



Equality Impact/Fairer Scotland Duty Assessment Form

(To be completed with reference to Guidance Notes)

Step 1

Name of Proposal (includes e. g. budget savings, committee reports, strategies, policies, procedures, service reviews, functions):

Review of the Kerbside Recycling Service (KRS) with recommendation of a revised system.

It was agreed that the current KRS should be reviewed at the Communities meeting in August 2022 (reference Report [189/22](#)) to align the service with forthcoming national policy changes and also to make savings identified in the Finance and Change Plan (reference Report [40/23](#)).

Step 2

Is this only a **screening** Equality Impact Assessment No

(A) If Yes, please choose from the following options **all** reasons why a full EIA/FSD is not required:

- | | |
|--|--------|
| (i) It does not impact on people | Yes/No |
| (ii) It is a percentage increase in fees which has no differential impact on protected characteristics | Yes/No |
| (iii) It is for information only | Yes/No |
| (iv) It is reflective e.g. of budget spend over a financial year | Yes/No |
| (v) It is technical | Yes/No |

If you have answered yes to any of points above, please go to **Step 16**, and sign off the Assessment.

(B) If you have answered No to the above, please indicate the following:

Is this a full Equality Impact Assessment	Yes
Is this a Fairer Scotland Duty Assessment	No

If you have answered Yes to either or both of the above, continue with Step 3.

If your proposal is a **strategy** please ensure you complete Step 13 which is the Fairer Scotland Duty Assessment.

Step 3

(i)Lead Directorate/Service:

(ii)Are there any **relevant** statutory requirements affecting this proposal? If so, please describe.

National Policy landscape

- Deposit Return Scheme (DRS) which will see plastic bottles and cans widely recycled at locations other than in kerbside recycling bins thus making our current system inefficient.
- Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) for Packaging which will result (from 2025) in payments to local authorities that are likely to be dependent on efficient recycling schemes where both income and the quality of recyclables are maximised (current system costs money to sort materials for disposal so does not realise income).
- Circular Economy Bill which introduces a requirement for authorities to meet a recycling Code of Practice; this is expected to look similar to the current voluntary CoP which requires paper and card, and glass, to be collected separately from other materials – we do not currently meet this requirement.

DRS is enshrined in Scottish Law and is expected to be implemented in October 2025 (at the earliest); EPR is expected to be legislated in 2024 and secondary legislation from the Circular Economy Bill at an unknown date.

(iii)What is the aim of the proposal? Please give full details.

To review the KRS with recommendation of a revised system as below and to introduce a policy whereby purple bins containing too many recyclables would be treated as contaminated and would not be emptied.

New system:

- Paper and card collected in a blue recycling bin;
- Cans and plastics collected in a grey recycling bin;
- Glass collected at recycling points;
- Food waste collected at the kerbside (service extended to more households)
- Garden waste as is.

(iv)Is it a new proposal? Yes Please indicate OR

Is it a review of e.g. an existing budget saving, report, strategy, policy, **service review**, procedure or function? Yes/No Please indicate

The need for service review agreed in August 2022 (reference Report [189/22](#)).

Step 4: Which people does your proposal involve or have consequences for?

Please indicate all which apply:

Employees	Yes/No
Job Applicants	Yes/No
Service users	Yes/No
Members of the public	Yes/No

Positive employee impact as will require the recruitment of four new staff members to crew the two new food waste vehicles that are required for the extension of the food waste service. All Angus residents will be impacted by changes to the KRS.

Step 5: List the evidence/data/research that has been used in this assessment (links to data sources, information etc which you may find useful are in the Guidance). This could include:

Internal data (e.g. customer satisfaction surveys; equality monitoring data; customer complaints).

KRS survey

A community engagement exercise was undertaken via the online kerbside recycling service survey which was open from 14 November – 11 December 2022; the survey was also available during this time as a paper survey that could be collected from libraries or provided through community councils or communities officers, and who could also provide assistance with completion. Results published on [AC website](#). 2464 responses were received.

Internal consultation (e.g. with staff, trade unions and any other services affected).

External data (e.g. Census, equality reports, equality evidence finder, performance reports, research, available statistics)

Market research with suppliers who process recycling to see what is acceptable to them and investigate pricing, particularly the ability to achieve income for recycling (rather than disposal cost as per current system) through service change.

External consultation (e.g. partner organisations, national organisations, community groups, other councils).

Research with local authorities already undertaking similar systems to that of proposed change to assess the likelihood of income generation from recyclable materials (and thus the ability to make savings as per the targets in the Finance and Change Plan), and also in terms of the quality of recycling achieved with regard to meeting national policy.

In addition data was sourced from a local authority that recently changed to collecting glass at recycling points rather than at the kerbside and found that glass tonnage was reduced by only 4%, indicating no significant barrier to participation.

Other (general information as appropriate).

Step 6: Evidence Gaps.

Are there any gaps in the equality information you currently hold? No

If yes, please state what they are, and what measures you will take to obtain the evidence you need.

Step 7: Are there potential differential impacts on protected characteristic groups?

Please complete for each group, including details of the potential impact on those affected. Please remember to take into account any particular impact resulting from **Covid-19**.

Please state if there is a potentially positive, negative, neutral or unknown impact for each group. Please state the reason(s) why.

Age

Impact

Negative – refer to mitigation in Step 9.

Physically carrying glass

One of the proposed changes involves taking glass to a recycling point instead of placing it in a bin at the kerbside. Elderly people may be less physically able to carry glass to a bring site though some may potentially travel to a supermarket or other recycling point by car (in passing, as we would not advocate making separate journeys) and thus make it manageable to use a recycling point.

Disability

Impact

Negative – refer to mitigation in Step 9.

Physically carrying glass

One of the proposed changes involves taking glass to a recycling point instead of placing it in a bin at the kerbside. Those people with a physical disability that means they are unable to carry glass to a bring site could be disadvantaged; some people in this situation may potentially travel to a supermarket or other recycling point by car (in passing, as we would not advocate making separate journeys) and thus make it manageable to use a recycling point.

Understanding the changes

People with learning disabilities or conditions such as dementia may find it difficult to understand the changes and those with visual impairments may not be able to read leaflets or website information.

Gender reassignment

Impact

Neutral.

Marriage and Civil Partnership

Impact

Neutral.

Pregnancy/Maternity

Impact

Negative – refer to mitigation in Step 9.

Physically carrying glass

One of the proposed changes involves taking glass to a recycling point instead of placing it in a bin at the kerbside. Those who are pregnant may be unable to carry glass to a bring site; some people in this situation may potentially travel to a supermarket or other recycling point by car (in passing, as we would not advocate making separate journeys) and thus make it manageable to use a recycling point.

Race - (includes Gypsy Travellers)

Impact

Neutral.

Religion or Belief

Impact

Neutral.

Sex

Impact

Neutral.

Sexual orientation

Impact

Neutral.

Step 8: Consultation with any of the groups potentially affected

If you have consulted with any group potentially affected, please give details of how this was done and what the results were.

The online and paper KRS survey gathered information relating to respondents' age. According to the National Records of Scotland, 25% of residents in Angus are over 65 – the survey response rate for this age group was 21% so is broadly representative. Of the

over 65s who responded, 42.5% disagreed with taking glass to a recycling point and this percentage was mirrored by those aged 55-64. Just under 50% of all respondents disagreed with taking glass to a recycling point, showing that elderly respondents were slightly less likely to disagree than younger residents.

If you have not consulted with any group potentially affected, how have you ensured that you can make an informed decision about mitigating action of any negative impact (Step 9)?

Step 9: What mitigating steps will be taken to remove or reduce potentially negative impacts?

For those that are physically unable to take their glass to a recycling point, there would be the option to place it in their purple non-recyclable (general) waste bin.

Where people with learning disabilities or conditions such as dementia find it difficult to understand the changes, we will ensure staff are available to communicate in a way that suits the person e.g. in person or by telephone. There may be a small minority of cases where a mental health disability means a resident is unable to sort their waste for recycling, and in such cases an exemption from the requirement may be given and residents may place all their waste in their purple non-recyclable (general waste) bin without fear of any repercussions.

Where visual impairment makes understanding leaflets or website information difficult, information can be adjusted to suit e.g. text provided in a format that is suitable for a 'text to speech' reading programme, or in Braille etc. Suitable formats will be produced in readiness for any such requests however all requests will be considered on an individual basis and any reasonable adjustments made to communications materials.

The use of a British Sign Language Video Link will also be considered.

Step 10: If a potentially negative impact has been identified, please state below the justification.

Changing glass from a kerbside collection and asking residents to bring their glass to a recycling point

It is necessary to review our KRS for the below reasons.

1. Align with policy changes e.g. the:
 - a. Deposit Return Scheme which will see plastic bottles and cans widely recycled at locations other than in kerbside recycling bins thus making our current system inefficient;
 - b. Extended Producer Responsibility for Packaging which will result (in future) in payments to local authorities that are likely to be dependent on efficient recycling schemes where potential income is maximised (our current system costs money to sort materials for disposal so does not realise income).
 - c. Circular Economy Bill which introduces a requirement for authorities to meet a recycling Code of Practice; this is expected to look similar to the current voluntary CoP which requires paper and card, and glass, to be collected separately from other materials – we do not currently meet this requirement.
2. Make savings as identified in the Finance and Change Plan.

The introduction of a separate kerbside glass collection was considered as part of an options appraisal however made the recycling system significantly more expensive to operate (as it requires additional vehicles to operate over and above the current system).

Data was sourced from a local authority that recently changed to collecting glass at recycling points rather than at the kerbside and found that glass tonnage was reduced by only 4%, indicating barriers to participation are not significant.

Step 11: In what way does this proposal contribute to any or all of the public sector equality duty to: eliminate unlawful discrimination; advance equality of opportunity; and foster good relations between people of different protected characteristics?

The equality of opportunity for people with disabilities has been ensured by addressing the negative impacts as detailed in Step 9.

Step 12: Is there any action which could be taken to advance equalities in relation to this proposal?

Not applicable.

Step 13: FAIRER SCOTLAND DUTY

This step is only applicable to **strategies** which are key, high level decisions. If your proposal is **not** a strategy, please leave this Step blank, and go to Step 14.

Links to data sources, information etc which you may find useful are in the Guidance.

Step 13(A) What evidence do you have about any socio-economic disadvantage/inequalities of outcome in relation to this strategic issue?

Step 13(B) Please state if there are any gaps in socio-economic evidence for this strategy and how you will take measures to gather the evidence you need.

Step 13(C) Are there any potential impacts this strategy may have specifically on the undernoted groupings? Please remember to take into account any particular impact resulting from **Covid-19**.

Please state if there is a potentially positive, negative, neutral or unknown impact for each grouping.

Low and/or No Wealth (e.g. those with enough money to meet basic living costs and pay bills but have no savings to deal with any unexpected spends and no provision for the future.

Impact

Material Deprivation (i.e. those unable to access basic goods and services e.g. repair/replace broken electrical goods, warm home, leisure and hobbies).

Impact

Area Deprivation (i.e. where people live (e.g. rural areas), or where they work (e.g. accessibility of transport).

Impact

Socio-economic Background i.e. social class including parents' education, people's employment and income.

Impact

Other – please indicate

Step 13(D) Please state below if there are measures which could be taken to reduce socio-economic disadvantage/inequalities of outcome.

Step 14: What arrangements will be put in place to monitor and review the Equality Impact/Fairer Scotland Duty Assessment?

The EIA will be monitored by the revised KRS project implementation group to ensure issues are addressed as identified in the EIA and any as yet unidentified issues are responded to going forwards.

Step 15: Where will this Equality Impact/Fairer Scotland Duty Assessment be published?

Will be published on Angus Council website along with committee report.

Step 16: Sign off and Authorisation. Please state name, post, and date for each:

Prepared by: Susanne Austin, Team leader – waste strategy & compliance, 21.08.23

Reviewed by: Doreen Phillips, Equalities Officer, 25.08.23

Approved by: Graeme Dailly, Director of Infrastructure and Environment, 05.09.23

NB. There are several worked examples of separate EIA and FSD Assessments in the Guidance which may be of use to you.
