**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** | Lurgan Signalling Improvement | | | | | |
| **Is it existing, revised or a new policy?** | Existing |  | New |  | Revised |  |
| **If revised, please outline main updates:** |  | | | | | |
| **What is it trying to achieve?**  **(Intended aims/outcomes)** | A reduction in level crossing barrier down times through alterations to the railway signalling system. This will also enable a small line speed enhancement and provide additional capacity on the line through Lurgan. This will allow an increase in service in future timetable changes. | | | | | |
| **Are there any Section 75 categories which might be expected to benefit from the intended policy? If so, explain how.** | No alterations to the passenger interface of information systems are proposed as part of this project. | | | | | |
| **Who initiated or wrote the policy?** | The project was identified within Translink’s overall capital investment plan. The Plan is approved by Translink’s Executive and currently with DfI for acceptance. Funding for this project will be provided by DfI.  Translink’s Executive and Board will be required to approve the project Economic Appraisal (business case) for the construction project and a Letter of Offer for funding will be sought from DfI. | | | | | |
| **Who owns and who implements the policy?** | Translink undertake the role of Senior Responsible Owner (SRO) in managing the approved business case and delivery of the main construction project.  A Project Board has been established to help deliver the project and includes project stakeholders from Translink and DfI. The group regularly reviews project progress and collectively take decisions that impact positively upon the projects progress. | | | | | |

**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: | Social and Community Benefits |

**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: | Local community through a Reduction in the disturbance the railway causes with the passage of trains through the area |

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

|  |
| --- |
| * The accompanying Equality Impact Assessment that covers our Capital Plan is also attached and available via link below:   <https://www.infrastructure-ni.gov.uk/sites/default/files/publications/drd/ensuring-a-sustainable-transport-future-a-new-approach-to-regional-transportation-equality-impact-assessment.pdf>   * Construction projects are managed in accordance with the principles of the ‘Achieving Excellence in Construction’ policy framework adopted by the Government Client Group (GCCG). * Non-monetary benefits are considered in the Business Case and approved Economic Appraisal process in adherence to the Northern Ireland Guide to Expenditure, Appraisal and Evaluation (NIGEAE) published by DoF. * This requires all projects to have an Economic Appraisal to justify any public expenditure. The objective of the Appraisal is to assess Value for Money (VfM) from a broad NI perspective. It assesses needs, objectives, options, costs, benefits, risks, funding, affordability and other factors relevant to decisions. |

**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 | No evidence exists regarding this category within the context of the project. |
| Political opinion | No evidence exists regarding this category within the context of the project. |
| Racial group | No evidence exists regarding this category within the context of the project. |
| Age | No evidence exists regarding this category within the context of the project. |
| Marital status | No evidence exists regarding this category within the context of the project. |
| Sexual orientation | No evidence exists regarding this category within the context of the project. |
| Men and women generally | No evidence exists regarding this category within the context of the project. |
| Disability | No evidence exists regarding this category within the context of the project. |
| Dependants | No evidence exists regarding this category within the context of the project. |

**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 impact identified for any for the S75 Groups. |
| Political opinion | There is no impact identified for any for the S75 Groups. |
| Racial group | There is no impact identified for any for the S75 Groups. |
| Age | There is no impact identified for any for the S75 Groups. |
| Marital status | There is no impact identified for any for the S75 Groups. |
| Sexual orientation | There is no impact identified for any for the S75 Groups. |
| Men and women generally | There is no impact identified for any for the S75 Groups. |
| Disability | There is no impact identified for any for the S75 Groups. |
| Dependants | There is no impact identified for any for the S75 Groups. |

**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 | No impact – current service provision continues, improved passenger and staff facilities/amenities, with future service improvement enabled by this project | None |
| Political opinion | No impact – current service provision continues, improved passenger and staff facilities/amenities, with future service improvement enabled by this project | None |
| Racial group | No impact – current service provision continues, improved passenger and staff facilities/amenities, with future service improvement enabled by this project | None |
| Age | No impact – current service provision continues, improved passenger and staff facilities/amenities, with future service improvement enabled by this project | None |
| Marital status | No impact – current service provision continues, improved passenger and staff facilities/amenities, with future service improvement enabled by this project | None |
| Sexual orientation | No impact – current service provision continues, improved passenger and staff facilities/amenities, with future service improvement enabled by this project | None |
| Men and women generally | No impact – current service provision continues, improved passenger and staff facilities/amenities, with future service improvement enabled by this project | None |
| Disability | No impact – current service provision continues, improved passenger and staff facilities/amenities, with future service improvement enabled by this project | None |
| Dependants | No impact – current service provision continues, improved passenger and staff facilities/amenities, with future service improvement enabled by this project | 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, there is no evidence to suggest category will be impacted upon by this project |
| Political opinion |  | No, there is no evidence to suggest category will be impacted upon by this project |
| Racial group |  | No, there is no evidence to suggest category will be impacted upon by this project |
| Age |  | No, there is no evidence to suggest category will be impacted upon by this project |
| Marital status |  | No, there is no evidence to suggest category will be impacted upon by this project |
| Sexual orientation |  | No, there is no evidence to suggest category will be impacted upon by this project |
| Men and women generally |  | No, there is no evidence to suggest category will be impacted upon by this project |
| Disability |  | No, there is no evidence to suggest category will be impacted upon by this project |
| Dependants |  | No, there is no evidence to suggest category will be impacted upon by this project |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **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 | No, there is no evidence to suggest category will be impacted upon by this project | None |
| Political opinion | No, there is no evidence to suggest category will be impacted upon by this project | None |
| Racial group | No, there is no evidence to suggest category will be impacted upon by this project | 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 is no evidence to suggest category will be impacted upon by this project |
| Political opinion |  | No, there is no evidence to suggest category will be impacted upon by this project |
| Racial group |  | No, there is no evidence to suggest category will be impacted upon by this project |

**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).

|  |
| --- |
| There is no negative impact identified for any for the S75 Groups. |

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

|  |
| --- |
| There is no negative impact identified for any for the S75 Groups. |

**PART 3 - SCREENING DECISION**

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

|  |
| --- |
| There is no negative impact identified for any for the S75 Groups. |

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**.

|  |
| --- |
| Mitigation is not required as no negative impact has been identified for any of the S75 Groups |

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 as there is no equality impact |

**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 | Not Applicable |
| Social need | Not Applicable |
| Effect on people’s daily lives | Not Applicable |
| Relevance to a public authority’s functions | Not Applicable |

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:

|  |
| --- |
| **N/A** |

**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 project will be monitored as it develops via the Project Board/Governance and any variations to the planned approach that require consideration will be dealt with accordingly. |

**PART 5 - APPROVAL AND AUTHORISATION**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Policy Title:** |  | **Version No:** |  |
| **Print Name** | **Position/Job Title** | **Signature** | **Date** |
| **Screened By:** | | | |
| Jonathan Ward | Project Manager | A signature on a white surface  Description automatically generated | 10/08/23 |
| **Approved by:** | | | |
| Ruairi Savage | Head of Renewals |  | 8/2/24 |

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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