

BOROUGH COUNCIL OF KING'S LYNN AND WEST NORFOLK

RECORD OF DECISION TAKEN BY OFFICERS UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

This is a record of a decision taken by an officers under delegated powers and where necessary taken in consultation with members and officers.

REPORT TITLE:	Going for Gold – achieving Gold Award status for the Armed Forces Covenant
OPEN/EXEMPT	Open (no exempt information – Schedule 12A not engaged).
LEAD OFFICER	Paul Lowes, Assistant Director Corporate Services
IS DECISION SUBJECT TO CALL IN?:	Executive Delegated Decision (Officer). Officer/Member Executive Delegated Decisions are subject to call-in
DATE DECISION ADVERTISED:	28 November 2025
DATE OF DECISION:	05 December 2025
DEADLINE FOR CALL IN:	12 December 2025
PRE-SCREENING EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT COMPLETED:	YES

Delegated Power

Specify the particular delegated power being exercised by reference to the Scheme of Delegation or the Council body minute and date.

Decision taken under Part 3 – Executive Scheme of Delegation to Officers: authority to create, amend and approve corporate HR/people policies where these fall within Executive functions.

Decision Taken

To implement the Armed Forces Covenant "Going for Gold" programme and approve the associated enabling actions, as follows:

1. Approve the programme to pursue the Ministry of Defence Employer Recognition Scheme (ERS) Gold Award, building on the Council's existing Silver award, with delivery actions and evidence collection as set out in the "Going for Gold" CLT briefing.
2. Approve and adopt the Reservists: Training, Mobilisation & Return-to-Work Policy as part of the associated work required for ERS Gold, with immediate commencement following expiry of call-in.
3. Authorise HR, Comms and Services to implement the supporting actions necessary for Gold, including:
 - o Positive recruitment links (register the Council with CTP and Forces Families Jobs for advertising);
 - o Communications activity (website/intranet updates; Remembrance-period campaign) and local engagement (e.g., RAF Marham business breakfast/pledge outreach) to secure at least five new employer/community pledges;
4. Authorise the submission of the ERS Gold application on completion of the evidence pack and to undertake any minor, non-material amendments to documents required by the MOD/Regional Employer Engagement Director (REED).

Reasons for the Decision

Specify all reasons for taking the decision

- Delivers the Council's Armed Forces Covenant commitments, positions the Council as an exemplar employer/community leader, and aligns with neighbouring authorities that already hold Gold.
- Addresses identified gaps for Gold accreditation: positive recruitment routes, robust mobilisation policy, and coherent communications/evidence capture.
- The Mobilisation Policy provides clear, lawful and consistent arrangements for Reservists/CFAVs, combining the councils current commitments and practice into a single resource (training leave, mobilisation handling, pay/pensions, statutory reinstatement), reducing operational risk by standardising manager actions.
- The programme is low cost and largely within existing resources, using targeted process changes and communications to evidence practice already in place.

Details of alternative options, if any, considered and rejected.

- Do nothing / remain at Silver – rejected: misses opportunity to formalise existing good practice, reduces external credibility, and forgoes workforce benefits (attraction/retention, resilience).
- Defer until a wider HR policy review – rejected: unnecessary delay; mobilisation policy and recruitment/engagement actions are discrete and ready to implement now.
- Refer to Cabinet immediately – rejected: delegated route enables timely delivery within CLT's agreed direction, with call-in still available for Members on Going for Gold and all associated work.

Any declarations of interest and details of any dispensations granted in respect of interests (in relation to officers and any Members consulted).

None

List of Background papers

- Reserve Forces Training & Mobilisation Policy – Borough Council of King's Lynn & West Norfolk (final draft).
- Line Manager and Reservist Guidance (as referenced in the Policy).

Authorisation

Post Held

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR CORPORATE SERVICES

Signature



Date

25/11/25.

Consultation with members/officers

If the decision is taken following consultation with the members/officers, please give details:

Name of Members/officers consulted:

Corporate Leadership Team

HR Manager

Armed Forces Internal Working Group

Signed by Member/officer as consulted:

Date

Stage 1 - Pre-Screening Equality Impact Assessment

For equalities profile information please visit [Norfolk Insight - Demographics and Statistics - Data Observatory](#)

Name of policy/service/function		Armed Forces Covenant - Going for Gold				
Is this a new or existing policy/service/function? <i>(tick as appropriate)</i>	New	X	Existing			
Brief summary/description of the main aims of the policy/service/function being screened. Please state if this policy/service is rigidly constrained by statutory obligations, and identify relevant legislation.	Pursue Armed Forces Gold Award status. This entails a number of actions, such as setting out fair, consistent arrangements supporting Reservists and CFAVs (training leave, mobilisation, pay/benefits/pension handling, return-to-work) ensuring no disadvantage and compliance with statutory duties. Statutory constraints: Reserve Forces Act 1996; Reserve Forces (Safeguarding of Employment) Act 1985; Reserve Forces (Call-out and Recall) (Financial Assistance) Regulations 2005; MoD/employer frameworks.					
Who has been consulted as part of the development of the policy/service/function? – new only <i>(identify stakeholders consulted with)</i>	HR, Payroll; Legal/Monitoring Officer; Armed Forces Champion/Lead Member.					
Question	Answer					
1. Is there any reason to believe that the policy/service/function could have a specific impact on people from one or more of the following groups, for example, because they have particular needs, experiences, issues or priorities or in terms of ability to access the service?			Positive	Negative	Neutral	Unsure
	Age				X	
	Disability				X	
	Sex				X	
	Gender Re-assignment				X	
	Marriage/civil partnership				X	
	Pregnancy & maternity				X	
	Race				X	
	Religion or belief				X	
	Sexual orientation				X	
	Armed forces community	X				
	Care leavers				X	
	Health inequalities*				X	
	Other (eg low income, caring responsibilities)				X	
Please tick the relevant box for each group. NB. Equality neutral means no negative impact on any group. <i>If potential adverse impacts are identified, then a full Equality Impact Assessment (Stage 2) will be required.</i> <i>*For more information on health inequalities please visit The King's Fund</i>						
Please provide a brief explanation of the answers above:						
Armed Forces community: Positive – policy prevents disadvantage and provides structured support.						

Other protected groups (age, disability, sex, gender reassignment, marriage/civil partnership, pregnancy & maternity, race, religion/belief, sexual orientation): Neutral – policy applies by Reservist/CFAV status; corporate EDI policies continue to apply.

Care leavers / low income / caring responsibilities / health inequalities: Neutral to minor positive – clearer paid-leave provisions and manager guidance may reduce ad-hoc inequities.

Question	Answer	Comments	
2. Is the proposed policy/service likely to affect relations between certain equality communities or to damage relations between the equality communities and the Council, for example because it is seen as favouring a particular community or denying opportunities to another?	No	Aligns with Covenant commitments.	
3. Could this policy/service be perceived as impacting on communities differently?	No	Applies only where Reservist/CFAV duties exist; proportionate support for CFAVs. (On this basis a full EIA is not required.)	
If 'yes' to questions 2 - 3 a full impact assessment will be required unless comments are provided to explain why this is not felt necessary: Decision agreed by EWG member:			
4. Are any impacts identified above minor and if so, can these be eliminated or reduced by minor actions? If yes, please agree actions with a member of the Corporate Equalities Working Group and list agreed actions in the comments section	No	Actions:	
		Actions agreed by EWG member:	
5. Is the policy/service specifically designed to tackle evidence of disadvantage or potential discrimination?	Yes	Please provide brief summary: It addresses potential workplace disadvantage for the Armed Forces community.	
Assessment completed by: Name	Jack Eddy		
Job title	Senior Policy Advisor		
Date completed	22/10/2025		
Reviewed by EWG member	Charlotte Marriott	Date	28.10.2025

☐ Please tick to confirm completed EIA Pre-screening Form has been shared with Corporate Policy (corporate.policy@west-norfolk.gov.uk)