

SP23 EIA – CCBS Emergency planning and resilience restructure– Staff

EIA writer(s) and authoriser

No.		Name	Department	Position	Email address	Phone number	Date	Issue
1	Report Writer(s)	Stuart Fox	CCBS	Head of Emergency Planning and Resilience	Stuart.fox@hants.gov.uk	07747 698258	12.05.21	V2
2	EIA authoriser	Patrick Blogg	CCBS	Deputy Director of CCBS	Patrick.blogg@hants.gov.uk	03707 796865	12.05.21	V2
3	EIA Coordinator	Rebecca Prowting	CCBS	Transformation Manager	Eia.ccbs@hants.gov.uk	03707 798946	12.05.21	V2

Section one – information about the service and service change

Service affected	Emergency Planning and Resilience Team (EPRT)
Please provide a short description of the service / policy/project/project phase	<p>Emergency Planning and Resilience Team is responsible for;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensuring the county council’s statutory duties, under the Civil Contingencies Act 2004, are undertaken. • Representing the council at the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Local Resilience Forum • Fulfilling the council’s duties under the Control Of Major Accident Hazard regulations • Fulfilling the council’s duties for Safety at Sports Grounds • Corporate Business Continuity strategy and implementation • Responsible for writing, reviewing and testing emergency plans for identified high risks

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning, Training, Exercising and responding to civil emergencies on behalf of the county council and 8 district and borough councils
Please explain the new/changed service/policy/project	<p>Emergency Planning propose to conduct a thorough review of all aspects of the service, to include the structure, staffing and workstreams undertaken with a view to implement changes in the way the service operates.</p> <p>The review will consider how necessary savings can be best delivered whilst maintaining adequate resource for delivering and effective, efficient, competent service that is fit for purpose. The review may propose changes to the current staffing structure and associated roles and responsibilities.</p> <p>It should be noted that the service is running with vacancies and has for some time which could be considered as part of the contribution towards savings.</p>

Engagement and consultation

The County Council's *Serving Hampshire Balancing the Budget* consultation (2021-2023) will seek residents' and stakeholders' views on strategic options for funding the Authority's budget gap. Where applicable, detailed proposals for making savings will be subject to further, more detailed 'stage two' consultation before any decisions on service specific changes are made.

Has any pre-consultation engagement been carried out?

(Delete as appropriate)

No

Describe the consultation or engagement you have performed or are intending to perform.

Describe who was engaged or consulted. What was the outcome of the activity and how have the results influenced what you are doing? If no consultation or engagement is planned, please explain why.

No consultation or engagement will be carried out prior to Serving Hampshire Balancing the Budget Consultation (2021-23). Should work force changes be identified and required post the proposed review, a thorough and appropriate staff consultation will be conducted.

Section two: Assessment

Table 1 Impact Assessment

Protected characteristic (see EIA Guidance for considerations)	Positive	Neutral	Negative - low	Negative - Medium	Negative - High	Affects staff, public or both?
Age		x				Staff
Disability		x				Staff
Gender reassignment		x				Staff
Pregnancy and maternity		x				Staff
Race		x				Staff
Religion or belief		x				Staff
Sex		x				Staff

Sexual orientation		x				Staff
Marriage & civil partnership		x				Staff
Poverty		x				Staff
Rurality		x				Staff

Table 2 Geographical impact

Does the proposal impact on a specific area?

Area	Yes / no	Area	Yes / no	Area	Yes / no
All Hampshire	Yes	Fareham		New Forest	
Basingstoke and Deane		Gosport		Rushmoor	
East Hampshire		Hart		Test Valley	
Eastleigh		Havant		Winchester	

Section three: Equality Statement

For all characteristics marked as either having a neutral or low negative impact, challenge your assessment - carefully consider the protected characteristics, if necessary, review the Inclusion and Diversity eLearning, discuss with an EIA co-ordinator.

Table 3 Consideration of and explanation for neutral or low negative impacts

Protected characteristic	Brief explanation of why this has been assessed as having neutral or low negative impact
Age	<p>The age profile of the Emergency Planning Team 20-29 = 50% 30-39 = 25% 40-49 = 12.5% 50-59 = 12.5%</p> <p>Our age profile differs from the corporate profile with more in the lower/mid age ranges and less in the upper range.</p> <p>It is very hard to know the implications on this protected characteristic until the review of the Emergency Planning Team and any subsequently required changes are confirmed. Any impacts are considered to be neutral or low. As previously stated, the service is already currently carrying vacancies and if further changes were required, stringent processes would be put in place to ensure that individuals are not unfairly disadvantaged because they possess a particular protected characteristic.</p>
Disability	<p>No staff in Emergency Planning have declared that they have a disability. This does not mean that measures will not be taken to ensure changes do not disadvantage those from the protected characteristic group</p>
Gender Reassignment	<p>It is not thought that any potential changes will have any impact on this group and no staff have indicated that they are in this protected characteristic group</p>
Pregnancy and Maternity	<p>80% of staff within impacted team are women, and it is possible that at the time of any staff reviews there may be staff on maternity leave or currently pregnant. Any staff on maternity leave during any period of workforce change would be given the opportunity to engage in relevant consultation and be kept briefed throughout the process. This equally applies to those off on paternity and adoption leave. There is no evidence that this protected characteristic would be disproportionately affected by any workforce changes.</p>
Race	<p>Current ethnicity profile of the Emergency Planning Service is 100% white.</p> <p>It is very hard to know the implications on this protected characteristic until the review of the Emergency Planning Team and any subsequently required changes are confirmed. Any impacts are considered to be neutral or low. As previously stated, the service is already</p>

	currently carrying vacancies and if further changes were required, stringent processes would be put in place to ensure that individuals are not unfairly disadvantaged because they possess a particular protected characteristic.
Sex	The gender profile of the Emergency Planning Service; 20% male (compared to 24% male staff within HCC) 80% Female (compared to 76% staff within HCC) Therefore there is an uneven gender split within the service. It is very hard to know the implications on this protected characteristic until the review of the Emergency Planning Team and any subsequently required changes are confirmed. Any impacts are considered to be neutral or low. As previously stated, the service is already currently carrying vacancies and if further changes were required, stringent processes would be put in place to ensure that individuals are not unfairly disadvantaged because they possess a particular protected characteristic.
Sexual Orientation	There is no current data on this characteristic in the Emergency Planning Service. It is not thought that any changes to the service will have an impact on this protected characteristic
Marriage and Civil Partnership	No current data on this characteristic in the Emergency Planning Service. It is not thought that any changes to the service will have an impact on this protected characteristic
Poverty	The grade profile of staff working for Emergency Planning is in the middle ranges and reflects the nature of the roles required within the team. It is very hard to know the implications on this protected characteristic until the review of the Emergency Planning Team and any subsequently required changes are confirmed. Any impacts are considered to be neutral or low.
Rurality	No current data on this characteristic in the Emergency Planning Service. It is not thought that any changes to the service will have an impact on this protected characteristic

Table 4 Explanation and mitigation for medium and high impacts

Protected characteristic	Brief explanation of why this has been assessed as having medium or high negative impact	Is there a Geographical impact? If so, please explain -use list below to	Short explanation of mitigating actions
---------------------------------	---	---	--

		identify geographical area(s)	

Table 5 Consideration of and explanation for positive impacts

Protected characteristic	Brief explanation of why this has been assessed as having positive impact

Box 1 Please set out any additional information which you think is relevant to this impact assessment:

It should be noted the Emergency Planning Team is not a public facing service. It's primary focus is internal and with partners/stakeholders and driven by statutory regulations and requirements. Regardless of any restructure to the service, the statutory functions that Emergency Planning discharge on behalf of the council (Control of Major Accident Hazards, Civil Contingencies Act, sports ground safety), will always be fulfilled and take precedence over non statutory work. At this stage of the proposal there are no predicted impacts on other HCC departments and as such no EIA has been undertaken for the public.

Currently, any changes to the Emergency Planning Service structure are not thought or expected to have any impact on the protected and other characteristics. Once the review underway and the outcomes become clearer if it is found that any proposed changes do present a risk, either this EIA will be updated or a more detailed EIA will be conducted and undertaken along with any appropriate actions in response to the outcomes.

Box 2

If appropriate, (i.e., it is immediately evident that a full EIA is not necessary) please provide a short succinct assessment to show that due regard has been given and that there is no requirement for a full EIA:

--

