

### Screening/Scoping Pro Forma

<b>Section</b>	Electoral Services	<b>Officer responsible for the screening/scoping</b>	Lynda Murlewski Electoral Services Manager		
<b>Name of Policy to be assessed</b>	Elections Management	<b>Date of Assessment</b>	24/10/2008	<b>Is this a proposed new or existing policy/procedure/practice?</b>	Existing
<b>1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the policy/procedure/practice?</b>	To comply with all statutory requirements and deadlines for the conduct of elections in the Borough and to do the same for the Guildford Constituency when a UK Parliamentary election is called.				
<b>2. Are there any associated or specific objectives of the policy/procedure/practice? Please explain.</b>	<p>To ensure that everyone who is eligible to vote has the opportunity to exercise this right, and in the manner in which they chose to do so when an election is called.</p> <p>To deal with all candidates and agents in a helpful manner, remaining neutral at all times.</p>				
<b>3. Who is intended to benefit from this policy and in what way?</b>	Eligible electorate for the relevant elections and the associated candidates.				
<b>4. What outcomes are wanted from this policy/procedures/practice?</b>	Fair and transparent conduct of elections run in an efficient manner.				
<b>5. What factors/forces could contribute/detract from the outcomes?</b>	<p>Electoral services staff fail to conduct the elections in the appropriate manner e.g. misunderstanding the legislation.</p> <p>Insufficient trained electoral staff available to man all aspects of the poll/count.</p> <p>Failure of the computer system at key times.</p> <p>Failure of printers to deliver ballot papers/postal packs on time.</p> <p>Postal strike</p> <p>.....the list of factors is considerable and a risk assessment done before every major election to try and cover all aspects.</p>				
<b>6. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the policy?</b>	Eligible electors, candidates, election agents, political parties, suppliers of stationery and equipment, hirers of polling stations, computer software supplier.	<b>7. Who implements the policy, and who is responsible for the policy?</b>	Returning Officer/Local Returning Officer/Deputy Returning Officer/Acting Returning Officer according to the type of election.		

<b>8. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on racial groups?</b>	<b>N</b>	Certain nationalities are excluded but those who are to be included are written in legislation. Leaflets and some notices could be provided in languages other than English if necessary.
<b>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</b>	No adverse comments have been received from anyone. All households are contacted up to three times during the annual registration period in order to encourage people to register to vote.	
<b>9. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to gender?</b>	<b>N</b>	Not in this area.
<b>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</b>	This area does not have a high ethnic population where decisions taken by the 'head of household' tend to be more prevalent.	
<b>10. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to disability?</b>	<b>Y</b>	Polling stations need to be accessible and postal votes easy to understand and complete.
<b>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</b>	<p>We are obliged in law to comply with providing voting facilities for disabled people and do so in the form of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Polling stations with disabled access</li> <li>Polling booths with disabled booths</li> <li>Large size example ballot papers</li> <li>Template for partially sighted voters</li> <li>Ability for companion to accompany voter or Presiding Officer to assist voter.</li> <li>Proxy voting (someone voting on behalf of another person)</li> <li>Medical emergency proxy voting (up to 5pm on polling day)</li> </ul> <p>Guildford also supplies the following (non statutory) facilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Postal voting packs with pictograms</li> <li>Home visits to assist voter where requested</li> <li>Information in 'Talking newspaper for the blind' regarding major elections</li> <li>Training electoral staff specifically in coping with people with access difficulties.</li> </ul>	

11. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?		<b>N</b>	Voting is open to all eligible electorate as is standing as a candidate if the specific qualifications are met.
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?			
12. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to their age?	<b>Y</b>		Only in so far as increasing age is frequently combined with disabilities and these are covered in 10. above.
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?			
13. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?		<b>N</b>	As per Q 11.
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?			
14. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to them having dependants/caring responsibilities?		<b>N</b>	As per Q 11.
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?			
15. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to them have an offending past?	<b>Y</b>		Currently convicted prisoners are unable to vote. There are certain restrictions in law on the ability of candidates to stand for election if they have been convicted of crimes in the past.
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?			

16. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to them being Transgender or transsexual?		N	As per Q 11.
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?			
17. Could the differential impact identified in 8-16 amount to there being the potential for adverse impact in this policy/procedure/practice?		N	The main area here is that of disability which is well covered by the facilities already set up.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? Or any other reason?	¥	N	Not applicable.
<p><b>Business improvement</b></p> 19. Is there any concern that there are unmet needs in relation to any of the above groups?		N	No, everything possible is done to assist all those who are eligible and wish to vote.
20. Does differential impact or unmet need cut across the equality strands (e.g. elder BME groups)?		N	
21. If yes, should the full EIA be conducted jointly with another service area/contractor/partner/agency?		N	No, not applicable.

<b>22. Is there a missed opportunity to improve your business in relation to any of the policies, procedures or practices to promote racial, gender, disability, age, sexual orientation, religion or belief equality?</b>		No missed opportunity - nearly everything to do with elections is written in legislation giving very little room for manoeuvre.						
		<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td data-bbox="764 540 1793 591"></td> <td data-bbox="1793 540 1913 591" style="text-align: center;"><b>Yes</b></td> <td data-bbox="1913 540 2049 591" style="text-align: center;"><b>No</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="764 591 1913 760"></td> <td data-bbox="1793 591 1913 760"></td> <td data-bbox="1913 591 2049 760"></td> </tr> </table>		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>			
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>						
<b>24. If No, are there any changes required to the policy to improve it around the equality agenda?</b>		None at present although the equality agenda should be included as part of the risk assessment for each major election to ensure we are not missing opportunity to improve where we can.						

Signed  
(completing officer)

Date October 2008

Signed  
(Head of Section) ..... Date

Countersigned  
(HR representative)

Date November 2008