

Form A – Relevance Test – for change of name of Pensioner Forum

Function/Service Being Assessed:

1. Populations served/affected:

- Universal (service covering all residents)?
- Targeted (currently the meetings have been aimed at people who are retired).

2. Is it relevant to the general equality duty? (see Q and A for definition of 'general duty')

Which of these three aspects does the function relate to (if any)?:

- 1 – Eliminating discrimination, harassment and victimisation
- 2 – Advancing equality of opportunity
- 3 – Fostering good relations

Is there any evidence or reason to believe that some groups could be differently affected?
Currently the Pensioner Forum has been aimed at people who are retired

- Yes
- No

Which equality categories are affected?

- Race
- Age
- Sexual Orientation
- Disability
- Gender
- Religion
- Gender reassignment
- Marriage / civil partnership
- Maternity / Pregnancy

3. What is the degree of relevance?

In your view, is the information you have on each category adequate to make a decision about relevance?

- Yes (specify which categories)
- No (specify which categories)

Are there any triggers for this review (for example is there any public concern that functions/services are being operated in a discriminatory manner?) If yes please indicate which: promotion of the forum meetings is not being undertaken on some local social media platforms and in the local newspaper due to the current name of the forum being considered as a barrier to access.

- Yes
- No

4. Conclusion

On the basis of the relevance test would you say that there is evidence that a medium or high detrimental impact is likely? (See below for definition)

- Yes
- No

Note: if a medium or high detrimental impact has been identified then a full impact assessment must be undertaken using Form B.

Completed forms should be attached as an appendix to the relevant report and a copy sent to the Community Partnerships Unit in Leisure and Community Services

Definition of Low, Medium or High detrimental impact.

For any one (or more) equality group the following evidence is found:

	<p>Evidence may come from one or more of the following sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local service data • Data from a similar authority (including their EIA) • Customer feedback • Stakeholder feedback • National or regional research
High Relevance	<p>The evidence shows a clear disparity (of more than 80% probability) between different sections of the community in one or more of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • levels of service access; • quality of service received; or • outcomes of service.
Medium Relevance	<p>The evidence is unclear (or there is no evidence) if there is any disparity in terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • levels of service access; • quality of service received; or • outcomes of service.
Low Relevance	<p>The evidence shows clearly (at least 80% certainty) there is no disparity in terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • levels of service access; • quality of service received; or • outcomes of service..