

## INTEGRATED IMPACT ASSESSMENT COVERING

- EQUALITIES & SOCIO ECONOMIC DUTIES
- HUMAN RIGHTS AND RIGHTS OF THE CHILD

### STAGE 1 - DO I NEED AN INTEGRATED IMPACT ASSESSMENT?

<b>Name of policy or proposal:</b> <b>Communities Service/Education Resources &amp; Communities</b> <b>A6-4 - Option 3: Reduction of CSU Support for Participatory Budgeting</b>	
Is this a	Mark X below
New activity, programme or policy?	
Change to an existing activity, programme or policy?	x
Budget proposal?	

Duties: tick the boxes you think apply	No	Maybe	Yes
<b>Equalities:</b> Will your proposal have an impact on groups with protected characteristics?  <i>Consider the impact of your proposal on people and how they access your services and information without barriers.</i>		x	
<b>Socio-economic</b>  <i>Not every person/family has access to regular income or savings. Will your proposal have an adverse impact on them</i>		x	
Does your proposal impact on the <b>human rights</b> of people?			
Does your proposal impact on the <b>rights of children</b> and young people			

<p><b>Reasoning</b> Briefly describe your reasoning for the responses given above: <i>Participatory Budgeting (PB) processes supported by the team include playparks, youth facilities, active travel, school Pupil Equity Fund allocation etc. Mainstream funding has</i></p>
--

*been allocated through a PB process so the argument would be that this could happen without PB – what would be lost would be the community engagement that involves the key stakeholders and leads to better outcomes.*

**If you have answered “maybe” or “yes” to any of the Stage 1 questions above then proceed to complete the Stage 2 Integrated Impact Assessment questions below.**

**If you have answered “no” to the Stage 1 questions above then provide the details below and submit to [email]**

Lead Officer for developing the contract	
Other people involved in the screening (this may be council staff, partners or others i.e. contractor or community)	
Date	

## **STAGE 2: INTEGRATED IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

### **Brief description of the affected service**

1. Describe what the service does:

***The Community Support Unit has a corporate role in supporting the delivery of mainstream Participatory Budgeting, working with services to develop participatory budgeting processes to ensure effective community engagement and participation in the prioritisation of spend within local communities, and supporting community groups to access additional external funding where appropriate***

***The two permanent Participatory Budgeting posts were created in 2021 through Transform to support council teams to work towards the Scottish Government target of a minimum of 1% of the Council budget being determined through Participatory Budgeting processes***

**Funding leveraged in as a result of the PB approach has secured funding of more than the salary costs to improve the provision of play-parks and other facilities for the council.**

2. Who are your main stakeholders?

*Internally – the services who are utilising main stream funding through the use of Participatory Budgeting,*

*Corporately – the Council itself as the PB approach has been wholly aligned with the existing Corporate Plan and in meeting the requirements to deliver 1% of budget through PB.*

*Externally – The PB team are advising the Youth Work team who have been asked to develop a PB campaign for young people for Money for Moray/tsi MORAY as part of the Just Transition PB programme.*

3. What changes as a result of the proposals? Is the service reduced or removed?

*This proposal would mean a significant loss of expertise which has been developed over the past two years in delivering using a PB approach. The CSU would no longer be able to support PB activity if the posts are not deemed to be necessary so will displace the work to services to do themselves.*

*One of the posts has developed a level of expertise in utilising CONSUL as a tool for engagement around PB. This staff member has also been instrumental in developing that platform which will be key in the budget public engagement process and council engagement going forward.*

4. How will this affect your customers?

*It will be a significant statement of intent from the council to reduce our commitment to community engagement and the notion of a co-operative delivery model. The benefits of the approach have been recognised in the previous and most recent Best Value audits which are fully objective assessments of the positive impact of the PB approach*

5. Impact on staff providing the service – *Both staff members are female and one is just recovering from an underlying health issue and the other is currently taking part in further education to achieve a CLD qualification. In addition the Level 7 post holder delivers wider support to the service and the authority ( e.g developing the online CONSUL platform for the Budget Engagement process)*

**6. Please indicate if these apply to any of the protected characteristics**

Protected groups	Potential impacts and considerations
Race	
Disability	<i>The playpark engagements have all included a design element which has included awareness raising around inclusive access</i>

Carers (for elderly, disabled or minors)	
Sex	<i>Significant numbers of mothers have got involved in the Playpark proposals – for example the added value brought in the Rothes Playpark example has been showcased at national events</i>
Pregnancy and maternity (including breastfeeding)	
Sexual orientation	
Age (include children, young people, midlife and older people)	<i>Majority of the PB processes so far have focussed on children and young people</i>
Religion, and or belief	
Gender reassignment	
Inequalities arising from socio-economic differences	

### Human rights

<b>List of convention rights</b>	<b>Describe, where applicable, if and how specific rights are engaged</b>
Article 5: Right to liberty and security	
Article 6: Right to a fair trial	
Article 8: Right to respect for private and family life, correspondence and the home	
<i>Article 10: Freedom of expression</i>	
<i>Article 11: Freedom of assembly and association</i>	
<i>Article 12: Right to marry</i>	
<i>Article 14: Prohibition of discrimination (in relation to the convention rights)</i>	
<i>Article 1 of Protocol 1: Protection of property</i>	
<i>Article 2 of Protocol 1: Right to education</i>	
<i>Article 3 of Protocol 1: Right to free elections by secret ballot</i>	


### Children's Rights and Wellbeing

<b>Relevant articles – UNCRC</b>	
Article 2 – Non discrimination	
Article 12 – Respect of the views of the child	

Article 3.1 – Best interest of the child	
Article 6.2 – Right to survival and development	

**7. Evidence.** What information have you used to make your assessment?

<b>Performance data</b>	<p><i>The Best Value Audit report in 2020, and follow up in 2022, highlighted the positive work undertaken by the CSU and noted the good foundations that have been laid in terms of working cooperatively with our communities to improve people’s lives; an approach that is becoming increasingly important for the Council and Community Planning Partners as we face budgetary challenges in delivering public services to the extent previously expected.</i></p> <p><i>The as yet unpublished report of the most recent Best Value Audit strongly endorses the PB approach being used and suggests that the council should be doing more of this – which is consistent with discussions at Leadership Forum around future delivery models.</i></p> <p><i>The following PB processes are currently live</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Open Spaces – Tomnavoulin Park (Glenlivet) 30k plus 10k leveraged. Letterfourie Park (Buckie) 50K plus 10k leverages Mannachie Playpark ( Forres) 70K plus 15k leverage. Forres Outdoor Gym ( all external 72k leveraged) Morven Playpark ( Findochty) (70k – park installed) Logie Playpark ( Cullen ) – 70k – park installed</i></li> <li>• <i>Economic Growth and Development Arts and Culture Activity ( UK Shared Prosperity) 100k</i></li> <li>• <i>Communities (CLD) Youth Facilities/Activities ( Forres/Buckie) 120K</i></li> <li>• <i>Active Travel Keith and Buckie ( 25k each)</i></li> <li>• <i>Education St Thomas’s PS Pupil Equity Fund ( 5k ) Seafied Primary Pupil Equity Fund ( 1k)</i></li> </ul>
-------------------------	---

<b>Internal consultation</b>	<i>Not possible at this stage due to confidentiality. Future requirement for consultation with impact services</i>
<b>Consultation with affected groups</b>	<i>Not possible at this stage due to confidentiality. Future requirement for further consultation required with external stakeholders impacted by option</i>
<b>Local statistics</b>	 20220721 COSLA Participatory Budgetir <i>Moray Councils most recent PB return is here</i>
<b>National statistics</b>	<a href="#"><u>Annual Summary Report 2021/22</u></a> – National PB Strategic Group
<b>Other</b>	<i>PB is a process to involve people in decision making about how finance is allocated but it is as much about the process as the spend. The relatively small 5k project in St Thomas’s PS is a good example where the sum involved is small but the impact is high – in this case as the process allowed the school to engagement with many more parents than they have been able to through any other methods.</i>

**8. Evidence gaps**

Do you need additional information in order to complete the information in the previous questions?  
*This is a more challenging IIA to complete as the case is strong as to why the council should continue to use this approach – but what is not clear (or costed) in the proposal is the displacement cost to services who will have to design and deliver their own processes, This is perhaps part of a bigger decision as to the type of delivery model the council favours and if PB features within that.*

**9. Mitigating action**

Can the impact of the proposed policy/activity be mitigated? Please explain  
*If the PB Officer post was to go we do have a CSU officer post which the Grade 9 staff member could be relocated to.*

*The Grade 7 post supports the wider CSU workload including CONSUL which is going to be key throughout the current budget engagement process and beyond **and serious consideration should be given to maintain that function within the team as it has wider corporate impacts.***

## 10. Justification

If nothing can be done to reduce the negative impact(s) but the proposed policy/activity must go ahead, what justification is there to continue with the change?

STAGE 1

## SECTION 3 CONCLUDING THE IIA

### Concluding the IIA

1. No potential negative impacts on any of the protected groups were found.	
2. Some potential negative impacts have been identified.  <i>The impacts relate to: the loss of the approach and the added benefits it brings and the impact on two staff members</i>	x
Reducing discrimination, harassment, victimisation or other conduct prohibited under the Equality Act 2010	
Promoting equality of opportunity	
Fostering good relations	
3. The proposals interfere with human rights and/or the rights of the child	
4. Negative impacts can be mitigated the proposals as outlined in question 8	
5. The negative impacts cannot be fully mitigated but are justified as outlined in question 9.	x
6. Further consultation with affected groups is needed.	x
7. It is advised not to go ahead with the proposals.	

**Decision**

Set out the rationale for deciding whether or not to proceed with the proposed actions:

**Date of Decision:**



**Sign off and authorisation:**

<b>Service</b>	Communities
<b>Department</b>	Education Resources and Communities
<b>Policy/activity subject to IIA</b>	A6-4 Option 3
We have completed the integrated impact assessment for this policy/activity.	Name: Kevin McDermott Position: Communities Services Manager Date: 2 October 2023
Authorisation by head of service	Name: Andy Hall Position: Acting Head of Education Resources and Communities Date: 11 <sup>th</sup> October 2023
Permission to publish on website -	
Please return this form to the Equal Opportunities Officer, Chief Executive's Office.	