

## Form A – Relevance Test

**Function/Service Being Assessed: Play Area Capital Programme**

**Officer completing form: Charlotte Gomes**

**Date of completion: September 2021**

### 1. Populations served/affected:

☒ Universal (service covering all residents)?

☐ Targeted (service aimed at a section of the community –please indicate which)?

### 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?

☐ 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 – play facilities are freely accessible for all – consideration is given to those with a disability, including providing sensory play opportunities.

☐ 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:

☐ 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.

**Definition of Low, Medium or High detrimental impact.**

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

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