

INTEGRATED IMPACT ASSESSMENT COVERING

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

STAGE 1 - DO I NEED AN INTEGRATED IMPACT ASSESSMENT?

Name of policy or proposal: Withdraw from Food for Life	
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
Equalities: 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		
Socio-economic <i>Not every person/family has access to regular income or savings. Will your proposal have an adverse impact on them</i> Note: lower welfare /quality does not change the requirement to meet prescribed nutritional standards for school meals	X		
Does your proposal impact on the human rights of people?	X		
Does your proposal impact on the rights of children and young people		X	

Reasoning

Briefly describe your reasoning for the responses given above:

Rights of Children

Article 12: Respect of the rights of views of the child. The proposal may impact on the children view with regards animal welfare and food standards

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

<p>1. Describe what the service does: The Catering service currently procures food items for school meals in accordance with the Food for Life Scheme. This means that currently all fresh meat and poultry are Red Tractor or QMS accredited. Also produce is locally sourced as much as possible.</p>
<p>2. Who are your main stakeholders? The main stakeholders are: School Pupils Catering Staff</p>
<p>3. What changes as a result of the proposals? Is the service reduced or removed? The proposal relates to withdrawing from Food for Life scheme. This would mean sourcing lower welfare foods. Fresh poultry would no longer be Red Tractor or QMS accredited. Most of the fresh chicken would not be of a UK origin, as most non Red Tractor chicken is from Poland</p>
<p>4. How will this affect your customers? The impact could be that a child's beliefs are not taken in account with regards the provision of school meals is compromised.</p>
<p>5. Impact on staff providing the service There should no impact on staff from this proposal.</p>

6. Please indicate if these apply to any of the protected characteristics	
Protected groups	Potential impacts and considerations
Race	
Disability	
Carers (for elderly, disabled or minors)	
Sex	
Pregnancy and maternity (including breastfeeding)	
Sexual orientation	
Age (include children, young people, midlife and older people)	
Religion, and or belief	
Gender reassignment	

Inequalities arising from socio-economic differences	
--	--

Human rights

List of convention rights	Describe, where applicable, if and how specific rights are engaged
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>	The proposal may impact on a child's view with regards animal welfare and food standards resulting in a child refusing to eat the school meal.
<i>Article 3 of Protocol 1: Right to free elections by secret ballot</i>	

Children's Rights and Wellbeing

Relevant articles – UNCRC	
Article 2 – Non discrimination	
Article 12 – Respect of the views of the child	The proposal may impact on a child's view with regards how animals bred for food consumption should be treated, and the level of animal welfare and food standards that should be achieved, in order for the child to be prepared to eat the produce.
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?

Performance data	
Internal consultation	Catering Management Team Head of Service Members Trade Union Representatives
Consultation with affected groups	
Local statistics	
National statistics	
Other	

8. Evidence gaps

Do you need additional information in order to complete the information in the previous questions?
There is no data available with regards whether a child (or even a parent) would be willing to eat food which has been prepared to lower levels of welfare and standards.

9. Mitigating action

Can the impact of the proposed policy/activity be mitigated? Please explain
The only mitigation would be for children to bring their own food to eat or purchase produce from the high street that meets the required standards.

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?
There is no statutory regulations for school meals to be prepared in accordance with 'Food for Life'. However the nutritional content of meals is regulated.
The proposals are potentially proportionate in the wider sense as it is unknown whether the perceived issues would be a deemed negative within the school environment given the wider considerations as regards making savings. Food for Life is a quality standard but school meals would still fully meet nutritional standards

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. The impacts relate to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protected characteristics under the Equalities Act • Socio Economic impact and inequality • Human rights/rights of the Child 	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.	TBC
6. Further consultation with affected groups is needed.	
7. It is advised not to go ahead with the proposals.	TBC

Decision

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

The impact on potential views of the child is cannot be quantified but where there is an ethical objections food can be brought from home or sourced elsewhere with the result that the saving is viewed as a proportionate means of achieving savings

Date of Decision: 11.10.23 RG in absence of NM

Sign off and authorisation:

Service	
Department	
Policy/activity subject to IIA	
We have completed the integrated impact assessment for this policy/activity.	Name: Paul Wolverson Position: Service Manager Date: 22 September 2023
Authorisation by head of service	Name: Nicola Moss Position: Head of Environmental & Commercial Service Date: 29 September 2023
Permission to publish on website -	
Please return this form to the Equal Opportunities Officer, Chief Executive's Office.	