**Equality Screening Form**

**INTRODUCTION**

The information contained in this Equality Screening Form has been extracted from the Equality Commission for Northern Ireland’s Guide for Public Authorities (2010). Additional information about the 5 parts of the form and a flowchart to demonstrate the process of completion is detailed in [**Appendix 1**](#Appendix1) of the form.

This template document and further guidance can be found by clicking the following link - [www.equalityni.org/S75duties](https://www.equalityni.org/S75duties)

**PART 1- POLICY SCOPING**

The first stage of the screening process involves scoping the policy under consideration. The purpose of policy scoping is to help prepare the background and context and set out the aims and objectives for the policy, being screened. At this stage, scoping the policy will help identify potential constraints as well as opportunities and will help the policy maker work through the screening process on a step by step basis.

Public authorities should remember that the Section 75 statutory duties apply to internal policies (relating to people who work for the authority), as well as external policies (relating to those who are, or could be, served by the authority).

**Information about the policy**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name of Policy** | Fares Strategy 2020-2023 | | | | | |
| **Is it existing, revised or a new policy?** | Existing |  | New |  | Revised |  |
| **If revised, please outline main updates:** | Updated Fares Strategy for the period 2020-2023 | | | | | |
| **What is it trying to achieve?**  **(Intended aims/outcomes)** | Translink’s fares policy is devised in the context of the Transport acts (Northern Ireland) 1967 & 2011. Fares (levels and structures) on Translink services are set to deliver the primary objective of commerciality while balancing the objective of delivering ‘social need’ as defined by Government policy and ensuring that public transport remains an attractive and affordable proposition.  The annual fare increase is based upon concepts outlined in this strategy and the move to ABT. | | | | | |
| **Are there any Section 75 categories which might be expected to benefit from the intended policy? If so, explain how.** | None | | | | | |
| **Who initiated or wrote the policy?** | Fares Working Group (Norman Maynes) | | | | | |
| **Who owns and who implements the policy?** | David Cowan (Commercial Operations) | | | | | |

**Implementation Factors**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Yes |  | No |  |

Are there any factors which could contribute to/detract from the intended aim/outcome of the policy/decision?

If yes, are they: (Select all applicable)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Financial |
|  | Legislative |
|  | Other – please specify: |  |

**Main stakeholders affected**

Who are the internal and external stakeholders (actual or potential) that the policy will impact upon?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Staff |
|  | Service Users |
|  | Other Public Sector Organisations |
|  | Voluntary/ Community/ Trade Unions |
|  | Other – please specify: |  |

##### [Other policies with a bearing on this policy](#Onefour) (please list):

|  |
| --- |
| * Corporate Strategy * Annual Corporate Plan * Cash Handling Policy (Treasury) |

**Available Evidence**

Evidence to help inform the screening process may take many forms. Public authorities should ensure that their screening decision is informed by relevant data. The following document should help you source data - [Section 75 - Evidence Signposting Guide](https://www.equalityni.org/ECNI/media/ECNI/Publications/Employers%20and%20Service%20Providers/Public%20Authorities/S75DataSignpostingGuide.pdf)

What evidence/information (both qualitative and quantitative) have you gathered to inform this policy? Specify details for each of the Section 75 categories.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Section 75 category** | **Details of evidence/information** |
| Religious belief | Census 2011 |
| Political opinion | No available evidence for this category in relation to the fares strategy |
| Racial group | Census 2011  Translink Passenger Profile 2019 |
| Age | [Travel Survey for Northern Ireland public transport factsheet 2016-2018 (infrastructure-ni.gov.uk)](https://www.infrastructure-ni.gov.uk/system/files/publications/infrastructure/tsni-public-transport-factsheet-2016-2018.pdf)  Translink Passenger Profile 2019  Internal data on ticket type usage |
| Marital status | Census 2011  Translink Passenger Profile 2019 |
| Sexual orientation | Census 2011 |
| Men and women generally | Census 2011  Translink Passenger Profile 2019  [Travel Survey for Northern Ireland public transport factsheet 2016-2018 (infrastructure-ni.gov.uk)](https://www.infrastructure-ni.gov.uk/system/files/publications/infrastructure/tsni-public-transport-factsheet-2016-2018.pdf) |
| Disability | Census 2011  Translink Passenger Profile 2019  [Travel Survey for Northern Ireland public transport factsheet 2016-2018 (infrastructure-ni.gov.uk)](https://www.infrastructure-ni.gov.uk/system/files/publications/infrastructure/tsni-public-transport-factsheet-2016-2018.pdf) |
| Dependants | Census 2011 |

**Needs, Experiences and Priorities**

Taking into account the information referred to above, what are the different needs, experiences and priorities of each of the following categories, in relation to the particular policy/decision?

Specify details for each of the Section 75 categories

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Section 75 category** | **Details of needs/experiences/priorities** |
| Religious belief | There is no identified need/experience or priority for this section 75 category. |
| Political opinion | There is no identified need/experience or priority for this section 75 category. |
| Racial group | There is no identified need/experience or priority for this section 75 category. |
| Age | The passenger profile suggests those in the younger age categories are more disposed to paying for the single journey as opposed to buying in advance. The Fares Strategy is designed to reward multi-journey purchase. The ABT new technology will mitigate this potential negative impact. In addition, the introduction of the ylink card and removal of the £8 introduction fee, mitigates potential negative impact for the 23 and under age category.  There are a range of different fare concessions for different categories to account for different needs:   * Children under 5 receive free travel * Under 16 years receive a half fare concession (DfI policy) * 16 years – 23 years can avail of the ylink card * Over 60 years can avail of free travel in NI (DfI policy) |
| Marital status | Family and Friends group travel discount has a benefit that is open to all marital status categories. |
| Sexual orientation | There is no identified need/experience or priority for this section 75 category. |
| Men and women generally | There is no identified need/experience or priority for this section 75 category. |
| Disability | There is no identified need/experience or priority for this section 75 category. |
| Dependants | There are a range of different fare concessions for different categories to account for different needs:   * Children under 5 receive free travel * Under 16 years receive a half fare concession (DfI policy) * 16 years – 23 years can avail of the ylink card * Over 60 years can avail of free travel in NI (DfI policy) |

**PART 2 - SCREENING QUESTIONS**

**Introduction**

In making a decision as to whether or not there is a need to carry out an equality impact assessment, the public authority should consider its answers to the questions 1-4 which are given on pages 66-68 of the Guide: [Guide for Public Authorities April 2010](https://www.equalityni.org/ECNI/media/ECNI/Publications/Employers%20and%20Service%20Providers/S75GuideforPublicAuthoritiesApril2010.pdf)

Taking into account the evidence presented above, consider and comment on the likely impact on equality of opportunity and good relations for those affected by this policy, in any way, for each of the equality and good relations categories, by applying the screening questions given overleaf and indicate the level of impact on the group i.e. minor, major or none.

**Impact: Major / Minor / None**

If the public authority’s conclusion is **major** in respect of one or more of the Section 75 equality of opportunity and/or good relations categories, then consideration should be given to subjecting the policy to the equality impact assessment procedure.

**In favour of ‘MAJOR’ impact**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **A** | The policy is significant in terms of its strategic importance; |
| **B** | Potential equality impacts are unknown, because, for example, there is insufficient data upon which to make an assessment or because they are complex, and it would be appropriate to conduct an equality impact assessment in order to better assess them; |
| **C** | Potential equality and/or good relations impacts are likely to be adverse or are likely to be experienced disproportionately by groups of people including those who are marginalised or disadvantaged; |
| **D** | Further assessment offers a valuable way to examine the evidence and develop recommendations in respect of a policy about which there are concerns amongst affected individuals and representative groups, for example in respect of multiple identities; |
| **E** | The policy is likely to be challenged by way of judicial review; |
| **F** | The policy is significant in terms of expenditure. |

If the public authority’s conclusion is **minor** in respect of one or more of the Section 75 equality categories and/or good relations categories, then consideration should still be given to proceeding with an equality impact assessment, or to:

* Measures to mitigate the adverse impact; or
* The introduction of an alternative policy to better promote equality of opportunity and/or good relations.

**In favour of ‘MINOR’ impact**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **A** | The policy is not unlawfully discriminatory and any residual potential impacts on people are judged to be negligible; |
| **B** | The policy, or certain proposals within it, are potentially unlawfully discriminatory, but this possibility can readily and easily be eliminated by making appropriate changes to the policy or by adopting appropriate mitigating measures; |
| **C** | Any asymmetrical equality impacts caused by the policy are intentional because they are specifically designed to promote equality of opportunity for particular groups of disadvantaged people; |
| **D** | By amending the policy there are better opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity and/or good relations. |

If the public authority’s conclusion is **none** in respect of all of the Section 75 equality of opportunity and/or good relations categories, then the public authority may decide to screen the policy out. If a policy is ‘screened out’ as having no relevance to equality of opportunity or good relations, a public authority should give details of the reasons for the decision taken.

**In favour of ‘NONE’**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **A** | The policy has no relevance to equality of opportunity or good relations. |
| **B** | The policy is purely technical in nature and will have no bearing in terms of its likely impact on equality of opportunity or good relations for people within the equality and good relations categories. |

**Screening Questions 1 - 4**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Screening Question 1** | | |
| What is the likely impact on equality of opportunity for those affected by this policy, for each of the Section 75 equality categories? Minor/ Major/ None | | |
| Section 75 category | Details of policy impact | Level of impact? Minor/Major/None |
| Religious belief |  | None |
| Political opinion |  | None |
| Racial group |  | None |
| Age | Minor positive – the fares strategy moves towards ABT and fairness for all age groups. | Minor |
| Marital status |  | None |
| Sexual orientation |  | None |
| Men and women generally |  | None |
| Disability | None within Translink’s Fares Strategy. Residual half fare concession passengers will not directly benefit from ABT due to DfI policy | None |
| Dependants |  | None |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Screening Question** **2** | | |
| Are there opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity for people within the Section 75 equalities categories? | | |
| Section 75 category | If **Yes**, provide details | If **No**, provide reasons |
| Religious belief |  | No, no opportunity within the fares strategy due to the strategy principle of fairness being applied to all S75 categories |
| Political opinion |  | No, no opportunity within the fares strategy due to the strategy principle of fairness being applied to all S75 categories |
| Racial group |  | No, no opportunity within the fares strategy due to the strategy principle of fairness being applied to all S75 categories |
| Age | Yes, ABT is fairer for all age groups. Relevant campaigns are run to promote travel amongst different age categories e.g. Ylink and Seniors promotion campaigns |  |
| Marital status |  | No, no opportunity within the fares strategy due to the strategy principle of fairness being applied to all S75 categories |
| Sexual orientation |  | No, no opportunity within the fares strategy due to the strategy principle of fairness being applied to all S75 categories |
| Men and women generally |  | No, no opportunity within the fares strategy due to the strategy principle of fairness being applied to all S75 categories |
| Disability |  | No, no opportunity within the fares strategy due to the strategy principle of fairness being applied to all S75 categories |
| Dependants | Yes, ABT is fairer for all age groups. Relevant campaigns are run to promote travel amongst different age categories e.g. Ylink and Seniors promotion campaigns |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Screening Question** **3** | | |
| To what extent is the policy likely to impact on good relations between people of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group? Minor/ Major/ None | | |
| Good relations category | Details of policy impact | Level of impact Minor/Major/None |
| Religious belief |  | None |
| Political opinion |  | None |
| Racial group |  | None |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Screening Question 4** | | |
| Are there opportunities to better promote good relations between people of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group? | | |
| Good relations category | If **Yes**, provide details | If **No**, provide reasons |
| Religious belief |  | No, there are no opportunities within the fares strategy to promote good relations. The fare strategy is applied across Northern Ireland equally. |
| Political opinion |  | No, there are no opportunities within the fares strategy to promote good relations. The fare strategy is applied across Northern Ireland equally. |
| Racial group |  | No, there are no opportunities within the fares strategy to promote good relations. The fare strategy is applied across Northern Ireland equally. |

**Additional Considerations**

**Multiple Identity**

Generally speaking, people can fall into more than one Section 75 category. Taking this into consideration, are there any potential impacts of the policy/decision on people with multiple identities?  (For example: disabled minority ethnic people; disabled women; young Protestant men; and young lesbians, gay and bisexual people).

|  |
| --- |
| We have not identified any multiple identity category impacts through this screening exercise. |

Provide details of data on the impact of the policy on people with multiple identities. Specify relevant Section 75 categories concerned.

|  |
| --- |
| N/a |

**PART 3 - SCREENING DECISION**

If the decision is **not** to conduct an **equality impact assessment**, please provide details of the reasons.

|  |
| --- |
| Not required, the fares strategy is applied across Northern Ireland equally. |

If the decision is not to conduct an equality impact assessment the public authority should consider if the policy should be **mitigated or an alternative policy be introduced**.

|  |
| --- |
| No mitigations have been identified through this screening exercise |

If the decision **is to** subject the policy to an **equality impact assessment**, please provide details of the reasons.

|  |
| --- |
| N/a |

All public authorities’ equality schemes must state the authority’s arrangements for assessing and consulting on the likely impact of policies adopted or proposed to be adopted by the authority on the promotion of equality of opportunity. The Commission recommends screening and equality impact assessment as the tools to be utilised for such assessments. Further advice on equality impact assessment may be found in a separate Commission publication: Practical Guidance on Equality Impact Assessment.

**Mitigation**

When the public authority concludes that the likely impact is ‘minor’ and an equality impact assessment is not to be conducted, the public authority may consider mitigation to lessen the severity of any equality impact, or the introduction of an alternative policy to better promote equality of opportunity or good relations.

Can the policy/decision be amended or changed or an alternative policy introduced to better promote equality of opportunity and/or good relations?

If so, give the **reasons** to support your decision, together with the proposed changes/amendments or alternative policy.

|  |
| --- |
| N/a |

**Timetabling and Prioritising**

Factors to be considered in timetabling and prioritising policies for equality impact assessment.

If the policy has been **‘screened in’** for equality impact assessment, then please answer the following questions to determine its priority for timetabling the equality impact assessment.

On a scale of 1-3, with 1 being the lowest priority and 3 being the highest, assess the policy in terms of its priority for equality impact assessment.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Priority Criterion** | **Rating (1-3)** |
| Effect on equality of opportunity and good relations | Choose an item. |
| Social need | Choose an item. |
| Effect on people’s daily lives | Choose an item. |
| Relevance to a public authority’s functions | Choose an item. |

Note: The Total Rating Score should be used to prioritise the policy in rank order with other policies screened in for equality impact assessment. This list of priorities will assist the public authority in timetabling. Details of the Public Authority’s Equality Impact Assessment Timetable should be included in the quarterly Screening Report.

Is the policy affected by timetables established by other relevant public authorities?

If yes, please provide details:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**PART 4 - MONITORING**

Public authorities should consider the guidance contained in the Commission’s Monitoring Guidance for Use by Public Authorities (July 2007).

The Commission recommends that where the policy has been amended or an alternative policy introduced, the public authority should monitor more broadly than for adverse impact (See Benefits, P.9-10, paras 2.13 – 2.20 of the Monitoring Guidance).

Effective monitoring will help the public authority identify any future adverse impact arising from the policy which may lead the public authority to conduct an equality impact assessment, as well as help with future planning and policy development.

|  |
| --- |
| *If applicable, please comment on how you will monitor the impact of this policy.*  The strategy will be assessed in line with the ABT project.  Ongoing consideration will be given to the following information:   * The bi-annual survey will be analysed to determine any change or impact * The passenger profile due in 2023 to reflect the profile in the calendar year 2022, will be reviewed for any changes * Any evidence of migration between ticket and fare types |

**PART 5 - APPROVAL AND AUTHORISATION**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Policy Title:** | Translink Fares Policy 2020-2023 | **Version No:** | **2020-2023** |
| **Print Name** | **Signature** | **Position/Job Title** | **Date** |
| **Screened By:** | | | |
| Norman Maynes |  | Head of Business Development | 25/06/21 |
| **Approved by:** | | | |
| David Cowan |  | Head of Commercial Operations | 25/06/21 |

Note: A copy of the Screening Template, for each policy screened should be ‘signed off’ and approved by a senior manager responsible for the policy, made easily accessible on the public authority’s website as soon as possible following completion and made available on request.

**APPENDIX 1**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **Part Title** | **Description** |
| **1** | [**Policy Scoping**](#Part1) | Asks public authorities to provide details about the policy, procedure, practice and/or decision being screened and what available evidence you have gathered to help make an assessment of the likely impact on equality of opportunity and good relations |
| **2** | [**Screening Questions**](#Part2) | Asks about the extent of the likely impact of the policy on groups of people within each of the Section 75 categories. Details of the groups consulted and the level of assessment of the likely impact. This includes consideration of multiple identity and good relations issues. |
| **3** | [**Screening Decision**](#Part3) | Guides the public authority to reach a screening decision as to whether or not there is a need to carry out an equality impact assessment (EQIA), or tointroducemeasures to mitigate the likely impact, or the introduction of an alternative policy to better promote equality of opportunity and/or good relations. |
| **4** | [**Monitoring**](#Part4) | Provides guidance to public authorities on monitoring for adverse impact and broader monitoring. |
| **5** | [**Approval and Authorisation**](#Part5) | Verifies the public authority’s approval of a screening decision by a senior manager responsible for the policy. |
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