## Equality Impact Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Name of policy/funding activity/event being assessed</td>
<td>Call for a Physical Sciences Database National Research Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Summary of aims and objectives of the policy/funding activity/event</td>
<td>To obtain bids to run a a Physical Sciences Database National Research Facility for the UK on behalf of EPSRC. Funding is available upto £3M. The aim of this service is to provide the UK academic research community cost-effective, efficient and ready access to a comprehensive suite of essential chemical, structure and properties databases needed to keep the UK at the forefront of cutting-edge science.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What involvement and consultation has been done in relation to this policy? (e.g. with relevant groups and stakeholders)</td>
<td>An open call for community led Statements of Need in 2017. These calls a normally run on an annual basis and advertised on the EPSRC website. Earlier this yearthere was a specification panel meeting to set the technical requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Who is affected by the policy/funding activity/event?</td>
<td>The physical sciences community who will/may make use of a Physical Sciences Database National Research Facility and potential applicants who wish to run such a facility. Support staff may also be employed to help run the facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What are the arrangements for monitoring and reviewing the actual impact of the policy/funding activity/event?</td>
<td>Research outcomes are collected through Researchfish and additional data through an annual data return. EPSRC Portfolio Managers are members of the facility advisory boards. An annual report is produced by each facility. A mid-term review will be conducted by EPSRC, employing an independent peer review panel to determine whether the facility should continue to be funded for the full 5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protected Characteristic Group</th>
<th>Is there a potential for positive or negative impact?</th>
<th>Please explain and give examples of any evidence/data used</th>
<th>Action to address negative impact (e.g. adjustment to the policy)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>None Identified</td>
<td>Action to minimise any possible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender reassignment</td>
<td>None Identified</td>
<td>negative impact – Mixed gender and age panels have been used at all steps that led to this call.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage or civil partnership</td>
<td>None Identified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnancy and maternity</td>
<td>None Identified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>None Identified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion or belief</td>
<td>None Identified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual orientation</td>
<td>None Identified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (gender)</td>
<td>Potentially positive</td>
<td>Ensure assessment panels are mixed gender in line with EPSRC policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Potentially positive</td>
<td>Evidence requirements for the Director are only about their ability to manage a National Facility and have sufficient standing within the relevant research community. They do not refer to years of experience.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Explanation / justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is it possible the proposed change in policy, funding activity or event could discriminate or unfairly disadvantage people?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Final Decision:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tick the relevant box</th>
<th>Include any explanation / justification required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. No barriers identified, therefore activity will <strong>proceed</strong>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. You can decide to <strong>stop</strong> the policy or practice at some point because the data shows bias towards one or more groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. You can <strong>adapt or change</strong> the policy in a way which you think will eliminate the bias</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Barriers and impact identified, however having considered all available options carefully, there appear to be no other proportionate ways to achieve the aim of the policy or practice (e.g. in extreme cases or where positive action is taken). Therefore you are going to <strong>proceed with caution</strong> with this policy or practice knowing that it may favour some people less than others, providing justification for this decision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Will this EIA be published?** (*EIA’s should be published alongside relevant funding activities e.g. calls and events:*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date completed:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Review date** (if applicable):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change log</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>