

Merseyside Fire and Rescue Service

Equality Impact Assessment Form

Title of policy/report/project:	Protective Security including: Protective Security Policy Protective Marking SI Personnel Security SI
Department:	Strategy and Performance
Date:	10/1/14
<p>1: What is the aim or purpose of the policy/report/project</p> <p><i>This should identify “the legitimate aim” of the policy/report/project (there may be more than one)</i></p>	
<p>Protective Security is the term used to describe the actions/policies required to meet the threats to an organisation and to protect its assets from compromise. Protective Security is important when considering the political climate and the technology that poses threats and risks to the Fire and Rescue Service. Effective security is important in maintaining the confidence of the public, staff, stakeholders and partner agencies in efficient, effective and safe service delivery. Protective Security is a holistic process that covers three related aspects of security; information (documents/data systems), personnel (staff/customers) and physical (buildings/estates/property).</p> <p>The Authority’s aim is to achieve compliance, as far as practicable, with the relevant aspects of HMG Security Policy Framework, and as detailed within the DCLG Fire & Rescue Protective Security Strategy. To this end, a working group has been set up to implement the requirements of the Fire and Rescue Service Protective Security Strategy. A draft policy and two service instructions have been developed.</p>	
<p>2: Who will be affected by the policy/report/project?</p> <p><i>This should identify the persons/organisations who may need to be consulted about the policy /report/project and its outcomes (There may be more than one)</i></p>	
<p>Staff (including contractors, partners, volunteers) Authority Members Visitors to FRS premises</p> <p>The Service Instructions that will be used to deliver against the policy will be</p>	

developed over time and this EIA will be reviewed and amended as each one is developed.

3. Monitoring

Summarise the findings of any monitoring data you have considered regarding this policy/report/project. This could include data which shows whether it is having the desired outcomes and also its impact on members of different equality groups.

What monitoring data have you considered?

No monitoring data is available in relation to the policy and Service Instructions from an equalities perspective. This will be collected as the policy and SIs are implemented. This EIA will then be reviewed and updated accordingly.

What did it show?

4: Research

Summarise the findings of any research you have considered regarding this policy/report/project. This could include quantitative data and qualitative information; anything you have obtained from other sources e.g. CFA/CLG guidance, other FRSs, etc

What research have you considered?

The FRS Protective Security strategy

Protective Security implementation documents from other FRS

Protective Security implementation documentation from non-FRS organisations

What did it show?

There are a number of actions required to ensure compliance with the three aspects for Protective Security. These include implementing protective marking, implementing staff security checks and reviewing and (if appropriate) improving physical security, including building security.

The Personnel Security SI will have an impact on staff, contractors and volunteers, as new security checks (Baseline Personnel Security Standard) will be required, initially for some, but eventually for all staff, contractors and volunteers. These checks are not considered particularly intrusive but involve criminal records checks

	<p>to replace the individual applying for a job providing that information as was previously the case.</p> <p>Existing staff are already required to inform the organisation if they receive a criminal conviction whilst in employment. In the future all staff, volunteers and contractors will be the subject of the same check as that used at recruitment. The decision on who requires a check and when they require it will be taken based on the risks associated with the information and other organisational assets they have access to, but over time all staff will be receive a BPSS check.</p>
<p>5. Consultation</p> <p><i>Summarise the opinions of any consultation. Who was consulted and how? (This should include reference to people and organisations identified in section 2 above)</i></p> <p><i>Outline any plans to inform consultees of the results of the consultation</i></p>	
<p>What Consultation have you undertaken?</p> <p>Discussions within the Protective Security working group</p> <p>Related discussions between POD and Joint secretaries on a Police vetting system</p>	<p>What did it say?</p> <p>A range of staff covering several departments considered the potential implications of the policy and SIs. Full implementation of Protective Security will result in tighter control of access to information and other assets and staff, contractors and volunteers will feel some impact from this in relation to personnel security checks. One consideration identified is the issue of what action would be taken if a security check highlighted convictions that an employee had not informed MFRA about. This could have equality and diversity implications, (ie in the way decisions are then made about individuals) and this is under consideration.</p> <p>However, it is accepted that the FRS Protective Security Strategy should be implemented to protect the assets MFRA is responsible for and protect staff.</p> <p>Future developments could include implications for staff, contractors and the public when physical (including building) security is reviewed and this is likely to have an impact on access to MFRA buildings. EIA implications will be considered as the work continues.</p> <p>MFRA has been consulting with Joint secretaries on the introduction of Police Vetting for some staff in relation to access to the Joint command and Control Centre. Although it is not directly related to Protective Security</p>

<p>Policy and Service Instruction consultation process</p>	<p>and the BPSS checks, there are some connections and POD will introduce the BPSS into its discussions with Joint Secretaries.</p> <p>The Policy, Protective Marking SI and Personnel Security SI have all been through the 21 day consultation period with no comments received.</p>
--	--

6. Conclusions

Taking into account the results of the monitoring, research and consultation, set out how the policy/report/project impacts or could impact on people from the following protected groups? (Include positive and/or negative impacts)

(a) Age

The implications of the Policy and SI are currently considered to be neutral in relation to this protected group.

(b) Disability including mental, physical and sensory conditions)

The implications of the Policy and SI are currently considered to be neutral in relation to this protected group.

(c) Race (include: nationality, national or ethnic origin and/or colour)

The implications of the Policy and SI are currently considered to be neutral in relation to this protected group.

(d) Religion or Belief

The implications of the Policy and SI are currently considered to be neutral in relation to this protected group.

(e) Sex (include gender reassignment, marriage or civil partnership and pregnancy or maternity)

The implications of the Policy and SI are currently considered to be neutral in relation to this protected group.

(f) Sexual Orientation

The implications of the Policy and SI are currently considered to be neutral in relation to this protected group.

(g) Socio-economic disadvantage

The implications of the Policy and SI are currently considered to be neutral in relation

to this protected group.

7. Decisions

If the policy/report/project will have a negative impact on members of one or more of the protected groups, explain how it will change or why it is to continue in the same way.

If no changes are proposed, the policy/report/project needs to be objectively justified as being an appropriate and necessary means of achieving the legitimate aim set out in 1 above.

This EIA will remain under review as the policy and SIs are implemented.

- MFRA will put in place arrangements to make sure that where someone “fails” a check (ie criminal convictions are identified) that this will be dealt with in an equitable way for all staff.
- MFRA will monitor the results of the personnel security arrangements 12 months after commencement with the Diversity and Consultation Manager

8. Equality Improvement Plan

List any changes to our policies or procedures that need to be included in the Equality Action Plan/Service Plan.

9. Equality & Diversity Sign Off

The completed EIA form must be signed off by the Diversity Manager before it is submitted to Strategic Management Group or Authority.

Signed off by:

Wendy Kenyon

Date:

21.1.2014

Action Planned	Responsibility of	Completed by
Monitor the results of the personnel security arrangements and the arrangements being used when someone “fails “ the security checks	Director of S and P , POD and Diveristy and Consultation Manager	Jan 2015

For any advice, support or guidance about completing this form please contact the DiversityTeam@merseyfire.gov.uk or on 0151 296 4237

The completed form along with the related policy/report/project document should be emailed to the Diversity Team at: DiversityTeam@merseyfire.gov.uk