

Equality Impact Assessment [version 2.9]



Title: Bristol Food Equality Strategy and Action Plan	
<input type="checkbox"/> Policy <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strategy <input type="checkbox"/> Function <input type="checkbox"/> Service <input type="checkbox"/> Other [please state]	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New <input type="checkbox"/> Already exists / review <input type="checkbox"/> Changing
Directorate: Public Health and Communities	Lead Officer name: Sally Hogg
Service Area: Public Health	Lead Officer role: Public Health Consultant

Step 1: What do we want to do?

The purpose of an Equality Impact Assessment is to assist decision makers in understanding the impact of proposals as part of their duties under the Equality Act 2010. Detailed guidance to support completion can be found here [Equality Impact Assessments \(EqIA\) \(sharepoint.com\)](#).

This assessment should be started at the beginning of the process by someone with a good knowledge of the proposal and service area, and sufficient influence over the proposal. It is good practice to take a team approach to completing the equality impact assessment. Please contact the [Equality and Inclusion Team](#) early for advice and feedback.

1.1 What are the aims and objectives/purpose of this proposal?

Briefly explain the purpose of the proposal and why it is needed. Describe who it is aimed at and the intended aims / outcomes. Where known also summarise the key actions you plan to undertake. Please use plain English, avoiding jargon and acronyms. Equality Impact Assessments are viewed by a wide range of people including decision-makers and the wider public.

Food equality is Bristol’s approach to making a fairer food system for all residents in Bristol. It involves addressing issues of household food insecurity, sustainability of the food environment and the wider food system in Bristol.

Food inequality is caused by a range of economic, social and environmental factors. These include low household income, a poorly functioning local food economy and a lack of land available for growing food. The impacts of food inequality are wide-ranging, and it causes a range of health, economic, social, and environmental impacts on our city. These include obesity, reduced educational attainment for children at school, poor social cohesion, and an environmentally unsustainable food system. The impacts of food inequality are not evenly distributed and are felt much more in the most deprived areas of the city and by certain groups.

The Covid-19 pandemic has made the issue of food inequality – in particular, food insecurity – more pressing than ever. The economic pressures of the pandemic have led to an unprecedented rise in households seeking emergency food support. The Trussell Trust (who manage more than half of all food banks in the UK) have reported that between 2019/20 and 2020/21 there has been a 33% increase in food parcels distributed in just one year (Trussell Trust, 2021).

The effects of food inequality are disproportionality felt within the most deprived areas of the city. Based on responses to the 2020/21 Bristol Quality of Life Survey, 1 in 20 households (4.2%) across Bristol experienced severe to moderate food insecurity in 2019/20, however, this rate increased to 1 in every 8 households (12.2%) in the most deprived wards of the city (JSNA, 2021). The ward with the highest percentage of QoL respondents reporting severe food insecurity was in Lawrence Hill (7.6%) and for moderate to severe food insecurity it was Hartcliffe & Withywood (12.2%). Moderate to severe food insecurity was experienced by respondents in all but one ward (Westbury-on-Trym & Henleaze).

Bristol City Council and One City partners have committed to taking action to address food inequality. A strategy is being developed to outline our aims and commitments for the next 10 years across the wider food system in our city.

The vision and priority areas for this strategy have been co-produced through stakeholder consultation – with representation from over 60 different organisations - and community conversations with people who have lived experience of food inequality in the city. A summary of the strategy aims, the definition of food equality for Bristol, and the 5 strategic priority areas are presented below.

This strategy is currently in development and will be embedded in the *One City* approach. The plan for this strategy is to sign it off through the Health and Wellbeing Board and then take it to full Cabinet for information in February 2022. An action plan is going to be developed separately to outline how we will achieve each of the strategic aims.

Aim of the Food Equality Strategy:

The aim of the Food Equality Strategy is **to strive for food equality for all residents in the city of Bristol** within ten years. Recognising the importance of this issue within our city, this aim is deliberately aspirational and aligns with the targets set out in the One City Plan.

A definition of Food Equality for Bristol:

“Food equality exists when all people, at all times, have access to nutritious, affordable and appropriate food according to their social, cultural and dietary needs. They are equipped with the resources, skills and knowledge to use and benefit from food, which is sourced from a resilient, fair and environmentally sustainable food system.”

The five priority strategic areas for food equality:

Priority Area: Fair and Equitable Access

Fair access to nutritious and appropriate food. Residents are able to access food that is appropriate for dietary needs, is culturally appropriate, and affordable.

Priority Area: Choice

Choice, empowerment, and a feeling of security. Everyone can make decisions about their relationship with food and are free from the anxiety and stress of food insecurity.

Priority Area: Skills and resources

People and communities are equipped with knowledge, skills and facilities. Residents can foster a healthy food culture, have confidence in their ability to access and use food to meet their needs, as well as the facilities and fuel to cook with.

Priority Area: Sustainable local food system

A resilient and sustainable local food system. The local food system prioritises resilience and sustainability in food production, food waste, distribution, economy and environmental resilience.

Priority Area: Food at the heart of decision-making

Food is at the heart of community, economy and city planning. Food needs and equality are considered in all decision-making – whether its developing social support models, new businesses or planning new housing developments

1.2 Who will the proposal have the potential to affect?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bristol City Council workforce	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Service users	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The wider community
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Commissioned services	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> City partners / Stakeholder organisations	
Additional comments:		

1.3 Will the proposal have an equality impact?

Could the proposal affect access levels of representation or participation in a service, or does it have the potential to change e.g. quality of life: health, education, or standard of living etc.?

If 'No' explain why you are sure there will be no equality impact, then skip steps 2-4 and request review by Equality and Inclusion Team.

If 'Yes' complete the rest of this assessment, or if you plan to complete the assessment at a later stage please state this clearly here and request review by the Equality and Inclusion Team.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	[please select]
--	------------------------------------	-----------------

The Strategy, together with a developing action plan, aims to significantly improve food equality in Bristol over the next decade. It aligns with other key strategies for improving food systems, to make them more fair and equitable and to address poverty in the city, as well as many of the aims laid out in the National Food Strategy.

Step 2: What information do we have?

2.1 What data or evidence is there which tells us who is, or could be affected?

Please use this section to demonstrate an understanding of who could be affected by the proposal. Include general population data where appropriate, and information about people who will be affected with particular reference to protected and other relevant characteristics: <https://www.bristol.gov.uk/people-communities/measuring-equalities-success>.

Use one row for each evidence source and say which characteristic(s) it relates to. You can include a mix of qualitative and quantitative data e.g. from national or local research, available data or previous consultations and engagement activities.

Outline whether there is any over or under representation of equality groups within relevant services - don't forget to benchmark to the local population where appropriate. Links to available data and reports are here [Data, statistics and intelligence \(sharepoint.com\)](#). See also: [Bristol Open Data \(Quality of Life, Census etc.\)](#); [Joint Strategic Needs Assessment \(JSNA\)](#); [Ward Statistical Profiles](#).

For workforce / management of change proposals you will need to look at the diversity of the affected teams using available evidence such as [HR Analytics: Power BI Reports \(sharepoint.com\)](#) which shows the diversity profile of council teams and service areas. Identify any over or under-representation compared with Bristol economically active citizens for different characteristics. Additional sources of useful workforce evidence include the [Employee Staff Survey Report](#) and [Stress Risk Assessment Form](#)

Data / Evidence Source [Include a reference where known]	Summary of what this tells us
Dimbleby et al, 2020. National food strategy; part one. Available at https://www.nationalfoodstrategy.org/part-one/	Urgent recommendations regarding food to support the country following the COVID-19 pandemic and exiting the EU.

Data / Evidence Source [Include a reference where known]	Summary of what this tells us
Loopstra & Lalor 2017. Financial insecurity, food insecurity, and disability: The profile of people receiving emergency food assistance from The Trussell Trust Foodbank Network in Britain June 2017. OU_Report_final_01_08_online2.pdf (trusselltrust.org)	A study using systematic sampling methods to learn more about the characteristics of people using food banks, the nature of their financial circumstances, and the scale and severity of their household food insecurity across Britain.
United Nations Human rights https://www.ohchr.org/En/Issues/ESCR/Pages/food.aspx	Details how the right to adequate food is realized when every man, woman and child, alone or in community with others, has physical and economic access at all times to adequate food or means for its procurement.
Bristol City Council JSNA Health and Wellbeing Profile 2020/21: Healthy Life expectancy. JSNA 2020/21 - Healthy Life Expectancy (bristol.gov.uk)	Huge health inequalities exist in Bristol, particularly demonstrated in the gap in health life expectancy between communities across the city
Bristol City Council JSNA health and wellbeing profile 2020/21: food poverty/insecurity. https://www.bristol.gov.uk/documents/20182/4059596/JSNA+2019+-+5.14+Food+Poverty+-+FINALv2.pdf/fd0684f6-2633-d084-8a88-bb699b5e2b3e	Outlines recent data on Food Poverty in Bristol. It highlights in particular how food insecurity is experienced much more in deprived areas of the city. It also shows much higher food insecurity in certain vulnerable groups, including disabled people, full-time carers, single parent households, and those renting from either the Council or a Housing Association
Bristol City Council Public Health Needs Assessment – food inequality. This HNA is not yet published online, but full details can be provided on request..	A detailed review of food insecurity in Bristol. Contains a focus on the inequalities between different groups, and also some recommendations for action.
House of Lords Select Committee on Food, Poverty, Health and the Environment. Hungry for change: fixing the failures in food. Report of Session 2019-20. House of Lords - Hungry for change: fixing the failures in food - Select Committee on Food, Poverty, Health and the Environment (parliament.uk)	Highlights some serious, systemic problems with the food system, problems that the COVID-19 crisis only serves to underscore.
Department of work and Pensions (2021), Family Resources Survey; financial year 2019 to 2020. Published online 25/03/21, available at https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/family-resources-survey--2	An annual report that provides facts and figures about the incomes and living circumstances of households and families in the UK.
The Trussell Trust. End of Year Stats 2021. Available at https://www.trusselltrust.org/news-and-blog/latest-stats/end-year-stats/ .	Gives details of emergency food data through the Trussell Trust food bank. The number of emergency food parcels given to people in crisis by food banks in the Trussell Trust network in the financial year 2020/21 Between 1 April 2020 and 31 March 2021, food banks in the Trussell Trust’s UK wide network distributed 2.5 million emergency food parcels to people in crisis, a 33% increase on the previous year. 980,000 of these went to children.
Stakeholder consultations with partners working in food equality across the city were held to help understand the local picture of food equality in	Through the qualitative data provided by these consultations, other groups at-risk groups of food inequality were highlighted. These include those with No Recourse to Public

Data / Evidence Source [Include a reference where known]	Summary of what this tells us																																																															
<p>Bristol. Community conversations were held to gather the perspectives of people with lived experience of food inequality.</p> <p>Full details on the stakeholder consultation, community conversation, and methods used in development of this vision are not yet published online, but full details can be provided on request.</p>	<p>Funds, people experiencing homelessness, and older residents. Notably, all of these groups may be under-represented in Quality of Life survey respondents.</p>																																																															
<p>Feeding Bristol Strategic Working Group for older people – report on food insecurity among older people in Bristol, Feeding Bristol, 2021</p>	<p>Background review of the experience of older people and food insecurity, and a review of how this may impact Bristol and the impact of COVID-19.</p>																																																															
<p>Quality of Life 2020-21 — Open Data Bristol</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="735 600 1326 712">Quality of Life Indicator: % households which have experienced moderate to severe food insecurity</th> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="735 712 1155 790">Characteristic</th> <th data-bbox="1155 712 1326 790">% Percentage</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td data-bbox="735 790 1155 835">16 to 24 years</td><td data-bbox="1155 790 1326 835">9.2</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="735 835 1155 880">50 years and older</td><td data-bbox="1155 835 1326 880">2.3</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="735 880 1155 925">65 years and older</td><td data-bbox="1155 880 1326 925">0.8</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="735 925 1155 969">Female</td><td data-bbox="1155 925 1326 969">4.6</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="735 969 1155 1014">Male</td><td data-bbox="1155 969 1326 1014">3.7</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="735 1014 1155 1059">Disabled</td><td data-bbox="1155 1014 1326 1059">14.8</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="735 1059 1155 1104">Black Asian & Minority Ethnic</td><td data-bbox="1155 1059 1326 1104">7.2</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="735 1104 1155 1149">White Minority Ethnic</td><td data-bbox="1155 1104 1326 1149">4.0</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="735 1149 1155 1193">White British</td><td data-bbox="1155 1149 1326 1193">3.7</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="735 1193 1155 1238">Asian/Asian British</td><td data-bbox="1155 1193 1326 1238">2.4</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="735 1238 1155 1283">Black/Black British</td><td data-bbox="1155 1238 1326 1283">12.4</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="735 1283 1155 1328">Mixed Ethnicity</td><td data-bbox="1155 1283 1326 1328">11.5</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="735 1328 1155 1373">White</td><td data-bbox="1155 1328 1326 1373">3.7</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="735 1373 1155 1417">Lesbian Gay or Bisexual</td><td data-bbox="1155 1373 1326 1417">11.9</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="735 1417 1155 1462">No Religion or Faith</td><td data-bbox="1155 1417 1326 1462">4.1</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="735 1462 1155 1507">Christian Religion</td><td data-bbox="1155 1462 1326 1507">2.9</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="735 1507 1155 1552">Other Religions</td><td data-bbox="1155 1507 1326 1552">13.7</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="735 1552 1155 1597">Carer</td><td data-bbox="1155 1552 1326 1597">7.7</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="735 1597 1155 1641">Full Time Carer</td><td data-bbox="1155 1597 1326 1641">12.1</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="735 1641 1155 1686">Part Time Carer</td><td data-bbox="1155 1641 1326 1686">6.4</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="735 1686 1155 1731">Single Parent</td><td data-bbox="1155 1686 1326 1731">13.4</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="735 1731 1155 1776">Two Parent</td><td data-bbox="1155 1731 1326 1776">1.6</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="735 1776 1155 1821">Parent (all)</td><td data-bbox="1155 1776 1326 1821">3.0</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="735 1821 1155 1865">No Qualifications</td><td data-bbox="1155 1821 1326 1865">5.8</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="735 1865 1155 1910">Non-Degree Qualified</td><td data-bbox="1155 1865 1326 1910">7.1</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="735 1910 1155 1955">Degree Qualified</td><td data-bbox="1155 1910 1326 1955">2.7</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="735 1955 1155 2000">Rented (Council)</td><td data-bbox="1155 1955 1326 2000">17.3</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="735 2000 1155 2045">Rented (HA)</td><td data-bbox="1155 2000 1326 2045">19.3</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="735 2045 1155 2098">Rented (Private)</td><td data-bbox="1155 2045 1326 2098">8.2</td></tr> </tbody> </table>		Quality of Life Indicator: % households which have experienced moderate to severe food insecurity		Characteristic	% Percentage	16 to 24 years	9.2	50 years and older	2.3	65 years and older	0.8	Female	4.6	Male	3.7	Disabled	14.8	Black Asian & Minority Ethnic	7.2	White Minority Ethnic	4.0	White British	3.7	Asian/Asian British	2.4	Black/Black British	12.4	Mixed Ethnicity	11.5	White	3.7	Lesbian Gay or Bisexual	11.9	No Religion or Faith	4.1	Christian Religion	2.9	Other Religions	13.7	Carer	7.7	Full Time Carer	12.1	Part Time Carer	6.4	Single Parent	13.4	Two Parent	1.6	Parent (all)	3.0	No Qualifications	5.8	Non-Degree Qualified	7.1	Degree Qualified	2.7	Rented (Council)	17.3	Rented (HA)	19.3	Rented (Private)	8.2
Quality of Life Indicator: % households which have experienced moderate to severe food insecurity																																																																
Characteristic	% Percentage																																																															
16 to 24 years	9.2																																																															
50 years and older	2.3																																																															
65 years and older	0.8																																																															
Female	4.6																																																															
Male	3.7																																																															
Disabled	14.8																																																															
Black Asian & Minority Ethnic	7.2																																																															
White Minority Ethnic	4.0																																																															
White British	3.7																																																															
Asian/Asian British	2.4																																																															
Black/Black British	12.4																																																															
Mixed Ethnicity	11.5																																																															
White	3.7																																																															
Lesbian Gay or Bisexual	11.9																																																															
No Religion or Faith	4.1																																																															
Christian Religion	2.9																																																															
Other Religions	13.7																																																															
Carer	7.7																																																															
Full Time Carer	12.1																																																															
Part Time Carer	6.4																																																															
Single Parent	13.4																																																															
Two Parent	1.6																																																															
Parent (all)	3.0																																																															
No Qualifications	5.8																																																															
Non-Degree Qualified	7.1																																																															
Degree Qualified	2.7																																																															
Rented (Council)	17.3																																																															
Rented (HA)	19.3																																																															
Rented (Private)	8.2																																																															

Data / Evidence Source [Include a reference where known]	Summary of what this tells us	
	Owner Occupier	1.2
	Most Deprived 10%	13.0
	Bristol Average	4.2
	<i>Source: Quality of Life in Bristol 2020-21</i>	
Additional comments:		

2.2 Do you currently monitor relevant activity by the following protected characteristics?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Age	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disability	<input type="checkbox"/> Gender Reassignment
<input type="checkbox"/> Marriage and Civil Partnership	<input type="checkbox"/> Pregnancy/Maternity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Race
<input type="checkbox"/> Religion or Belief	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sex	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sexual Orientation

2.3 Are there any gaps in the evidence base?

Where there are gaps in the evidence, or you don't have enough information about some equality groups, include an equality action to find out in section 4.2 below. This doesn't mean that you can't complete the assessment without the information, but you need to follow up the action and if necessary, review the assessment later. If you are unable to fill in the gaps, then state this clearly with a justification.

For workforce related proposals all relevant characteristics may not be included in HR diversity reporting (e.g. pregnancy/maternity). For smaller teams diversity data may be redacted. A high proportion of not known/not disclosed may require an action to address under-reporting.

A key challenge in development of this strategy is the lack of data relating to food equality. The Quality of Life survey provides the most valuable source of data on the picture locally, but has quite small numbers for some of the specific at risk groups. We have combined these findings with the various national data sources and qualitative information from stakeholder and community conversations in Bristol to build our best understanding of food inequality in Bristol at this point in time. We recognise that there may be gaps in evidence, especially for the following groups:

- People experiencing homelessness
- Asylum seekers and refugees
- Carers
- Young people
- Gypsy, traveller and boater communities
- Older People

Developing a robust mechanism for monitoring data for food inequality, and in particularly to improve evidence for those groups listed above, is a key strategic aim for the strategy. The action plan which will follow this strategy will provide the detail of how this will be achieved.

2.4 How have you involved communities and groups that could be affected?

You will nearly always need to involve and consult with internal and external stakeholders during your assessment. The extent of the engagement will depend on the nature of the proposal or change. This should usually include individuals and groups representing different relevant protected characteristics. Please include details of any completed engagement and consultation and how representative this had been of Bristol's diverse communities. See <https://www.bristol.gov.uk/people-communities/equalities-groups>.

Include the main findings of any engagement and consultation in Section 2.1 above.

If you are managing a workforce change process or restructure please refer to [Managing change or restructure \(sharepoint.com\)](#) for advice on consulting with employees etc. Relevant stakeholders for engagement about workforce changes may include e.g. staff-led groups and trades unions as well as affected staff.

Over 9 months, we facilitated 3 stakeholder group meetings and surveys (involving more than 100 individuals representing over 60 organisations) and 8 community conversations (involving 38 people) to test and develop the vision of food equality. Stakeholder group meetings involved discussions on what food inequality looks and feels like; what the barriers to food equality are; and governance, accountability, and inclusivity to ensure the success of the strategy and action plan. The community conversations were targeted at 5 wards that ranked highest on the 2019 index of multiple deprivation, and 3 communities of interest (disabled people, people experiencing homelessness, and refugee groups) to provide valuable insights and views from those with lived experience of food inequality.

The results of these consultations, conversations and literature reviews led to the formation of the vision of food equality for Bristol.

2.5 How will engagement with stakeholders continue?

Explain how you will continue to engage with stakeholders throughout the course of planning and delivery. Please describe where more engagement and consultation is required and set out how you intend to undertake it. Include any targeted work to seek the views of under-represented groups. If you do not intend to undertake it, please set out your justification. You can ask the Equality and Inclusion Team for help in targeting particular groups.

A consultation period is going to be held to review and comment on the strategy. A task group is being set up to create a consultation plan, which will include a plan for how to get representative feedback on the strategy, including from under-represented groups. Various methods of increasing engagement are being planned, including facilitated consultation sessions as an alternative to completing the online survey. The existing stakeholder group will be leveraged for their links into the specific target communities.

A Steering Group will be set up for the delivery of the strategy which will have a representative membership from across key partners in the public, private and VCSE sectors in the city, as well as representatives of the key communities and groups of interest. Membership will consist of representatives from all the relevant departments in Bristol city council, community anchors, community organisations, food support, social care and communities of interest.

This stakeholder group will also contain ten Food Equality Champions who will be recruited as part of the strategy development. These are members of local communities who have relevant lived experience.

The stakeholder group will be encouraged to meet regularly to ensure continued engagement and representation from across a wider section of organisations in the city. This stakeholder group will evolve to oversee the creation and delivery of the action plan, with membership being reviewed and expanded accordingly.

Step 3: Who might the proposal impact?

Analysis of impacts must be rigorous. Please demonstrate your analysis of any impacts of the proposal in this section, referring to evidence you have gathered above and the characteristics protected by the Equality Act 2010. Also include details of existing issues for particular groups that you are aware of and are seeking to address or mitigate through this proposal. See detailed guidance documents for advice on identifying potential impacts etc. [Equality Impact Assessments \(EqIA\) \(sharepoint.com\)](#)

3.1 Does the proposal have any potentially adverse impacts on people based on their protected or other relevant characteristics?

Consider sub-categories (different kinds of disability, ethnic background etc.) and how people with combined characteristics (e.g. young women) might have particular needs or experience particular kinds of disadvantage.

Where mitigations indicate a follow-on action, include this in the 'Action Plan' Section 4.2 below.

GENERAL COMMENTS (highlight any potential issues that might impact all or many groups)

<p>This is a city-wide strategy so while no services will be directly affected it will potentially impact on many community groups. The core value at the heart of the strategy is to reduce inequalities, and as such it is not expected that the strategy will have any direct negative impacts to any groups or communities. However, we must be mindful that it does not unintentionally increase health inequalities, particularly in groups who may be less visible or for certain 'just managing' groups. An oversight of the activities and impacts will be provided by the steering group. Active consideration and assurance that we are not having unintended negative consequences will be sought throughout delivery, as well as by encouraging active participation and regular feedback from communities throughout the delivery process.</p>	
<p>PROTECTED CHARACTERISTICS</p>	
<p>Age: Young People</p>	<p>Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>Potential impacts:</p>	<p>A lack of adequate or quality food can cause a range of behavioural, academic and emotional issues in children, and can compromise their educational attainment, as well as problems with physical development. We also know that a significant number of children are overweight or obese: Data collected during 2019/20 shows that around 1 in 4 (23.0%) of children in reception year in Bristol schools (4-5 years old) and 1 in 3 (33.9%) of Year 6 pupils (10-11 year olds) have excess weight. This is unevenly distributed and disproportionately affects those in more deprived areas of the city and has a range of short- and long-term health impacts.</p> <p>Diet quality (measured as fruit and vegetable intake) has been shown to be lower for people aged 16-25, and for those with no further educational qualifications.</p>
<p>Mitigations:</p>	<p>The strategy recognises the importance of addressing this impact in children and young people. It contains a specific strategic aim to address this:</p> <p><i>Under "Priority area, skills and facilities":</i> <i>Recognise the impact of food inequality on children and young people, and the key opportunity working with this group can have in preventing many further issues for themselves, their families and their communities. Ensure interventions that impact this group receive appropriate consideration and prioritisation. as well as expanding opportunities for education on food beyond school age.</i></p>
<p>Age: Older People</p>	<p>Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>Potential impacts:</p>	<p>Poverty plays a key role in driving food insecurity. There are well established links between older people and poverty. 2.1 million (18 per cent) of pensioners in the UK live in poverty. Rates have risen since 2013-14 when 1.6 million (14 per cent) lived in poverty. Within this, Some groups are at particular risk: 38% of private tenants and 36% of social rented sector tenants, live in poverty compared to 14 per cent of older people who own their home outright. 33 % of Asian or Asian British pensioners and 30 % of Black or Black British pensioners, are in poverty compared to 16 per cent of White pensioners (from poverty in later life briefing, age uk, June 2021)</p> <p>However, food insecurity for older people is driven by a complex range of factors which extends beyond poverty, including loneliness and social isolation, diminished availability of 'meals on wheels' type services, and inadequate social care packages. These are exacerbated by the changes to health, mobility and social arrangements often experience by people as they age. Older people are also less likely to be able to attend events or services designed to address food security.</p>
<p>Mitigations:</p>	<p>Finding more data on the impact of this issue in Bristol will be a strategic aim, alongside the other groups we believe may be under-represented at the moment. Stakeholders working in this area will be involved in the steering groups to ensure considerations to improve food equality or this group is included.</p>
<p>Disability</p>	<p>Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>Potential impacts:</p>	<p>The Quality of Life survey (reporting on 2019/20 figures): show that almost 1 in 7 disabled people (14.8%) reported moderate to severe food insecurity in the past 12 months, more than three times higher than the Bristol average (4.2%). Stakeholder</p>

	consultation and community conversations have provided an insight into some of the specific difficulties faced by this group.
Mitigations:	The strategy recognises the disproportionate impact of food inequality on disabled people. Close working with communities and stakeholder groups will continue to ensure work to reduce this inequality is prioritised.
Sex	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	Most single household parents are women. Evidence from the Bristol Quality of Life survey shows single parent households experience disproportionate levels of food inequality: Single parent households reported higher rates of food insecurity compared to two parent households, with 13.4% of single parent households reporting that they had experienced moderate to severe food insecurity in the last 12 months, compared to only 1.6% of two parent households. Single parents were also more likely to receive emergency food and groceries, with 7.7% of single parents reporting they had received emergency food and/or groceries during the last 12 months, over eight times more than that reported by two parent households (0.9%).
Mitigations:	The strategy will target people on low incomes including those from single parent households, which in the main affect women. Stakeholders from single parent organisations are also included in the stakeholder conversations.
Sexual orientation	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	The quality of life survey showed that moderate to severe food insecurity was more likely to be experienced by those identifying as lesbian, gay or bisexual (11.9%), although the numbers for this were relatively small. We also know gay men, together with bisexual men and women, are more likely to experience poverty than heterosexuals and therefore may be more at risk of food insecurity.
Mitigations:	The strategy will target all those on low incomes, and will aim to gather more understanding of the impacts of these under-represented groups
Pregnancy / Maternity	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	No specific data on maternity, but this group are likely to be affected in the same way as for the section on 'sex' above.
Mitigations:	A number of national schemes (such as the healthy start vouchers) aim to reduce food insecurity in pregnancy. Through work with stakeholders, we will continue to monitor the impact of this in Bristol and build in mitigations as necessary.
Gender reassignment	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	No evidence of direct impact in this group.
Mitigations:	It is recognised this group are often under-represented, and during stakeholder and community engagement we will make sure this risk of overlooking this group is not ignored.
Race	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	Though the Quality-of-Life survey those who identified as Black/Black British or Mixed Ethnicity were more likely to report that they had experienced moderate to severe food insecurity. Diet quality (measured as fruit and vegetable intake) has been shown to be lower for those in more deprived areas and those who identified as Black/Black British.
Mitigations:	The strategy will target people on low incomes including those from community groups who have been identified as at particular risk of food inequality. Diversity in background and experience will be considered in recruitment of the food equality champions and others who will be included in the steering groups.
Religion or Belief	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	
Mitigations:	
Marriage & civil partnership	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	
Mitigations:	

OTHER RELEVANT CHARACTERISTICS	
Socio-Economic (deprivation)	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	Quality of Life survey (reporting on 2019/20 figures): Residents in Council housing were 25 times more likely (11.5%) to have used emergency food support than those who owned their own homes (0.46%). 13.4% of single parent households reported that they had experienced moderate to severe food insecurity in the last 12 months, compared to only 1.6% of two parent households.
Mitigations:	The strategy will target all those on low incomes and suffering from the wider impacts of poverty. We are working closely with other Bristol City Council and One City colleagues to align the work of food inequality with the broader work to counter poverty in the city.
Carers	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	Working-age carers have a higher rate of poverty than those with no caring responsibilities, and women of working age who are carers have the greatest risk of all. The Bristol Quality of Life survey showed 12.1% of full time carers have experienced some level of food insecurity.
Mitigations:	The strategy will target all those on low incomes. The stakeholder partners include representatives from carer organisations.
Other groups [Please add additional rows below to detail the impact for other relevant groups as appropriate e.g. Asylums and Refugees; Looked after Children / Care Leavers; Homelessness]	
Potential impacts:	Any of the above groups are at risk of poverty and therefore food inequality. A specific community conversation was held with refugee groups to understand food inequality from their perspective and highlighted some specific issues.
Mitigations:	The strategy will target all those on low incomes, and takes into account the community conversations with this group when making recommendations on for example food provision being appropriate to people's cultural backgrounds.

3.2 Does the proposal create any benefits for people based on their protected or other relevant characteristics?

Outline any potential benefits of the proposal and how they can be maximised. Identify how the proposal will support our [Public Sector Equality Duty](#) to:

- ✓ Eliminate unlawful discrimination for a protected group
- ✓ Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who don't
- ✓ Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who don't

The aim of the Food Equality Strategy is to strive for food equality for all residents in the city of Bristol within ten years. Recognising the importance of this issue within our city, this aim is deliberately aspirational and aligns with the targets set out in the One City Plan.

Equity is the key consideration at all stages of the strategy, and reducing the inequalities outlined in this document is one of the strategy's core aims, as presented in the key aims sections:

The inequalities present in our food system and health outcomes are the primary focus of this strategy. To address these inequalities, we need to ensure inclusion of the most vulnerable members of society. We strive for equity, by which we mean creating a fair and just system which appropriately prioritises the communities and individuals most in need. This focus on equity is what will enable us to drive towards equality across the city.

Step 4: Impact

4.1 How has the equality impact assessment informed or changed the proposal?

What are the main conclusions of this assessment? Use this section to provide an overview of your findings. This summary can be included in decision pathway reports etc.

If you have identified any significant negative impacts which cannot be mitigated, provide a justification showing how the proposal is proportionate, necessary, and appropriate despite this.

Summary of significant negative impacts and how they can be mitigated or justified:
No significant negative impact identified however the EqIA highlights existing disparities for people in Bristol based on their characteristics and circumstances which we will aim to address through the proposal
Summary of positive impacts / opportunities to promote the Public Sector Equality Duty:
This proposal specifically aims to address and prevent food inequality in Bristol with community groups who are living in poverty or at risk of this.

4.2 Action Plan

Use this section to set out any actions you have identified to improve data, mitigate issues, or maximise opportunities etc. If an action is to meet the needs of a particular protected group please specify this.

Improvement / action required	Responsible Officer	Timescale
No actions identified		

4.3 How will the impact of your proposal and actions be measured?

How will you know if you have been successful? Once the activity has been implemented this equality impact assessment should be periodically reviewed to make sure your changes have been effective your approach is still appropriate.

Monitoring and evaluation are key to understanding impact and success of the Food Equality Strategy and Action Plan. Current data sources are not sufficient to adequately assess this in our city and creating a system which will allow us to monitor this sufficiently is one of our key strategic aims.
Sources of data that will help to inform the state of food equality in Bristol will draw on national sources, such as the measurement of food insecurity in the DWP 'Family Resources Survey'; and local data sources, such as the Bristol Quality of Life survey. Other proxy measures, such as Free School Meal eligibility, Healthy Start Voucher uptake and Universal Credit claims will continue to be used to estimate the impact of food inequality. Such proxy measures overlap with the broader anti-poverty agenda in the city, and we will continue to engage and collaborate with this broader work, providing insight from the Food Equality monitoring and evaluation.
Establishing a framework for monitoring and evaluating impact will be a core aim in the Food Equality Action Plan, and will strive to create a regular, reliable and representative method of visualising the state and impact of food equality work in our city. Importantly, a key method of monitoring will be continuing to have regular community conversations and seeking regular feedback from affected communities and vulnerable groups.

Step 5: Review

The Equality and Inclusion Team need at least five working days to comment and feedback on your EqIA. EqIAs should only be marked as reviewed when they provide sufficient information for decision-makers on the equalities impact of the proposal. Please seek feedback and review from the [Equality and Inclusion Team](#) before requesting sign off from your Director¹.

¹ Review by the Equality and Inclusion Team confirms there is sufficient analysis for decision makers to consider the likely equality impacts at this stage. This is not an endorsement or approval of the proposal.

Equality and Inclusion Team Review: <i>Reviewed by Equality and Inclusion Team</i>	Director Sign-Off:  Christina Gray, Director for Communities and Public Health
Date: 1/10/2021	Date: 7 October 2021