

<b>AssessmentNo</b>	79	<b>Owner</b>	RHolling	
<b>Resource</b>	Transformation		<b>Service/Establishment</b>	Resources
	First Name	Surname	<b>Job title</b>	
<b>Head Officer</b>	Richard	Holling	Corporate Debt Officer	
	(include job titles/organisation)			
<b>Members</b>	Ricardo Rea &Richard Holling			
	<i>(Please note: the word 'policy' is used as shorthand for strategy policy function or financial decision)</i>			
<b>Policy Title</b>	Procurement of Debt Services and Sheriff Officers for new contract			
	<b>The aim, objective,purpose and intended out come of policy</b>			
	Walker Love 5 year contract ending on 31/3/19 and we need to continue to provide these services for collections			
	<b>Service/Partners/Stakeholders/service users involved in the development and/or implementation of policy.</b>			
	Finance and housing			
<b>Does the proposals involve the procurement of any goods or services?</b>			Yes	
<b>If yes please confirm that you have contacted our procurement services to discuss your requirements.</b>			Yes	
<b>SCREENING</b>				
<i>You must indicate if there is any relevance to the four areas</i>				
<b>Duty to eliminate discrimination (E), advance equal opportunities (A) or foster good relations (F)</b>			Yes	
<b>Relevance to Human Rights (HR)</b>			Yes	
<b>Relevance to Health Impacts (H)</b>			Yes	
<b>Relevance to Social Economic Impacts (SE)</b>			Yes	
<b>Who will be affected by this policy?</b>				
Residents of West Dunbartonshire, Corporate Debt Team				
<b>Who will be/has been involved in the consultation process?</b>				
Finance and ProcurementThis EIA process builds on the wrok carried out in 2013, and prior tenders.The previous EIA can be view at <a href="https://www.west-dunbarton.gov.uk/media/2432266/debt_collection_arrangements_eia_3.pdf">https://www.west-dunbarton.gov.uk/media/2432266/debt_collection_arrangements_eia_3.pdf</a>				
<b>Please outline any particular need/barriers which equality groups may have in relation to this policy list evidence you are using to support this and whether there is any negative impact on particular groups.</b>				
	<b>Needs</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Impact</b>	
<b>Age</b>			No likley Impact	
<b>Cross Cutting</b>	All of the Councils services, whether provided directly or by third parties need to be free of discrimination and accessible.	Past contracts have run without any complaints of discrimination. The current tender process will have the same requirements. All potential	Therefore we have not identified any potential differential impacts	

		contractors will have to prove membership of relevant trade bodies. Tenders will have to comply with the Council's overall requirements on Equality and procurement.	
<b>Disability</b>			No likely Impact
<b>Social &amp; Economic Impact</b>			No likely Impact
<b>Gender</b>			No likely Impact
<b>Gender Reassign</b>			No likely Impact
<b>Health</b>			No likely Impact
<b>Human Rights</b>			No likely Impact
<b>Marriage &amp; Civil Partnership</b>			No likely Impact
<b>Pregnancy &amp; Maternity</b>			No likely Impact
<b>Race</b>			No likely Impact
<b>Religion and Belief</b>			No likely Impact
<b>Sexual Orientation</b>			No likely Impact
<b>Actions</b>			
<b>Policy has a negative impact on an equality group, but is still to be implemented, please provide justification for this.</b>			
No negative impacts have been identified.			
<b>Will the impact of the policy be monitored and reported on an ongoing basis?</b>			
Contracts are always monitored on an ongoing basis. If we did receive any complaints these would be investigated and referred to the contractor. The Council has a clear complaints process in place with the public and with any contractor.			
<b>Q7 What is your recommendation for this policy?</b>			
Introduce			
<b>Please provide a meaningful summary of how you have reached the recommendation</b>			
The proposal has been screened and Impact Assessed as it was identified as relevant to equalities. This impact assessment built on that carried out in 2013, when the service was last out for tender. The process identified no likely differential impacts, either negative or positive. From an equalities perspective the proposal is therefore acceptable, and would continue to help us provide accessible and fair services.			