

**Equality in our lifetime?
Discrimination Law Review Briefing Paper**

Seminar 9 November 2006, City Hall

copyright

**Greater London Authority
November 2006**

Published by

Greater London Authority
City Hall
The Queen's Walk
London SE1 2AA

www.london.gov.uk

enquiries **020 7983 4100**

minicom **020 7983 4458**

ISBN 10 **1 85261 945 7**

ISBN 13 **978 1 85261 945 9**

EQUALITY IN OUR LIFETIME?

1. INTRODUCTION

Will the Discrimination Law Review deliver the law needed to secure a more equal future?

Discrimination and inequality blight the lives of individuals and communities and deprive society of the best that people have to give. Doing everything possible to help deliver equality is at the heart of the work of the Mayor of London and the Greater London Authority (GLA).

That is why the Mayor believes that the Discrimination Law Review (DLR) – charged with fulfilling the manifesto commitment for a Single Equality Act must aim to produce the kind of law that can seriously challenge the realities of discrimination. The review must deliver equality not in 200 years, but in our lifetime. The DLR must aim to level up anti-discrimination law and render it consistent in definition, comprehensive in protection and effective in implementation. The best standards in existing law should be identified and extended to all areas of discrimination.

Ample evidence, including research by the GLA and the testimony of a wide range of equality stakeholder organisations, exists of the scale of inequality and the need for more robust and comprehensive anti-discrimination law, mechanisms and enforcement. That evidence should be taken on board and result in a robust Single Equality Act.

The DLR is a once in a generation opportunity to fundamentally improve anti-discrimination law and really tackle inequality – we must get it right.

2. THE EQUALITY CHALLENGE

The evidence of inequality shows why better equality law is needed.

- In London 39 per cent of children are in income poverty, but for Black ethnic groups this goes up to 51 per cent and for Pakistani and Bangladeshi groups it reaches 69 per cent¹.
- The gender pay gap is wider in London, at 24 per cent, than across the UK as a whole².
- Black and minority ethnic men in London are less likely to be in employment than white British males: 60 per cent of Pakistani/ Bangladeshi men and 63 per cent of Black or Black British men are in employment compared with 80 of men in White groups³.
- Disabled children continue to face severe discrimination: only 60 per cent of pupils with Special Educational Needs statements are placed in mainstream schools but in English special schools 61 per cent of pupils are not entered for any GCSE/GNVQs compared to 4 per cent of children in mainstream schools⁴, while 43 per cent of disabled people are in employment compared with 74 per cent of non-disabled people⁵.

¹ Households Below Average Income, Department for Work and Pensions

² Women in London's Economy, GLA, 2006

³ Introducing the Annual Population Survey: Preliminary results for the 2004 APS GLA DMAG briefing 2005/34

⁴ cited in Disablist Britain, Demos/Scope, 2006

⁵ Introducing the Annual Population Survey: Preliminary results for the 2004 APS GLA DMAG briefing 2005/34

- Hate crime against lesbian and gay people, including homophobic bullying in schools, is a reflection of continuing prejudice and the need for a duty on private and public sector organisations to promote equality in relation to sexual orientation.
- Age discrimination legislation does not cover provision of goods and services, allowing ageism in the provision of health care, for example, to persist.
- Sections of the media spread prejudicial attitudes about religious or ethnic minority groups with apparent impunity: for example, encouraging Islamophobia by virtually equating Muslim people with terrorists or headlines maligning Gypsy, Roma and traveller people.

There are clearly many more examples and statistics that could be cited. The picture is clear: anti-discrimination law is in need of radical improvement.

3. POLITICAL CONTEXT OF THE DISCRIMINATION LAW REVIEW

Aspects of the current political dialogue on equality are deeply worrying. Too often, prejudice is being pandered to instead of confronted. This trend can only be of assistance to those who stand against the values of equality, respect for diversity and against discrimination – including the most extreme bigots and racists.

In particular it is suggested that multiculturalism is to blame for social tensions and problems of communications, and is producing polarisation of communities. Such attacks on multiculturalism deny the reality that this is a product of progress against prejudice and that diversity has contributed to this country's economic, cultural and social development. In reality, particularly in London, the fact is that varied communities are living and working together and valuing this diversity as a positive part of London life.

There is a stronger danger that the current political narrative may serve to lower the aspirations of the DLR. That would be a great mistake. Inequality, poverty, prejudice and discrimination are social evils that the Review can and should play a significant part in eradicating.

Additionally, ministers have said that the Equalities Review, chaired by Trevor Phillips, will inform proposals of the DLR. This is a problem because the Interim Report of the Equalities Review did not investigate or appear to understand discrimination and structural disadvantage and their impact on inequality. It had a rose-tinted view of recent history as 'gradual progress towards a less unequal society'. On the need for new anti-discrimination law it was extremely conservative.

Tendencies towards limiting the content of a Single Equality Act must be firmly resisted.

New legislation that levels up, coheres and strengthens rights to equality is needed and can command wide public support and strengthen the fabric of society.

4. FULL CONSULTATION NEEDED

Despite being announced in February 2005, the DLR has still not produced any proposals and there has been no public discussion. With a commitment to introduce a Single Equality Act in this parliament, time is ticking by if the DLR is to produce a meaningful proposal, which can command public confidence.

The first step in ensuring that the outcome of the DLR is anti-discrimination law fit for the 21st Century is to have the widest possible debate about the realities of discrimination and inequality today. The statistics of inequality remain profound and discrimination strongly prevalent in the face of current law. How to improve law so it can really confront and root out discrimination must be the objective.

It is to encourage the wide discussion that is essential to inform the future shape of law that the Mayor has supported a series of consultations on the future of equality and why the seminar on the DLR on 9 November has been organised. This is the latest in a series of consultations hosted by the Mayor on the future of equality in Britain, which will continue as proposals from the DLR emerge.

Now is the moment for those communities and organisations with direct experience of discrimination to make their views known and to put forward proposals on the ways in which the law should change to secure equality.

5. AIMS OF THE REVIEW – THE DISCRIMINATION LAW REVIEW MUST AIM FOR FUNDAMENTAL CHANGE

The DLR was set up following a manifesto commitment to introduce a Single Equality Act within the lifetime of this parliament. The DLR has a remit ‘to develop a simpler, fairer legal framework that fits the needs of 21st century Britain’. The terms of reference state this will include ‘consideration of the fundamental principles of discrimination and its underlying concepts’.

The DLR must be based on a clear understanding of the objectives of a Single Equality Act. Our goal must be a radically more equal and fairer society. So that, for example, black, Asian, minority ethnic or Muslim people have fair representation in senior jobs or in public life. Or that the pay gap between men and women is ended, or that lesbians and gay men have the same civil rights and chance of being safe on the streets at night as other citizens. Or so that disabled children are included and provided for in education.

The DLR must also be based on a clear understanding of the barriers to achieving such goals.

Institutionalised discrimination in its multitude of forms confines all too many members of our society to gross inequality – from working structures that fail to take into account the demands of caring responsibility, to educational institutions which fail to meet the needs of BME children or protect children from homophobia, or services that impose arbitrary exclusion on older people and, transport systems designed for the able-bodied male minority.

The Interim Report of the Equalities Review (which is said to be ‘informing’ the work of the DLR) is fundamentally flawed in this regard, and was widely rejected by equality groups. The Interim Report failed to analyse or understand that structured discrimination and disadvantage create inequality, instead putting it down to ‘trigger episodes’ or a ‘particular life event’. Its approach would reduce the analysis of inequality to random life chances, not systematic processes, which need to be socially changed. If the Equalities Review does not understand what causes inequality, then it will not inform the development of adequate laws to challenge it (*see Mayor’s Submission to the Equalities Review Interim Report, at www.london.gov.uk/londonissues/equalityanddiversity.jsp*)

It is crucial that the DLR rejects this approach (which comes pretty close to ‘blaming the victim’) and instead takes advantage of the wealth of analysis of discrimination and the views of representative and campaigning organisations. That requires a broad, inclusive and multilayered consultation process.

However, that also would be limited by the approach taken in the Equalities Review Interim Report, which attacked some of the kinds of organisations whose participation will be critical in getting a Single Equality Act right. It said that equality organisations were ‘self interested groups’ seeking to address problems ‘for which they in part are themselves responsible’. It is these very organisations that have tirelessly driven forward awareness of inequality and the agenda needed to tackle it for many years. A negative approach to such experience by the DLR should be rejected.

6. CHANGES NEEDED

Defining Equality

If anti-discrimination law is not comprehensive and is failing to fully tackle discrimination, is this because of a too limited definition of equality?

Outside of the Disability Discrimination Act, the dominant approach within Britain’s anti-discrimination laws requires treating everyone the same. Increasingly there is a recognition that this inadequately expresses the underlying principle of fairness which motivated these laws. For example, sex discrimination law – based on formal or ‘symmetrical’ concepts – works by saying women and men should be treated alike. But that means that positive action measures may often fall foul of the law. Is that sensible?

Disability most starkly exposes the limitations of the equal treatment approach. In some situations pure prejudice and stereotypical assumptions are involved. However, more often disabled people need different treatment – ‘reasonable adjustments’ - to have genuine equality of opportunity.

The same can be true in relation to other diversity characteristics. People may need to be treated differently in order either to redress the broader social disadvantage which they face (as in training schemes to compensate for poor educational experiences); or to meet the requirements intrinsic to a particular identity (as in enabling people to engage in religious or cultural practices). For example, this approach would allow reasonable adjustments to be required for women or men who wish to observe particular dress codes in particular work situations or to allow flexibility around religious or cultural requirements.

A law which focuses solely on treating everyone the same sends the clear message that if people fail after receiving equal treatment this is the result of their own personal limitations and choices. It fails to adequately recognise that artificial barriers (such as unnecessary job criteria, rigid dress codes or inflexible work practices;) need to be removed to create a more level playing field. In some circumstances additional support (such as childcare or supplementary training schemes) is needed to provide genuinely equal opportunities.

- **The DLR need to consider the actions which are needed to provide a genuinely ‘level playing field’ for all.** For example, could ‘reasonable accommodation’, a concept from disability law, be helpful?

- **The DLR must provide strong legal rights** to carers leave, and genuinely flexible working, as well as positive action, to really tackle inequality.

Positive Action

Due to these limitations in the dominant approach to discrimination in UK law, positive action to redress discrimination in employment or public life is often declared illegal.

There is a common misconception that EU law may restrict the scope for positive action. However, many legal experts believe the opposite is the case – that there is much more scope for positive action under international law, most directly, under European Union Directives, and that UK law is not taking full advantage of this. Drawing from the international conventions, it could be said that the aim of positive action is to achieve substantive equality, that is, full and equal participation in all fields.

Article 5 of the EU Race Directive/Article 7 of the Employment Framework Directive for example state: *‘With a view to ensuring full equality in practice, the principle of equal treatment shall not prevent any Member State from maintaining or adopting specific measures to prevent or compensate for disadvantages linked to racial or ethnic origin/religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation.’*

Or, the United Nations Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Racial Discrimination (ICERD) states that positive action is an obligation of signatory states:

‘Article 2(2) State Parties shall, when the circumstances so warrant, take, in the social, economic, cultural, and other fields, special and concrete measures to ensure the adequate development and protection of certain racial groups or individuals belonging to them, for the purpose of guaranteeing them the full and equal enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms. These measures shall in no case entail as a consequence the maintenance of unequal or separate rights for different racial groups after the objectives for which they were taken have been achieved.’

However, the positive action provisions in certain of the current UK anti-discrimination laws are *far* more limited in scope, providing only narrow exceptions, such as for education or training in certain circumstances.

This means that even very limited positive action measures are often deemed illegal. A report early in 2006 showed some of the problems: a company with a goal of placing graduates that were ‘visibly from a non-white background’ was considered to be acting outside the law⁶. Experience in London suggests that without stronger legal tools, a significant increase in recruitment rates for black and minority ethnic entrants into the Metropolitan Police is unlikely to be achieved. Unless recruitment, and retention, are improved, progress towards the kind of representative police force that London needs, is likely to be very slow. A competition by an arts group, open to black and minority ethnic entrants, where the prize was to be published in a collection, was considered outside of existing UK law.

There are also big anomalies: the Sex Discrimination Act 2002 which allowed women only shortlists legalises positive action in that area – but what is the logic for not allowing this for Black, Asian or Muslim candidates or for other areas such as employment?

In Northern Ireland there is a much stronger provision for positive action.

⁶ Personnel Today 17 January 2006

New legislation should define positive action in broad terms, enabling it to be seen as relevant to all areas within the scope of the legislation, not limited to employment. The focus should be measures to remove the barriers that create and maintain disadvantage. Employers need to be totally clear on the scope and requirement for positive action in appropriate circumstances. For example, there is a case for mandating public sector organisations to take positive action measures within the scope of their functions where entrenched patterns of disadvantage are identified. Logically these would be time specified until the designated equality objective is achieved.

Levelling Up

The DLR should grasp the opportunity to level up protection across grounds and strands and in all the areas of people's lives where they may be subject to discrimination.

At the moment UK anti-discrimination law has many weaknesses and differences. Even recently introduced laws like anti-discrimination provisions on race or disability have major inconsistencies, or new measures such as those against discrimination in providing goods, facilities and services to lesbian and gay people are still undergoing discussion as to whether there should be omissions – which would effectively legalise discrimination depending on where it occurred. There is concern over weaknesses in age discrimination regulations and these do not yet cover provision of goods, services and facilities.

Positive Duties to Equality

The limits of existing law, based in an individual, complaints led model, has led to a push for more proactive laws – which create a positive duty to eliminate discrimination and promote equality. Whatever sectors these duties applied to would have to show that they were complying with the law – rather than purely relying on individuals to take action against discrimination through the courts.

This approach has already been enacted through the equality duty in Northern Ireland and in the race equality duty in Britain. A disability duty will come into force in December 2006 and a gender duty in April 2007. These will create positive duties to equality in race, gender and disability in the public sector.

However, the positive right to equality should clearly extend across all strands of discrimination and indeed all sectors of employment and service delivery.

Indeed, the GLA and the Wales Assembly must uphold cross strand positive duties.

The GLA is widely recognised as setting a standard of excellence in the implementation of this duty. The Mayor's vision is that the GLA will be an equalities champion and leader in promoting equality, challenging and eradicating discrimination, providing responsive and accessible services for Londoners and ensuring its workforce reflects the diverse population of London. The GLA has adopted gender, race, disability, faith, sexuality and age as its high-level equalities categories for planning, delivery and monitoring purposes and annually reports on how equality of opportunity has been taken forward for target groups, in action plans, impact assessments and budgeting.

There are big decisions to be made on the exact content, application and enforcement of new equality duties, such as:

- Outcomes – Existing duties have been criticised for being process driven – a tick-box and bureaucratic exercise. Any new law needs to focus on producing real outcomes for greater equality.
- ‘Due Regard’ not enough – Currently organisations just have to pay ‘due regard’ to equality, not to do anything about it. Discrimination is illegal – organisations should be required to act to eliminate it.

Private Sector

Most people work in the private sector and, as a result of contracting out of services, the private sector is also increasingly important in providing services to the public. So what anti-discrimination standards should the private sector have to uphold? If discrimination is wrong – surely it is wrong wherever it occurs?

Should positive duties be limited to people who work in or receive services from the public sector? Why? Should all employees not be entitled to equality? In London, 70 per cent of women in employment work in the private sector – a law that just covers the public sector won’t do much for the majority of working women, or men. The DLR’s discussion needs to embrace the scope of obligations on the private sector.

- **Procurement:** through contract compliance public authorities can embed equality standards in the process of public procurement. Given the scale of public sector contracting, this could have considerable impact. However the law remains too vague and permissive and is surrounded by other legal obligations that can create confusion on the scope for equality in contracts – particular in smaller authorities with fewer resources. Any room for confusion needs to be removed, so that there is a clear obligation on public authorities to include equality and elimination of discrimination in procurement of services across strands.
- The GLA is widely recognised as having provided clear leadership in this **area, ensuring that equality standards are embedded in the contract process.** This experience shows what can be done with clear leadership: that approach has to be extended at a national level.
- The GLA’s approach is set out here:

The Greater London Authority (GLA) and its Functional Bodies (Transport for London, the London Development Agency, the Metropolitan Police Authority and the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority) have sought to incorporate equality and anti-discrimination measures in their contracting and procurement processes.

The GLA Group has adopted a Sustainable Procurement Policy. The seven strands of the policy include three that are particularly relevant to anti-discrimination measures: encouraging a diverse base of suppliers; promoting fair employment practices; and addressing strategic labour needs.

Implementation of the policy is expected to have a significant impact on addressing anti-discrimination measures, by increasing the level of consideration given to the supply chain and employment practices and intentions of GLA Group contractors and sub-contractors.

Monitoring and Transparency

To be effective the implementation of law needs to be monitored, and this will require greater transparency by employers and service providers to show how they are implementing duties and what steps they are taking when a problem is revealed. Robust monitoring, including measures to ensure transparency through the publication of data, is necessary.

Monitoring must lead to actions that produce measurable improvements in equality. To avoid being a tick-box exercise, monitoring must be outcome focussed and supported by effective mechanisms to raise awareness, remedy discrimination and encourage compliance. At present limitations in the law – for example, on positive action – can prevent organisations taking the necessary steps to address under-representation identified or met public sector goals set by government.

Pay Audits

Patterns of pay discrimination remain entrenched. Pay audits are just one example of a mechanism that could be applied to correct discriminatory pay patterns, if such transparency existed to allow the real situation in workplaces to be shown.

For example, women in London are paid an average 24 per cent less than men. This in a city where housing, transport and childcare are all very expensive.

The Equal Opportunity Commission's 'Equal pay reviews survey 2005' illustrates both the difficulty in getting some employers to provide greater transparency without legislative requirement to do so, and the pattern of discrimination that can be revealed – and therefore acted upon – if a pay audit is carried out.

- 82 per cent of all organisations reported in 2005 that they had never carried out an Equal Pay Review, had none in progress and had no plans to conduct one;
- However, 61 per cent of large public sector organisations had completed or were doing a pay review as were 39 per cent of large private sector ones;
- Three-fifths of those with some EPR activity stated that being seen as a 'good practice' employer was the main reason for undertaking a review'.
- Where EPRs were undertaken and a pay gap revealed, the causes were:

- women not getting into senior, more highly paid jobs	40 per cent
- women coming in on lower starting salaries	22 per cent
- differences in the length of time that women take to progress through the pay scale	19 per cent
- Women not getting access to jobs that attract bonus or other performance related payments	8 per cent
- Other	34 per cent

Putting Equality First

By subordinating anti-discrimination law to certain other laws, discrimination in certain areas of life is currently effectively sanctioned. Race and religious discrimination in some aspects of immigration control remains perfectly legal, for example. The DLR must make sure equality comes first by ending these anomalies. Further, any new legislation should be subject to an

equality assessment before it is introduced in Parliament, and the relevant Minister should be required to certify that any new legislation does not conflict with equality law (or give reasons why, despite a conflict, it should be approved nevertheless) as Ministers must now do relation to human rights.

7. ENFORCING THE LAW

Both the DLR and ER are to inform the workings of the **Commission for Equalities and Human Rights (CEHR)**. The CEHR is due to open its doors in October 2007. It will replace the existing statutory commissions – the Commission for Racial Equality, Equal Opportunities Commission and Disability Rights Commission – which will all be abolished, and have new responsibilities on age, sexual orientation and religion, as well as human rights.

The CEHR has been criticised for being a ‘one-size fits all’ or lowest common denominator solution. That would amount to a big step backwards in understanding and tackling inequality. It will have no representative structures, save for a disability commissioner and committee. The tone of recent public and political discussion on issues of diversity and multiculturalism underline the need for voices of minority communities and those facing inequality to be included and heard. The DLR must aim to prevent a reduction in the expertise and links needed to combat discrimination.

With a focus on ‘strategic’ cases, the CEHR is also likely to provide a much lower level of support through legal representation of individuals who wish to challenge discrimination: in addition to legal aid being unavailable for such cases at Employment Tribunals and the impact that the Carter review and similar civil law proposals may have on limiting choice in legal representation, this may see a severe restriction in access to justice. Without the ability to actually use the law, the positive impact of improvement in the text of the law will be severely limited in practice.

The Single Equality Act should be used to address these weaknesses and to strengthen anti-discrimination law directly. For example, race equality groups are calling for a statutory race committee and legal aid campaigners are calling for the limits in access to justice to be addressed.

Representative Actions

Even the best resourced, and most effective CEHR cannot be relied on as the sole institution championing strategic change and countering institutionalised discrimination. The DLR need to find ways to give bodies such as law centres, citizens advice bureaux, trade unions and groups such as race equality or lesbian and gay equality organisations more ability to also act.

One way of facilitating justice would be to allow **representative actions**. Representative actions would allow groups of people who believe themselves collectively affected by the same discrimination to take legal action and for a decision to apply to them all as a group.

For example, if lesbians were being discriminated against in terms of health provision under the provision of goods, facilities or services, rather than an individual having to take an action, at her own personal cost and with results potentially applying only to the individual concerned, a representative action could be taken on behalf of a group of people experiencing the same discrimination. Or, in relation to disabled people, representative action by a group discriminated against by environmental barriers to access a restaurant, for example, is more likely to be effective in producing change.

The CEHR will be entirely inadequate to support the thousands of people who face discrimination and want to defend their rights. At present many cases cannot advance due to lack of legal support. Discussion must include the strong case for representative actions.

Penalties

The sanctions that courts and tribunals can apply are also limited. This means that everything possible to deter discrimination is not being done.

The EU anti-discrimination Directives provide for sanctions that are 'effective, proportionate and dissuasive'. Under British law the main sanction, and remedy for the victim, is a declaration of rights of the parties and an award of compensation to the victim. There is good evidence that such sanctions are not dissuasive, even to the particular employer.

A most important piece of evidence is the typical level of compensation in awards by Employment Tribunals. Awards are generally extremely low: in 2005 the median award was only £7,567. Media coverage that focuses on those cases where there are substantial awards can leave the impression that these are typical: in fact, in 2005 there were only four awards above £100,000. This tiny number of high awards drags the average award upwards, to £14,228 last year – meaning that there are a very significant number of awards much lower than this, as shown by the median figure⁷.

The DLR must strengthen the sanctions that courts can apply if discrimination is found so that they are 'effective, proportionate and dissuasive'. For example, by making binding recommendations to prevent recurrence, disqualifying offenders from future public contracts (as in Northern Ireland) or publicising court rulings.

8. ACCESS TO JUSTICE

Even if the law is perfect on paper, it will be of little use if people are unable to access it.

The CEHR will provide very limited legal representation to individuals – lack of funding to take cases will decrease access to justice. Legal aid is not available for employment tribunal cases. In principle it is available for some goods and services cases (heard in county courts) but is rarely awarded and subject to a strict means test. Free legal advice through Citizens Advice Centres and Law Centres is increasingly rare due to funding restriction.

Legal Aid funding and the ability to free choice of legal representation are critical issues to make legal rights meaningful.

Equality Tribunals

Stakeholders have made a strong case for the creation of specialist Equality and Employment Tribunals, hearing all but the most specialised of discrimination cases, to create an expert and easier to access route to justice. At the moment all discrimination cases, except for employment, start in the county and sheriff courts and have to pay court fees: unlike Employment Tribunal cases. Fees are charged for county court cases: so someone who is facing discrimination in, for example, provision of a service, will have to be able to pay a fee to even start a case and may

⁷ Equal Opportunities Review, August 2005

face an order for costs if unsuccessful. The Hepple Report, as long ago as 2000, recommended that: All discrimination cases should be commenced in the Employment Tribunal; where the matter does not relate to employment the tribunal should be designated as an “equality tribunal”...⁸.

9. CONCLUSION

Equality in our lifetime needs an ambitious vision based on an informed discussion.

This paper deliberately takes a stance: tackling inequality and discrimination is a duty.

It is intended to stimulate discussion and be further developed as a result of consultation with stakeholder organisations. The essential point is that patterns of discrimination are clear and entrenched, and the reasons behind the government’s manifesto commitment for a Single Equality Act are compelling.

Now is not the time for a cautious and limited technical adjustment of existing legislation. Now is the time for a bold vision of an equal future to be advanced through a Discrimination Law Review resulting in a Single Equality Act that is comprehensive, rigorous, based on concepts of equality that can challenge the social reality of structural disadvantage and which is proudly promoted, monitored and enforced by meaningful mechanisms for change.

The gaps and inconsistencies in anti-discrimination law are reflected in the realities of entrenched inequality, whether judged by educational outcomes, horizontal and vertical occupational segregation, pay inequality, representation in public life and employment, defamatory and hateful media imagery, and many other measures.

The DLR must address these issues to:

- base anti-discrimination law on concepts that reflect the reality of discrimination;
- bring under the scope of the law forms and areas of discrimination that still remain legal;
- level up across strands, building on the most effective definitions and mechanisms, extending them comprehensively and introducing new measures needed;
- strengthen access to justice and enforcement of the law.

⁸ Equality: A New Framework, Report of the Independent Review of the Enforcement of UK Anti-Discrimination Legislation. Hepple, Coussey and Choudhury, Hart Publishing, 2000.

Other formats and languages

For a large print, Braille, disc, sign language video or audio-tape version of this document, please contact us at the address below:

Public Liaison Unit

Greater London Authority
City Hall
The Queen's Walk
London SE1 2AA

Telephone **020 7983 4100**
Minicom **020 7983 4458**
www.london.gov.uk

You will need to supply your name, your postal address and state the format and title of the publication you require.

If you would like a copy of this document in your language, please phone the number or contact us at the address above.

Chinese

如果需要您母語版本的此文件，
請致電以下號碼或與下列地址聯絡

Vietnamese

Nếu bạn muốn có văn bản tài liệu này bằng ngôn ngữ của mình, hãy liên hệ theo số điện thoại hoặc địa chỉ dưới đây.

Greek

Αν θέλετε να αποκτήσετε αντίγραφο του παρόντος εγγράφου στη δική σας γλώσσα, παρακαλείστε να επικοινωνήσετε τηλεφωνικά στον αριθμό αυτό ή ταχυδρομικά στην παρακάτω διεύθυνση.

Turkish

Bu belgenin kendi dilinizde hazırlanmış bir nüshasını edinmek için, lütfen aşağıdaki telefon numarasını arayınız veya adrese başvurunuz.

Punjabi

ਜੇ ਤੁਹਾਨੂੰ ਇਸ ਦਸਤਾਵੇਜ਼ ਦੀ ਕਾਪੀ ਤੁਹਾਡੀ ਆਪਣੀ ਭਾਸ਼ਾ ਵਿਚ ਚਾਹੀਦੀ ਹੈ, ਤਾਂ ਹੇਠ ਲਿਖੇ ਨੰਬਰ 'ਤੇ ਫੋਨ ਕਰੋ ਜਾਂ ਹੇਠ ਲਿਖੇ ਪਤੇ 'ਤੇ ਰਾਬਤਾ ਕਰੋ:

Hindi

यदि आप इस दस्तावेज की प्रति अपनी भाषा में चाहते हैं, तो कृपया निम्नलिखित नंबर पर फोन करें अथवा नीचे दिये गये पते पर संपर्क करें

Bengali

আপনি যদি আপনার ভাষায় এই দলিলের প্রতিলিপি (কপি) চান, তা হলে নীচের ফোন নম্বরে বা ঠিকানায় অনুগ্রহ করে যোগাযোগ করুন।

Urdu

اگر آپ اس دستاویز کی نقل اپنی زبان میں چاہتے ہیں، تو براہ کرم نیچے دئے گئے نمبر پر فون کریں یا دیئے گئے پتے پر رابطہ کریں

Arabic

إذا أردت نسخة من هذه الوثيقة بلغتك، يرجى الاتصال برقم الهاتف أو مراسلة العنوان أدناه

Gujarati

જો તમને આ દસ્તાવેજની નકલ તમારી ભાષામાં જોઈતી હોય તો, કૃપા કરી આપેલ નંબર ઉપર ફોન કરો અથવા નીચેના સરનામે સંપર્ક સાધો.

GREATER LONDON AUTHORITY

City Hall
The Queen's Walk
London SE1 2AA

www.london.gov.uk
Enquiries **020 7983 4100**
Minicom **020 7983 4458**