

## FULL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT/EQUALITY ANALYSIS

### FORM HRFEIA

<b>Name of Policy, Decision, Strategy, Service, Function, Other (Please indicate)</b>	Emergency Cover Review – Equality Analysis of the impact on the Community
<b>Name Lead Officer Job Designation</b>	Liz Sandiford
<b>Department</b>	Human Resources
<b>E-Mail Address</b>	ElizabethSandiford@lancsfirerescueservice.org.uk
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	01 December 2022
<b>Assessors:</b>	Mike Burnitt – Senior Partner McKenzie LLP

We carry out Full Equality Impact Assessments (EIA) where we are unsure or know that the policy/decision will have an impact on an equality group or further to completing an Initial analysis negative impacts have been identified. The EIA should be undertaken/started at the beginning of the policy development process before any decision is made.

It will be updated through the decision making/policy development process until the conclusion of the decision making/ policy development process and then it is completed.

#### External Input:

To ensure this Equality Impact Assessment was completed with maximum objectivity and to the correct legal and statutory standards, LFRS appointed an external Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) consultancy – McKenzie LLP, to complete this assessment.

Formed in 1996, McKenzie are one of the leading UK EDI consultancies having previously worked extensively within the UK blue light / emergency sector including the NFCC and a large number of UK fire and rescue services.

[www.diversitymckenzie.co.uk](http://www.diversitymckenzie.co.uk)



## 1. Overview

### The main aims/objectives of this policy<sup>1</sup> are:

The Service commenced a consultation process from 22 July 2022 to the 14 October 2022. The aim of the consultation was to consult with local communities and staff with regard to the proposals contained within the Emergency Cover Review. Several proposals were being considered, which further to feedback have been amended. This Equality Impact Assessment focuses on the impact on communities from an equality perspective in relation to the revised proposals.

In developing the proposals, the Service identified as of importance: The need for the Service to meet its response standards for the time it takes to reach incidents in every area of Lancashire, ensuring the Service had effective and resilient crewing arrangements to deliver its Services and assurance that the Service had the right equipment and technology, so it was fit for the future. Also of importance was the need to deliver a balanced budget in relation to the delivery of any change.

Following a 12-week consultation period the following changes are being considered, this equality analysis considers any impact on employees in relation to the proposed changes.

The introduction of Flexible Day Crewing (FDC) at St Annes and Penwortham Fire Stations this proposal will be subject to further consultation.

The introduction of a Flexible Wholetime Shift System (FWT).

The optimisation of emergency cover through the use of a dynamic cover software tool.

Strengthening the Services response to climate change emergencies.

Strengthening firefighting and rescue capabilities in high-rise and commercial buildings

Broaden on-call firefighting capabilities to strengthen operational response.

### Is the policy or decision new or under review or existing<sup>2</sup>

New/Proposed

Modified/Reviewed/Updated/Adapted

Existing but new EIA

### The main intended people or groups that will be most affected by this policy are:

Members of the Community

## 2. Findings/Evidence

**Findings/Evidence: The following information/data has been considered in developing this policy/decision (This may include census data, the results of any consultation with community groups or representative bodies.)**

What did you do/consider, list any consultation with	What did it say
--	-----------------

<sup>1</sup> Policy refers to any policy strategy, procedure, function decision or delivery of service

<sup>2</sup> To tick the box: right click, properties, click check the box

<p><b>employees, service users, unions, members of the public</b></p>	
<p>Consultation undertaken by Pearson Insight were commissioned to undertake consultation which commenced 22 July 2022 for 12 weeks and closed 14 October 2022</p> <p>Use of social media and “In the know” to target audiences as well as Libraries</p> <p>Three methods of feeding back into the Service were utilised:  Online public survey  Online staff survey  Via consultation email in box</p> <p>969 responses were received to the public consultation, with the majority from local residents. Of the resident respondents, they were most likely to live in South Ribble or Lancaster.</p> <p>912 responses were from local residents, 44 were from an organisation, 13 members of staff also used this form of consultation. Stakeholder responses were more likely to be from a town or parish council or another public sector organisation.</p> <p>The majority of respondents were aged 56 to 74 with an increasing number aged 55 to 64 years of age. There was an even split of female and male respondents. The majority were of English, Welsh, Scottish, Northern Irish or White British. Around a quarter indicated that they had a physical, sensory or mental condition or illness that was expected to last 12 months or more.</p>	<p>Stakeholders were more likely than staff to feel reviewing data and trends as part of the review as important. Public sector representatives were more likely than others to feel considering the impact on staff was important. Public Sector respondents also felt that considering the impact of climate change was very important.</p> <p>82% of stakeholder respondents agreed that the proposals in the consultation represented value – for – money.  77% of stakeholder respondents agreed that the emergency cover review reflected the most effective and efficient use of resources.  91% of stakeholder respondents agreed that ensuring response standards could be met was the most important consideration if introducing new crewing arrangements.  64% of stakeholder respondents agreed that the flexibility offered by the flexible wholetime system would appeal to people considering joining the Fire Service.  66% of stakeholder respondents agreed that the proposal to introduce the flexible wholetime duty system will provide efficient and effective emergency cover.  50% of stakeholder respondents agreed with the proposal to replace DCP with FDC at St Annes whilst 39% were either neutral or did not know, 45% of stakeholder respondents agreed with the proposal to replace DCP with FDC in Penwortham whilst 45% were neutral or did not know.</p> <p>93% of stakeholder responses agreed with the proposal to introduce fire appliances with off-road capabilities.  93% stakeholder respondents agreed with the proposal to introduce specialist flood water incident management.  95% of stakeholder respondents agreed with the overall approach to dealing with climate change emergencies in Lancashire.  84% of stakeholder respondents agreed with the proposal to move resources around the County using the dynamic cover software.  89% of stakeholder respondents agreed with the proposal to expand training opportunities for on-call firefighters to strengthen operational response.  Residents also provided a range of additional considerations for the emergency cover review:  Views of the fire service and staff / ensure staff should be taken on board in relation to change and how changes impact staff. Full consultation has taken place with staff and measures are being put in place to mitigate the impact of any change.  Sufficient staffing needs to be in place to cover all existing emergencies. Longer response times for “lower risk” and “rural” area is not acceptable. Consideration of traffic densities, accessibility of roads and roadworks. In developing the proposals, crewing models were developed</p>

taking into consideration time required for leave, training, possible sickness and protracted incidents. Full consideration was given to meeting response times in accordance with our robust response standards. In assessing the risks and the most effective deployment of resources, population, types of housing and traffic networks are all taken into consideration.

79% of respondents agreed that the proposals represented value for money.

Whilst no key impact on communities was identified from an equality perspective, further to the consultation, a comment was made that the needs of physically disabled people to be considered when responding to incidents. In terms of its approach when responding to incidents, firefighters would look to meet the needs of disabled people.

Two thirds of residents agreed with the overall proposal to introduce flexible wholtime duty system.

Flexibility within shift systems were seen as positive, the original proposal re the shifts was identified as not family friendly, this proposal has subsequently been amended. Some positive comments were received in relation to the proposals resulting in reducing fatigue and helping recruitment and retention.

50% of resident respondents agree with the proposal to replace DCP with flexible day crewing at St Annes whilst 32% were neutral or did not know.

48% of resident respondents agreed with the proposal to replace DCP with flexible day crewing at Penwortham 33% were neutral or did not know.

There were some comments in relation to longer response time, but response times will still be within our robust response standards.

93% of residents agreed with the proposal to introduce fire appliances with off-road capabilities.

91% of residents agreed with the proposal to introduce specialist flood water incident management.

89% generally agreed with the overall approach to dealing with climate change emergencies.

76% of resident respondents agreed with moving resources around the County to provide the most effective and efficient emergency response using a dynamic cover software tool

90% of resident respondents agreed with the proposal to expand training opportunities for On Call firefighters to strengthen the operational response.

No comments or feedback was received which identified a negative impact on any equality group in relation to the proposals.

### 3. Equality Impact

Using the table below please indicate whether the policy/strategy/decision has a positive, negative or no impact from an equalities perspective on any of the protected equality groups listed below.

<b>Equality</b>	<b>Positive Impact</b> It could benefit	<b>Negative Impact</b> It could disadvantage	<b>Reason why there is a positive and negative impact</b> and any mitigating actions already in place to reduce any negative impact	<b>No Impact</b>
<b>Age</b> People of all ages				X
<b>Disability</b> Physical Disability Learning Disability Learning Difficulty Mental Health				X
<b>Gender Identity/ Gender Reassignment</b>				X
<b>Pregnancy and Maternity</b>				X
<b>Race</b> Ethnicity Nationality				X
<b>Belief or Religion</b>				X
<b>Gender</b> Men/Women				X
<b>Sexual Orientation</b> Lesbian, Gay and bisexual people				X

<b>Marriage and Civil Partnership</b> (employment only)				X
<b>Other groups who are not protected under the Equality Act</b> Examples include social economic factors (i.e. poverty, isolation), unemployment, homelessness, rurality, health inequalities any other disadvantage.				X
<b>Contributes to equality of opportunity</b>				X
<b>Contributes to fostering good relationships between different groups</b>				X
<b>The decision will be taken in compliance with Human Rights <sup>3</sup></b>	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	No	<input type="checkbox"/>		

#### 4. Outcome of the Equality Impact Assessment: Actions to be taken

<b>What course of action does the Equality Impact assessment Suggest you take</b>	
<b>Outcome 1 - No major change required</b> The EIA has not identified any potential discrimination or adverse impact and all opportunities to promote equality have been taken.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Outcome 2 - Adjust the policy</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<sup>3</sup> Human Rights are the basic rights and freedoms that belong to every person in Europe regardless of nationality and citizenship. Human Rights are based on the five FREDA principles: Fairness, Respect, Equality, Dignity, Autonomy.

<p>To remove the negative impact identified in the EIA or to promote better equality.</p>	
<p><b>Outcome 3 - Continue with the policy despite negative impact – Stop and Think</b></p> <p>You need to ensure the Equality Impact Assessment clearly sets out the justification for continuing with it. You should consider whether there are sufficient plans to reduce the negative impact and to monitor impact. Complete the EIA Action Plan.</p> <p>If you are continuing with the policy despite the negative impact you need to seek guidance from the Head of Human Resources as this shows the EIA demonstrates a significant impact on people with a protected characteristic</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>