

Site Level Equality Analysis for: London Cityside NINO Hub

Site reference: 71184

Date: 09/06/17

Completed by: [REDACTED]

Introduction

This document records the analysis undertaken by the Department to enable the decision maker to fulfil the requirements placed on them by the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) as set out in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010.

The PSED requires the decision maker to pay due regard to the need to:

- eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act;
- advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not; and
- foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.

In undertaking the analysis that underpins this document, where applicable, the Department has also taken into account the following:

- a) United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, in particular Article 9 on Accessibility (to services and buildings) and Article 27 on Work and Employment (in relation to employees); and
- b) United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, Article 3(1) (best interests of the child) when considering whether those with parental responsibilities may be affected by the proposal.

This equality analysis should be read together with the High Level Equality Analysis:

- Equality Analysis for Tranche 1, People and Locations Project dated September 2015
- Equality Analysis for Tranche 2, Front of House, People and Locations Project dated January 2016
- Equality Analysis for Tranche 2, Back of House, Corporate and Technology and Transformation Hubs, People and Locations Project dated January 2016

This equality analysis will be considered together with other relevant documents that form part of the Business Case when a final decision on the proposal is made.

Brief outline of the proposal

The proposal is to divest Cityside, 13-29 Settles Street (71184). City Towers (99600) will import 84 BOH staff from Cityside greatly increasing the utilisation of the building. The distance between Cityside and City Towers is 0.9 miles, 6 minutes by car and 8 minutes by bus. The NINO Hub operated from Cityside will move to City Towers.

Evidence and analysis

Potential impact on members of the public, external stakeholders or partners

There is no impact on members of the public, either in respect of those who share this protected characteristic or those who do not as this is a BoH site only with no public access to the building.

Race or Ethnicity – what potential impacts have been identified and how are they to be addressed

	Ethnic Minority	White
Tower Hamlets	54.81%	45.19%
National	24.60%	75.39%

Source: Census 2011 QS201EW (Ethnic group)

The percentage of ethnic minorities in the Tower Hamlets area is more than the national average.

There is no impact on members of the public, either in respect of those who share this protected characteristic or those who do not as this is a BoH site only with no public access to the building.

Disability – what potential impacts have been identified and how are they to be addressed

	Day-to-day activities limited a lot	Day-to-day activities limited a little	Day-to-day activities not limited
Tower Hamlets	6.79%	6.71%	86.50%
National	8.5%	9.4%	82.00%

Source: Census 2011 QS303EW (Long-term health problem or disability)

The percentage of the public in the Tower Hamlets region with a disability that limits day to day activities is less than the national average, which decreases the numbers of people with this protected characteristic that may be affected by this proposal. The data does not provide a breakdown of the types of disability or specific details on the type of impact that would be experienced.

There is no impact on members of the public, either in respect of those who share this

protected characteristic or those who do not as this is a BoH site only with no public access to the building.

Gender – what potential impacts have been identified and how are they to be addressed

	Male	Female
Tower Hamlets	51.52%	48.48%
National	49.17%	50.82%

Source: Census Data 2011 QS104EW (Sex)

There is no impact on members of the public, either in respect of those who share this protected characteristic or those who do not as this is a BoH site only with no public access to the building.

Age – what potential impacts have been identified and how are they to be addressed

	16-17	18-19	20-24	25-29	30-44	45-59	60-64
Tower Hamlets	2.63%	3.72%	16.36%	21.32%	37.29%	15.57%	3.11%
National	3.83%	4.02%	10.49%	10.57%	31.74%	30.01%	9.31%

Source: Census Data 2011 KS102EW (Age)

There is no impact on members of the public, either in respect of those who share this protected characteristic or those who do not as this is a BoH site only with no public access to the building.

Religion / Beliefs – what potential impacts have been identified and how are they to be dealt with

	Christian	Buddhist	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Other Religion	No Religion	Religion not stated
Tower Hamlets	27.08%	1.07%	1.65%	0.50%	34.51%	0.32%	0.32%	19.15%	15.38%
National	58.86%	0.15%	0.16%	0.04%	0.75%	0.33%	0.21%	32.66%	6.85%

Source: Census Data 2011 KS209EW (Religion)

There is no impact on members of the public, either in respect of those who share this protected characteristic or those who do not as this is a BoH site only with no public access to the building.

Other protected characteristics

Sexual orientation, Gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, marriage and civil partnership

There is no impact on members of the public, either in respect of those who share this protected characteristic or those who do not as this is a BoH site only with no public access to the building.

Any other equality impacts – what potential impacts have been identified that are not covered by the above categories and how are they to be addressed

None

Potential impact on members of staff

Summary of one to one conversations

121 conversations have been held with 83 out of the 84 staff. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] the Department will continue to consult with [REDACTED] and take reasonable steps to accommodate [REDACTED] requirements and mitigate potential negative impacts which have been identified. At this stage, the outcome of this consultation cannot be confirmed, though the Department remains committed to taking all reasonable steps in order to accommodate individual needs arising from the proposal.

All member of staff have agreed to relocate. 14 of these are outside of mobility. 4 members of staff have identified personal circumstances that could impact on mobility. They include.

[REDACTED]
(no mention of blue badge). The new site having no car park is not ideal but [REDACTED] willing to use public transport to move to new site, and will review on going [REDACTED] issues with LM. All adjustments currently in place will continue in new site.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] willing to move as finding [REDACTED] will hopefully not prove too problematic, as car parks can also be used.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] No mention of blue badge holder, but 1-2-1 indicates [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] has discussed a move to Dalston JCP with L/M instead.

[REDACTED] As the journey to City Tower JCP is further MOS concerned this could result in health issues, albeit [REDACTED] willing to try and then if need be discuss a move with LM to Dalston which is nearer as an option.

No issues have been received from external suppliers. External suppliers will have been

informed of the planned office closure and relocation as part of the stakeholder engagement and planned communication between the Department and the provider. They will also have been asked to confirm any potential impact on their staff.

Race or Ethnicity – what potential impacts have been identified and how are they to be addressed

	Ethnic Minority	White	Unknown
London Cityside NINO hub	50%	20%	30%
All DWP	8.97%	65.17%	25.86%

Source: Resource Management, December 2016

The percentage of ethnic minorities in the London Cityside NINO hub office is significantly higher than the DWP average, although there is a large percentage of “unknowns” so the variation is not completely certain.

No issues in this category have been raised in the course of the staff one-to-one meetings. No evidence has been presented to suggest that the proposal would have an impact on DWP or external suppliers’ members of staff because of their race or ethnicity.

Disability – what potential impacts have been identified and how are they to be addressed

	Disabled	Non-Disabled	Unknown
London Cityside NINO hub	4%	75%	21%
All DWP	5.63%	73.06%	21.31%

Source: Resource Management, December 2016

The percentage of staff with a disability in the London Cityside NINO hub office would appear to be slightly below the DWP average, although there is a large percentage of “unknowns” so the variation from average is not certain. Also, the data does not cover the type of impairments disabled employees have, or how they may be impacted by the changes.

1

The new site having no car park is not ideal willing to use public transport to move to new site, and will review on going issues with LM. All adjustments currently in place will continue in new site.

as car parks can also be used.

willing to try the journey etc and if too excessive has

discussed a move to Dalston JCP with L/M instead.

they are willing to try and then if need be discuss a move with LM to Dalston which is nearer as an option.

Gender – what potential impacts have been identified and how are they to be addressed

	Male	Female
London Cityside NINO hub	40%	60%
All DWP	32.18%	67.82%

Source: Resource Management, December 2016

London Cityside NINO hub has a lower percentage of female staff than all DWP.

The proposal could have an impact on those with caring responsibilities (for children or disabled people) which is likely to contain a higher proportion of women. The Department has to consider the worst case scenario in assessing potential impacts of the proposal. In some cases the additional distance could result in an increase in journey time for staff that can affect their caring responsibilities. For example a mother will have to pick up their child at fixed times.

However no issues have been raised in the course of the staff one-to-ones or from elsewhere. Should any arise, the Department considers that any negative impacts can be mitigated as part of business as usual at the office, by applying existing practices and policies, e.g. flexible working patterns.

The Department is currently consulting individuals and will take reasonable steps to accommodate their requirements, and mitigate the potential negative impacts which have been identified. At this stage, the outcome of this consultation cannot be confirmed, though the Department remains committed to taking all reasonable steps in order to accommodate individual needs arising from the proposal.

Gender Reassignment – what potential impacts have been identified and how are they to be addressed

No data is collected on the number of staff affected by gender reassignment.

It is not anticipated that staff would be disproportionately impacted because of gender reassignment as a result of the Estate Strategy and any potential relocation. No evidence has been presented following the 1-2-1 discussions or from elsewhere to suggest that the proposal would have a negative (or positive) impact on this group.

Should the need arise, consideration will be given on a case by case basis where there might be a need to conduct confidential or sensitive conversations in a separate room.

Age – what potential impacts have been identified and how are they to be addressed

	16-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55- 64	65+
London Cityside NINO hub	1%	13%	34%	31%	19%	2%
All DWP	2.92%	11.20%	22.39%	38.19%	23.83%	1.47%

Source: Resource Management, December 2016

The age distribution shows a slight variation against the DWP averages for these age groups. However, no evidence has been presented following the 1-2-1 discussions or from elsewhere to suggest that the proposal would have a negative (or positive) impact on anyone because of their age as a result of the office move to the nearby location at City Tower.

Sexual Orientation – what potential impacts have been identified and how are they to be addressed

Some voluntary data is collected by DWP on this protected characteristic, but the reporting level is low. The Department does not envisage that the proposal would have a particular adverse impact on those with any of these protected characteristics, or affect the other aims of the equality duty in relation to these groups.

No evidence has been presented following the 1-2-1 discussions or from elsewhere to suggest that the proposal would have a negative (or positive) impact on this group. Should the need arise, consideration will be given on a case by case basis where there might be a need to conduct confidential or sensitive conversations in a separate room.

Religion / Beliefs – what potential impacts have been identified and how are they to be addressed

DWP gathers some information on the religions and beliefs held by staff, however completion is voluntary and numbers cannot be broken down to an individual site level. DWP policy includes the provision, where possible in their buildings, for a quiet room for staff to use for prayer and contemplation.

[REDACTED]

Pregnancy / Maternity – what potential impacts have been identified and how are they to be addressed

At this stage it is not anticipated that pregnant staff or those on maternity leave would be disproportionately impacted as a result of the Estate Strategy and any potential relocation. Any member of staff on maternity leave will have an automatic right to relocate to a similar job role, without the need to complete any kind of selection exercise for particular job roles. Any member of staff who is pregnant will be fully consulted before and during their

maternity leave to ensure they will not be at a disadvantage due to their pregnancy or maternity leave.

No staff have been identified currently on maternity or paternity leave.

Marriage and civil partnership – what potential impacts have been identified and how are they to be addressed

While DWP collects data on next of kin, no data has been available from the Resource Management system for the compilation of this equality analysis.

It is not anticipated that staff would be disproportionately impacted because of their marriage or civil partnership as a result of the proposed move. No evidence has been presented following the 1-2-1 discussions or from elsewhere that the proposal would have a negative (or positive) impact on people with this protected characteristic

Any other equality impacts – what potential impacts have been identified that are not covered by the above categories and how are they to be addressed

Work Pattern

	Full-time	Part-time/Part Year
London Cityside NINO hub	60%	40%g
All DWP	59.74%	40.26%

Source: Resource Management December 2016

The London Cityside NINO office has a similar proportion of part time or part year staff than the DWP average.

No other significant risks with regard to equality issues have been identified and wider consultation has not been considered necessary at this stage. All staff likely to be impacted will be engaged by their managers in frequent one to one discussions, with the opportunity to explore their options and access the full range of support offered by DWP under Departmental workforce management and equality policies. Local Human Resources Business Partners and Trade Union representatives will be kept informed of all developments and will be available for staff to consult about their particular circumstances.

Summary of equality impacts

There is no anticipated impact on members of the public, either in respect of those who share this protected characteristic or those who do not.

[REDACTED] At this stage, the outcome of this consultation cannot be confirmed, though the Department remains committed to taking all reasonable steps in order to accommodate [REDACTED] needs arising from the proposal.

121 conversations have been held with 83 out of the 84 staff. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Department will continue to consult with [REDACTED] and take reasonable steps to accommodate [REDACTED] requirements and mitigate potential negative impacts which have been identified. At this stage, the outcome [REDACTED] cannot be confirmed, though the Department remains committed to taking all reasonable steps in order to accommodate [REDACTED] needs arising from the proposal.

All member of staff have agreed to relocate. 14 of these are outside of mobility. [REDACTED] members of staff have identified personal circumstances that could impact on mobility. The reasons have outlined in the body of this report and have been mitigated by outling next steps.

No issues have been received from external suppliers. External suppliers will have been informed of the planned office closure and relocation as part of the stakeholder engagement and planned communication between the Department and the provider. They will also have been asked to confirm any potential impact on their staff.

We conclude that there are no staff members with protected characteristics who will be disproportionately impacted when compared to other staff members without protected characteristics if this proposal is implemented.

Decision making

This site level equality analysis will be considered by the Implementation Assurance Group as part of the final decision on the proposal. The decision, together with reasons, will be produced by IAG.

Monitoring and review

As the Public Sector Equality duty is a continuing one, DWP will continue to monitor and review the impacts this proposal has had on individuals generally and those with protected characteristics. The impacts identified in this equality analysis and

mitigations put in place will be monitored and reviewed at London City side NINI Hub under existing policies and practices, as part of business as usual.

Ongoing monitoring should provide qualitative and quantitative evidence of the impacts that DWP may wish to subsequently address. It will also confirm whether the impacts anticipated in this equality analysis have been accurate, and may allow us to inform future decisions.

This EA will be further reviewed in the light of any additional evidence presented.