In some cases a full EA is not necessary and/or the equalities duties do not apply. In other cases, only part of a decision will require an EA to ensure the Council has due regard to its equality duties. The following examples are intended to assist:

### Where will a full EA be required?

In short, wherever a decision has a more than minimal or theoretical adverse or negative impact on those with protected characteristics, for example, if the Council is considering:

- Ceasing a service
- Reducing a service or reducing it in particular areas, e.g. closing an office in Leyton but not Walthamstow
- Changes to the way a service is delivered, e.g. moving to personalisation or moving to online access only
- Changes to eligibility criteria, rules or practices for a service
- Changes to discretionary fees and charges

### Where might an EA not be required?

- Where it can be proven that the decision has no equalities impact-- with particular focus on negative impacts on service users and residents
- Where it can be proven that the decision has a minimal or theoretical equalities impact (and so does not need to be considered)
- Where the decision is mandatory and there is no element of discretion (e.g. to adopt a member’s code of conduct or similar)
- In rare cases, where a previous EA exists and a review shows that it is still relevant at the time of the final decision, i.e. the facts have not changed

### Important:

- The EA screening tool should not be used to mask over any equality impacts or as a “get out”.
- There can be a negative equality impact even if you think that overall, you are proposing changes that will make services better. If there is an adverse or negative impact, you must complete a full EA.
- Negative impacts are often indirect, i.e. a rule that is on its face of universal impact but has greater impact on some groups in practice e.g. due to the ethnic makeup of an area.
- In most cases, the screening process requires a degree of collation and analysis of evidence. If this requires a lot of work, consider whether it is actually simpler to omit the screening process and undertake a full EA.
- The equality duty continues up to and after the final decision. If proposals or facts change before the final decision, any screening tool will need to be reviewed and evidenced.
- Any consultation undertaken should also inform the screening process, e.g. issues raised by those affected. Monitoring should take place after a decision as part of service delivery.
- The completed screening template will be attached to Cabinet or other decision making report and so it must include sufficient detail to justify the decision not to carry out a full EA.

### What to do?

The screening process should be used on ALL new proposals, policies, projects, functions, saving proposals, major developments or planning applications, or when revising them, if there is no negative equality impact or there is uncertainty about whether there is a negative equality impact. However, if your proposal is of a significant nature and it is apparent from the outset that a full EA will be required, then you do not need to complete this screening template and can progress directly to a full EA. If a negative/adverse impact has been identified during completion of the screening tool, a full EA MUST be undertaken. If you have not identified any negative/ adverse impacts arising from your proposal you do not need to undertake a full EA. However, make sure you have explained clearly why the proposal does not have any negative/adverse impact. If your proposal is going to Cabinet or Committee (e.g. Planning or Licensing) and you are not undertaking a full EA, you must:

a. share your report and completed screening tool with Shahid Mallam, Performance & Improvement Team, who will check and challenge your findings and 

b. use the following wording under the Equality & Diversity paragraph in the Cabinet report: “An initial screening exercise of the equality impact of this decision was undertaken and determined there was no / minimal impact (delete as appropriate) on the Council’s equality duty.” Attach the completed template as an appendix to your report.
1. Proposal / Project Title: Review of Substance Misuse, Health Scrutiny Committee

2. Brief summary of the above: (include main aims, proposed outcomes, recommendations / decisions sought)

Main aims
In June 2016, the Health Scrutiny Committee agreed to carry out a themed review into substance misuse. For the purposes of this report, substance misuse is defined as: “the harmful use of substances (like drugs and alcohol) for non-medical purposes. The term “substance misuse” often refers to illegal drugs. However, legal substances can also be misused, such as alcohol, prescription medications, caffeine, nicotine and volatile substances (e.g. petrol, glue, paint).”

The Committee looked at substance misuse at three of its meetings:

- on September 21 2016 the Committee heard about the current provision of drug and alcohol treatment for adults
- on November 23 2016 the Head of Community Safety presented a report on the extent of drug use in Waltham Forest and on the actions being taken by Safetynet, the Borough’s Community Safety Partnership (CSP), to reduce the harm that drug usage causes
- on January 25 2016 the Committee received a report from Public Health about prevention of problematic drug and alcohol use
- the Committee also visited Lifeline on September 5 2016.

The report (Appendix 1) was drawn up after the final meeting in January 2017 for the consideration of the Committee, detailing the key issues arising from the evidence gathering sessions and incorporating additional information gathered before and after the meeting.

Proposed outcomes
It is hoped that the adoption of the recommendations will lead to improved services and outcomes for residents.

Recommendations
Recommendation 1: The Council should work with CLG staff and service users to review the premises and determine what changes are needed to ensure that Lifeline is housed in up-to-date facilities that are welcoming for people actively seeking treatment.

Recommendation 2: The Council should continue to work with partners to ensure that the range of services offered by CLG is understood by healthcare professionals and the wider community.

Recommendation 3: The Council and CLG should consider how they can improve treatment readiness for GP and criminal justice referrals.

Recommendation 4: The Council should work with the STP board and other partners to secure investment in preventions that will reduce hospital admissions and burdens elsewhere.

Recommendation 5: The Council should continue to liaise with the MPS to ensure that performance in this area is monitored and continues to improve.
**Recommendation 6:** The Council should consider whether it is possible to utilise systematic screening to explore the benefits of systematic screening techniques and what the potential benefits could be.

**Recommendation 7:** The Council should continually work to ensure that high quality prevention work is being delivered in all schools, including academies.

**Recommendation 8:** The Council should use its new VCSE provider, Community Waltham Forest, to explore with voluntary organisations what support they can and do provide to residents of all ages to prevent substance misuse.

**Decisions sought:**
- Note the content of this report
- Note the findings of the report as set out in Appendix 1
- Agree to ask officers to implement the recommendations of the Health Scrutiny Report into Substance Misuse, as set out in Appendix 1, reporting back to Cabinet if these cannot be met from within the existing budget allocation.

### 3. Considering the equality aims (eliminate unlawful discrimination; advance equality of opportunity; foster good relations) indicate for each protected group whether there may be a positive impact, negative (adverse) impact, or no impact arising from the proposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protected Characteristic (Equality Group)</th>
<th>Positive Impact</th>
<th>Negative Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnancy and Maternity</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion or Belief</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (Including Gender Re-assignment)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage and Civil Partnership</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5. There are no negative/adverse impact(s)**

If you have not identified any negative/adverse impacts please briefly explain your answer, providing evidence to support decision.

These recommendations are designed to improve services connected to substance misuse. The recommendations are aimed at improving current provision of services and do not propose new services or fundamental changes to existing services that will alter the way they are delivered of who they are expected to benefit.
These recommendations are likely to be positive across all of the protected characteristics.

6. Describe how opportunities to advance equality and foster good relations for any of the protected characteristics has been taken up (where relevant).

Click here to enter text.

7. As a result of this screening is a full EA necessary (Please check ☒ appropriate box)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Briefly explain your answer.

These recommendations are designed to improve services connected to substance misuse. The recommendations are aimed at improving current provision of services and do not propose new services or fundamental changes to existing services that will alter the way they are delivered of who they are expected to benefit.

8. Name of Lead Officer: James Holden  Job title: Policy & Public Affairs Officer  Date screening tool completed: 4 September 2017

Signed off by Head of Service: Policy Manager  Name: Janice Cheddie  Date: 4 September 2017