

BCP Equality Impact Assessment Template

Executive Summary and Conclusions

Once the Equality Impact Assessment Template has been completed, please summarise the key findings here. Please send a copy of your final document to the Policy and Performance Team.

Whitecliff Road is one of a series of active travel schemes that were provided during the Summer of 2020. In the context of the schemes being introduced on an emergency basis due to the Covid-19 pandemic, a single generic Equalities Impact Assessment, EIA, was provided for all the schemes. Questionnaire responses for individual schemes, following their implementation, are then analysed for equalities detail when each individual scheme is up for decision.

Guided by local research and consultation, reducing the impact of traffic in each scheme area by improving the amenity for pedestrians and cyclists, will contribute to a more inclusive transport network. As some of our residents, especially in areas of high social deprivation, do not own cars, enabling cycling and walking and to an extent public transport, will deliver travel improvements for these communities. There are likely benefits to many of the higher risk people in society - including the elderly, BME citizens and people with health limiting disabilities, by providing additional space for social distancing giving more confidence to travel locally. Prioritising active travel will result in less pollution and better air quality, this benefits all of us but especially people with respiratory conditions. Reduced conflict between motor vehicles and pedestrians and cyclists should improve road safety.

Responses from the questionnaire specific to Whitecliff Road from 7 August 2020 until 11 January 2021, with 450 responses, showed that younger people, people without a disability, all other ethnicities, people with no religion or other religions and heterosexual sexual orientations were all notably more supportive of the aims of the scheme. Men were slightly more supportive than women. Correspondingly older people, Christians, non-heterosexual orientations and especially disabled people were less supportive of the aims. Women were slightly less supportive than men. All white British/Irish ethnicities supported the scheme broadly to the extent of the total sample, but all other ethnicities were clearly more supportive. Consistency was shown with groups that agreed with prioritising walking and cycling at Keyhole bridge also indicating that through motor traffic would be reduced, thinking the scheme would encourage cycling and walking and willing to cycling and walk more personally. Groups that were less supportive were also consistent in being less willing to cycle or walk and anticipating the scheme would not deliver reduced through traffic or increased active travel.

Unlike some other implemented active travel schemes there is very minimal loss of parking, 2 spaces, compared to an overall provision of 58 spaces. As a result, it is not considered that there is an impact for disabled motorists where a vehicle is their only means of transport available.

The recommended decision is to revoke the point closure so that Whitecliff Road can be re-opened to through traffic. A perspective that through re-instating motor traffic there would be a negative impact on vulnerable road users including young, elderly and disabled people is not clearly evidenced in the responses to the questionnaire with only young people showing clear support for the scheme. It is possible that very few elderly or disabled people regularly use this location for cycling and walking and they mostly drive. It needs to be noted that 96% of replies stated that they owned or had access to a car,

BCP Equality Impact Assessment Template

however the council ward - Poole Town, has relatively low levels of car ownership, with 66% of households with a car available.

Based on the responses to the questionnaire there is not a clear conclusion in overall terms of equalities impact and each protected group view this specific scheme differently. Considering the wider equalities benefits of encouraging active travel, noting the equalities and social deprivation profile of BCP residents that do not have access to cars, by removing the measure, more people in protected groups are likely to be **negatively** affected when seen from a wider transport perspective.

Part 1 - The Project

| | |
|---|--|
| Policy/Service under development/review: | Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council Emergency Active Travel Programme – Phase One, Specific project – Whitecliff Road |
| Service Unit: | Growth and Infrastructure |
| Service Lead: | Gary Powell |
| Equality Impact Assessment Team: | Richard Barnes, Beth Barker-Stock, Richard Pearson. Simon Philp. |
| Date assessment started: | 12 th June 2020 |
| Date assessment completed: | 13 January 2021 |
| What are the aims/objectives of the policy/service? | Whitecliff Road is one of multiple interim highways schemes, to deliver pop-up and temporary interventions to create an environment that is safe for walking and cycling. Initiated by Department of Transport, (DfT) funding, with the purpose to enable continuation of the transport network but still maintain social distancing during the Covid-19 pandemic. The aim is to embed walking and cycling as part of long - term commuting habits and reap the associated health, air quality and congestion benefits. As a |

BCP Equality Impact Assessment Template

Part 1 - The Project

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>condition of the funding the schemes need to be started within 4 weeks of receiving the DfT funding and completed within 8 weeks. BCP Council aims to deliver the schemes to ensure the Government funding is used to enable active and sustainable travel for people to get around while maintaining social distance. For the period of the funding allocation, public transport is discouraged to avoid overcrowding. Creating better spaces for cycling and walking will encourage local sustainable travel, to try to avoid escalating car use which has detrimental impacts in terms of congestion, air quality and health.</p> <p>Whitecliff Road specifically aims to create a safer environment to travel to and through the area on foot and/or by bicycle with safer and more sustainable access to the Poole park area. A further aim is to reduce the number of vehicles driving through Poole Park itself.</p> |
| <p>What outcomes will be achieved with the new or changed policy/service?</p> | <p>The overall combined scheme aim, is to provide, initially temporary highway changes to support social distancing requirements through safe walking and cycling measures – including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Closing roads to through traffic • installing segregated cycle lanes • widening pavements • review of parking arrangements to encourage safe active travel • bus stop measures. <p>The changes will be implemented on a temporary basis with evaluation and consultation to guide which schemes will become permanent. For Whitecliff Road at Keyhole Bridge, a planter, placed as a barrier will prevent through traffic at that location, with the intended outcome of encouraging active travel – walking and cycling. With the level of traffic significantly reduced at the pinch point under the bridge a safer environment for vulnerable road users will be developed. Additionally, an improved environment for cycling will allow improved continuity of cycling routes in the wider area.</p> |

BCP Equality Impact Assessment Template

Part 1 - The Project

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Are there any associated services, policies or procedures?</p> | <p>COVID-19, Emergency Active Travel Fund Statutory Guidance issued by HM Government including related temporary processes for new emergency traffic orders. Network Management Duty as part of Traffic Management Act 2004. Bournemouth, Poole and Dorset Local Transport Plan 3, 2011. BCP Council Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (Draft December 2019) BCP Council Climate Emergency, declared July 2019.</p> |
| <p>Please list the main people, or groups, that this policy/service is designed to benefit, and any other stakeholders involved:</p> | <p>Improvement to the environment for cycling and walking in the area around Keyhole bridge and the length of Whitecliff Road will form part of developing suitable routes as part of area wide active travel provision. Residents and visitors will benefit for active travel for commuting, education shopping and leisure. Improvements at this particular pinch point will help with access by foot and bicycle to Poole Park and Poole Hospital nearby. Links to other cycle routes – specifically National Cycle Network 25 and the related Evening Hill scheme will provide access to leisure at Sandbanks.</p> <p>Households living along Whitecliff Road will have reduced exposure to through motor traffic, however motorists may need to take a different route initially to their destination.</p> <p>Motorists who regularly use Whitecliff Road as through traffic will also be affected.</p> |
| <p>With consideration for their clients, please list any other organisations, statutory, voluntary or community that the policy/service/process will affect:</p> | <p>BH Active Travel Forum. Local Chambers of Commerce and Trade. Organisations on the statutory consultation list for Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO) including the emergency services – Police, Fire, Ambulances, Taxi associations/operators and DOTS Disability - community interest company. Bournemouth Transport – Yellow Buses</p> |

BCP Equality Impact Assessment Template

Part 1 - The Project

Go South Coast – More Bus.

Part 2 – Supporting Evidence¹

Please list and/or link to below any recent & relevant consultation & engagement that can be used to demonstrate a clear understanding of those with a legitimate interest in the policy/service/process and the relevant findings:

General -

Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Travel Survey, October 2018 to January 2019, a comprehensive local travel survey with a sample size of 3,621. There is detailed analysis as part of the survey linked to equalities profiles. The availability of local information is important as the schemes are within the BCP Council area. National data on transport is plentiful, however use of local research will provide more relevant data to evaluate the equalities impact of these schemes. Some findings from the research are detailed below.

If there is insufficient consultation or engagement information please explain in the Action plan what further consultation will be undertaken, who with and how.

Please list or link to any relevant research, census and other evidence or information that is available and relevant to this EIA: The BCP Travel Survey, is useful through the research undertaken to consider the impact of the overall objective of the programme to increase cycling and walking on different protected characteristics.

- 86% of respondents had travelled on foot within the last 12 months, the highest take up of any travel mode.
- Respondents with a disability are significantly less likely to drive a car or van compared to those without a disability.
- Males are twice as likely to cycle at least weekly, compared to females, with females citing personal security concerns and busy roads as a barrier to cycling to a greater degree than men.

¹ This could include: service monitoring reports, research, customer satisfaction surveys & feedback, workforce monitoring, staff surveys, opinions and information from trade unions, previous completed EIAs (including those of other organisations) feedback from focus groups & individuals or organisations representing the interests of key target groups or similar.

BCP Equality Impact Assessment Template

Part 2 – Supporting Evidence¹

- With car ownership and use proportionately lower in deprived communities and for younger people (16-24 Years), improving the viability of cycling and walking is anticipated to benefit these groups to a greater extent.
- Respondents with a disability are significantly less likely to cycle or walk than those without a disability; encouraging cycling and walking could exclude take up by some disabled people.

Specific to Whitecliff Road

A questionnaire by the BCP Council consultation team stated on 7 August 2020 with an indicated end date of 21 Feb 2021. The scheme was initiated on 17 August 2020, allowing responses during the trial as part of the guidance issue by HM Government for the funding. The evidence detailed is based upon 450 responses.

The key questions asked were-

- Should cycling and walking be prioritised at Keyhole Bridge, on Whitecliff Road?
- Would the measures introduced make it more or less likely that you would walk or cycle in the scheme area? (Questions about other modes of transport were asked, but increasing active travel was the main intention)
- Does the scheme provide a positive, negative or neutral impact based on your circumstances?

When the responses were broken down according to protected characteristics, there were some differences.

Age – younger people, but notably the 25-34 and 35-44 groups were more supportive of the measure, agreed it would help support walking and cycling, would be more likely to cycle and walk themselves and overall give a positive impact. Older groups, above 55 years were less supportive, felt it would encourage them and others to cycle or walk to a lesser extent and overall, the scheme had a more negative impact compared to younger groups. For the 18-24 age bracket, the support was less evident than those over 25, noting a small sample from this group.

Gender – Men were slightly more supportive, slightly more likely to cycle or walk as a result and slightly less impacted by the scheme than women.

Disability – respondents with a disability identified that limited their circumstances as either a little or a lot, were far less supportive of the scheme, than non-disabled people. The support was progressively less for those with a higher degree of disability. Disabled replies were much less likely to suggest that the measure would encourage themselves or others to walk/cycle and the scheme had a much greater negative impact compared to those without a disability. Disabled people considered the scheme would not reduce through motor traffic, compared to people without a disability.

Ethnicity – Due to a low level of responses from some groups, all white British and Irish responses were compared to all other ethnic groups. All other groups showed higher levels of support and indicated that they were more likely to benefit from the scheme. White British/Irish people's responses were very slightly less supportive compared to all replies, likely due to the positive response from the small sample size of all other ethnicities.

BCP Equality Impact Assessment Template

Part 2 – Supporting Evidence¹

Religion – respondents with no-religion or other non-Christian religions were more supportive, more likely to cycle and walk and more positively impacted by the measure. Christians were less likely to support prioritising cycling and walking, less likely to cycle and or walk more as a result and tended to a more negative view of the impact.

Transgender – There were not any respondents that identified. Notably, those who would 'Prefer not to say', their status, were less supportive than respondents that declared they were not transgender.

Sexual Orientation. Heterosexual people were more supportive, more likely to cycle/walk and indicated they would be less impacted by the scheme than all other orientations.

The consultation asked if respondents had access to a car. With 96% of respondents stating they did have access to a car, this compares with car ownership levels in the local council ward – Poole Town, of 66% of households. This indicates that car owning households are likely to have responded to the consultation to a greater extent than households that do not own a car.

The measure resulted in a loss of two parking spaces with 58 remaining for use on Whitecliff Road. This is unlikely to have any equalities impact due to the level of spaces retained.

Please list below any service user/employee monitoring data available and relevant to this policy/service/process and what it shows in relation to any Protected Characteristic:

See above.

If there is insufficient research and monitoring data, please explain in the Action plan what information will be gathered:

BCP Equality Impact Assessment Template

Part 3 – Assessing the Impact by Equality Characteristic

Use the evidence to determine to the impacts, positive or negative for each Equality Characteristic listed below. Listing negative impacts will help protect the organisation from potential litigation in the future, it does not mean the policy cannot continue.

Click here for more guidance on how to understand the impact of the service/policy/procedure against each characteristic.

If the impact is not known please explain in the Action plan what steps will be taken to find out.

| | Actual or potential positive outcome | Actual or potential negative outcome |
|---------------------|---|---|
| 1. Age ² | <p>Locally, younger people (16-24 yrs.) are significantly less likely to drive than all other age groups. Enhancements to encourage more walking and cycling will proportionately benefit younger people.</p> <p>Both the younger (16-34 yrs. and 65 yrs. and over) are less likely to cycle regularly than all other age groups. A better environment for cycling could encourage greater take up from both younger and older people who currently cycle less. With under 35 yrs. groups more likely to be discouraged from cycling due to personal safety concerns, this age group would likely feel safer from local measures to give more road space to cycling.</p> <p>Providing pedestrian areas with more personal space will give greater confidence to travel by foot or cycle for elderly people who could find crowded areas intimidating during the current health situation.</p> <p>Younger groups identified in the consultation with a higher level of support and higher benefit, with positive impact from the scheme.</p> | <p>With car use highest amongst middle age groups and higher among older people than much younger ages, any measures prioritising road space to pedestrians and cyclists will affect the age groups that drive more. Older age brackets showed less support for the aims of the scheme in the consultation, were less likely to travel actively as a result and felt the scheme had a more negative impact. Older groups did not think the scheme would encourage cycling or walking or reduce through traffic as much as younger ages.</p> |

² Under this characteristic, The Equality Act only applies to those over 18.

BCP Equality Impact Assessment Template

Part 3 – Assessing the Impact by Equality Characteristic

Use the evidence to determine to the impacts, positive or negative for each Equality Characteristic listed below. Listing negative impacts will help protect the organisation from potential litigation in the future, it does not mean the policy cannot continue. [Click here](#) for more guidance on how to understand the impact of the service/policy/procedure against each characteristic. If the impact is not known please explain in the Action plan what steps will be taken to find out.

| | Actual or potential positive outcome | Actual or potential negative outcome |
|----------------------------|--|---|
| 2. Disability ³ | <p>Locally people who identified as having a disability were slightly less likely to travel regularly by car, both as a driver or passenger, than non-disabled people. For many disabilities driving is not an option or through reduced income motoring is not feasible. Prioritising transport by other means than cars would likely benefit the many disabled people who do not have access to a car.</p> <p>Personal safety is highlighted to a greater degree by disabled people as a barrier to cycling. Improvements creating a safer cycling environment as part of these schemes should help mitigate this, benefiting some disabled people.</p> <p>Where a scheme widens pavements and removes any on street parking, the additional space will give visibility and easier movement with potential benefits for disabled people with mobility aids/wheelchairs and for partially</p> | <p>People who identified as having a disability are less likely to walk and especially cycle regularly, compared to non-disabled people. With 70% of disabled people mentioning health factors/physical ability as one of the reasons why they do not regularly cycle or walk, schemes prioritising active travel will not benefit these disabled people.</p> <p>Unlike other measures implemented elsewhere, there is very little changes to parking and so limited impact for any disabled drivers.</p> <p>The responses to the consultation from disabled people, were notably less supportive to the aims and indicated that the anticipated benefits of the scheme would not be as positive for disabled people compared to the non-disabled. The measure clearly had a high negative impact for disabled people that responded to the survey.</p> |

³ Consider any reasonable adjustments that may need to be made to ensure fair access.

BCP Equality Impact Assessment Template

Part 3 – Assessing the Impact by Equality Characteristic

Use the evidence to determine to the impacts, positive or negative for each Equality Characteristic listed below. Listing negative impacts will help protect the organisation from potential litigation in the future, it does not mean the policy cannot continue. [Click here](#) for more guidance on how to understand the impact of the service/policy/procedure against each characteristic. If the impact is not known please explain in the Action plan what steps will be taken to find out.

| | Actual or potential positive outcome | Actual or potential negative outcome |
|--------|---|--|
| | <p>sighted people. The aim in creating more space is that confidence is provided for local movement during the Covid-19 pandemic, benefiting many disabled people, including those affected by mental health.</p> <p>From the specific scheme consultation, disabled respondents, did not support the intentions above.</p> | |
| 3. Sex | <p>In the UK, cycling, both frequency and distance cycled are significantly higher for men than women. Locally men are twice as likely to cycle regularly than women. Busy roads and personal safety are mentioned to a greater extent as barriers to cycling; and personal safety for walking by women, compared to men. By reducing traffic and creating a safer environment for active travel, the main barriers to cycling for women will be addressed. The responses to the questionnaire showed the scheme was supported slightly more by men, who were slightly more likely to view the scheme as encouraging cycling/walking and to</p> | <p>Prioritising a transport means, cycling, which is significantly more likely to be undertaken by men could increase the existing gender disparity. By focusing on the reasons why women cycle less, this gap can be narrowed.</p> <p>Based on the responses to the specific scheme Women were slightly less supportive of the aims and slightly less likely to cycle/walk themselves or consider others would be encouraged as a result. Women also indicated a slightly higher negative impact of the measure than men.</p> |

BCP Equality Impact Assessment Template

Part 3 – Assessing the Impact by Equality Characteristic

Use the evidence to determine to the impacts, positive or negative for each Equality Characteristic listed below. Listing negative impacts will help protect the organisation from potential litigation in the future, it does not mean the policy cannot continue. [Click here](#) for more guidance on how to understand the impact of the service/policy/procedure against each characteristic. If the impact is not known please explain in the Action plan what steps will be taken to find out.

| | Actual or potential positive outcome | Actual or potential negative outcome |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| | slightly increase cycling/walking themselves, compared to responses from women. | |
| 4. Gender reassignment ⁴ | There are not any known positive outcomes specific to gender reassignment, if following consultation, the position changes, they will be included. The specific survey included a question whether respondents identified as trans, there were not any responses that identified as such. | There are not any known negative outcomes specific to gender reassignment, if following consultation, the position changes, they will be included. The specific survey included a question whether respondents identified as trans. Some responses stated they preferred not to say. For this group they were notably less supportive than people that had declared their status – as non-trans. |
| 5. Pregnancy and Maternity | Wider pavement widths will help ease of movement around local areas for people with prams/pushchairs. | The physical ability to take up active travel through pregnancy. |
| 6. Marriage and Civil Partnership | There are not any known positive outcomes specific to Marriage/Civil Partnership, if following consultation, the position changes, they will be included. | There are not any known negative outcomes specific to Marriage and Civil Partnership, if following consultation, the position changes, they will be included. |
| 7. Race | People from 'White Other Backgrounds' and BME backgrounds are locally more likely to cycle than 'White British' people, this is correlated with car ownership levels – 'White | Anticipated no overall detriment based on race for delivering these schemes. White British/Irish people's responses were very slightly less supportive compared to all replies, likely |

⁴ Transgender refers people have a gender identity or gender expression that differs to the sex assigned at birth.

BCP Equality Impact Assessment Template

Part 3 – Assessing the Impact by Equality Characteristic

Use the evidence to determine to the impacts, positive or negative for each Equality Characteristic listed below. Listing negative impacts will help protect the organisation from potential litigation in the future, it does not mean the policy cannot continue. [Click here](#) for more guidance on how to understand the impact of the service/policy/procedure against each characteristic. If the impact is not known please explain in the Action plan what steps will be taken to find out.

| | Actual or potential positive outcome | Actual or potential negative outcome |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| | <p>Other Backgrounds' are likely to be residents from the European Union who rely on other transport modes, if they don't own a car. Creating better spaces for cycling will have a positive impact for different racial groups. For schemes that deliver additional public space there should be more confidence for BME people to travel locally, linked to the emerging evidence that BME communities are impacted to a greater extent by the pandemic. The responses to the questionnaire indicate that all other ethnic groups support the aims, will benefit more and view the impact as positive compared to than all white British/Irish people.</p> | <p>due to the positive response from the small sample size of all other ethnicities.</p> |
| 8. Religion or Belief | <p>The BCP Transport Survey analysis suggested that differences in responses due to religion or belief correlated with age responses due to a higher proportion of Christians amongst older groups. Following the questionnaire, people that have no religion and non-Christian religions viewed the scheme as more favourable, more likely to</p> | <p>The BCP Transport Survey analysis suggested that differences in responses due to religion or belief correlated with age responses due to a higher proportion of Christians amongst older groups. From the specific scheme questionnaire, Christian respondents did not consider the scheme as favourable as those with no or other religions. Christians were less likely to walk/cycle as a result and thought the scheme had a greater negative impact.</p> |

BCP Equality Impact Assessment Template

Part 3 – Assessing the Impact by Equality Characteristic

Use the evidence to determine to the impacts, positive or negative for each Equality Characteristic listed below. Listing negative impacts will help protect the organisation from potential litigation in the future, it does not mean the policy cannot continue. [Click here](#) for more guidance on how to understand the impact of the service/policy/procedure against each characteristic. If the impact is not known please explain in the Action plan what steps will be taken to find out.

| | Actual or potential positive outcome | Actual or potential negative outcome |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | encourage active travel and provide a positive outcome. | |
| 9. Sexual Orientation | The BCP Transport Survey analysis suggested that differences in responses due to sexual orientation correlated with age responses due to a higher proportion of non-heterosexual identification amongst younger groups. Non-heterosexual people are linked to this, more likely to cycle or walk than heterosexual people so measures as part of these schemes will proportionately benefit LGBT+ people. The specific scheme consultation differed from this and showed that Heterosexual people were more supportive than those that identify as non-heterosexual. | The BCP Transport Survey analysis suggested that differences in responses due to sexual orientation correlated with age responses due to a higher proportion of non-heterosexual identification amongst younger groups. For the specific consultation all other non-heterosexual orientations were actually based on the sample, less receptive to the scheme and considered they would be benefit less and are more likely to be negatively impacted. |
| 10. Armed Forces Community | Any impacts are not known, if information becomes available it will be included. | Any impacts are not known, if information becomes available it will be included. |
| 11. Any other factors/groups e.g. | The BCP Transport Survey included analysis of index of multiple deprivation. Residents living in the most deprived areas are significantly less likely to drive frequently and have lower car ownership levels than areas of | |

BCP Equality Impact Assessment Template

Part 3 – Assessing the Impact by Equality Characteristic

Use the evidence to determine to the impacts, positive or negative for each Equality Characteristic listed below. Listing negative impacts will help protect the organisation from potential litigation in the future, it does not mean the policy cannot continue. [Click here](#) for more guidance on how to understand the impact of the service/policy/procedure against each characteristic. If the impact is not known please explain in the Action plan what steps will be taken to find out.

| | Actual or potential positive outcome | Actual or potential negative outcome |
|---|--|--|
| socio-economic status/carers etc ⁵ | lower deprivation. Where schemes are focused on creating a better transport environment for walking and cycling the measures will benefit residents living in more deprived areas accordingly. The Whitecliff scheme through linking with other cycle routes will better allow people from more deprived areas access to leisure and the seafront at Evening Hill and Sandbanks, | |
| 12. Human Rights | Any impacts are not known, if information becomes available it will be included. | Any impacts are not known, if information becomes available it will be included. |

Any policy which shows actual or potential unlawful discrimination must be stopped, removed or changed.

Part 4 – Equality Impact Action Plan

Please complete this Action Plan for any negative or unknown impacts identified in the assessment table above.

| Issue identified | Action required to reduce impact | Timescale | Responsible officer |
|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------|---------------------|
|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------|---------------------|

⁵ People on low incomes or no income, unemployed, carers, part-time, seasonal workers and shift workers

BCP Equality Impact Assessment Template

| | | | |
|---|---|------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Depending on the decision to continue or revoke the scheme, further evaluate responses from groups that were less supportive. | Consider if the responses from the questionnaire were representative. Further investigate why responses from disabled people indicated they were negatively impacted compared to other responses. | Subject to overall decision. | Project and consultation team. |
| | | | |
| | | | |

Key contacts for further advice and guidance:

Equality & Diversity:

[Sam Johnson - Policy and Performance Manager](#)

Consultation & Research:

[Lisa Stuchberry – Insight Manager](#)