

DEPARTMENT FOR INFRASTRUCTURE

SECTION 75 EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY SCREENING ANALYSIS FORM

The purpose of this form is to help you to consider whether a new policy (either internal or external) or legislation will require a full equality impact assessment (EQIA). Those policies identified as having significant implications for equality of opportunity must be subject to full EQIA.

The form will provide a record of the factors taken into account if a policy is screened out, or excluded for EQIA. It will provide a basis for quarterly consultation on the outcome of the screening exercise, and will be referenced in the biannual review of progress made to the Minister and in the Annual Report to the Equality Commission.

Further advice on completion of this form and the screening process including relevant contact information can be accessed via the Department for Infrastructure (DfI) Intranet site.

HUMAN RIGHTS ACT

When considering the impact of this policy you should also consider if there would be any Human Rights implications. Guidance is at:

- <https://www.executiveoffice-ni.gov.uk/articles/human-rights-and-public-authorities>

Should this be appropriate you will need to complete a Human Rights Impact Assessment. A template is at:

- <https://www.executiveoffice-ni.gov.uk/publications/human-rights-impact-assessment-proforma>

Don't forget to Rural Proof.

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 the policy

Dfl Car Parking

Is this an existing, revised or a new policy?

New policy as no Dfl car parking policy was in place

What is it trying to achieve? (intended aims/outcomes)

This form considers any equality impacts of the policy

Are there any Section 75 categories which might be expected to benefit from the intended policy?

If so, explain how.

There may be a minor positive to those in Disability category i.e., to blue badge holders or those who require a car parking space as part of a reasonable adjustment (DDA)

Who initiated or wrote the policy?

Dfl Facilities Management Unit (FMU)

Who owns and who implements the policy?

Dfl

Background

The policy outlines the principles and rationale for the allocation and management of car parking spaces at James House, ensuring compliance with legal obligations, departmental policies, and the Northern Ireland Climate Change Act. It aims to balance operational business needs with sustainability commitments.

The policy aims to comply with:

- The Disability Discrimination Act 1995, ensuring priority access for Blue Badge holders and those requiring car parking as part of a reasonable adjustment where possible. It should be noted however that, should the number of spaces required for the above increase, this will impact on the 17 spaces allocated to DfI under this policy and business areas will be required to surrender part of their allocation to ensure that Blue Badge holders and those requiring reasonable adjustments are prioritised;
- The department's Active Travel and Sustainability Objectives, promoting modal shift from private car use to public and active transport;
- The Northern Ireland Climate Change Act 2022, contributing to departmental carbon reduction targets;
- The business/operational needs of the department.

Before the implementation of the policy, staff who required the use of a private vehicle or public transport for business needs were re-imbursed Travel & Subsistence (T&S) costs in line with NICS policy at a cost to the public purse. It is recognised by the department that there is an associated opportunity cost when staff are required to search for parking and then walk to and from the office or time spent walking to and from public transport facilities.

An Options Paper was considered by the DfI Senior Management and **Option 3** was identified as the preferred option. The policy aims to address the specific requirements outlined in Option 3, as outlined below:

Option 3 – Acquire 19 spaces from DoF and allocate to SLT – 5 spaces x for each Grade 3 Group and 4 x Permanent Secretary’s Office

This option provides 5 car parking spaces for each of the UG3 directorates and 4 spaces for the Permanent Secretary’s Office which will be managed separately by each directorate. This would account for an additional 19 spaces and will be classified as being ‘**based on official business need**’.

Implementation factors

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

NO

If yes, are they (please delete as appropriate)

financial

legislative

other, please specify _____

Main stakeholders affected

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

James House staff (DfI)

James House staff (other tenants)

Visitors to James House

Other policies with a bearing on this policy

- what are they? **NA**

- who owns them? **NA**

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 Commission has produced this guide to [signpost to S75 data](#).

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

Religious belief evidence / information:

In 2024 for the 22850 staff who determined their religious belief 11,448 were Catholic and 11,402 were Protestant. 1,126 chose not to determine.

Equality Statistics for the Northern Ireland Civil Service - 2023 | Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency (nisra.gov.uk)

There is no evidence to suggest a higher or lower number of people in this Section 75 group will be impacted by this policy

Political Opinion evidence / information:

There is no evidence to suggest a higher or lower number of people in this Section 75 group will be impacted by this policy

Racial Group evidence / information:

There is no evidence available on the political opinion of employees at James House or the NI Civil Service generally.

Of recent NICS external appointments at 2022 (1,174) 97.3% were White and 2.7% were Other (including Mixed Ethnic Origin and Traveller).

Equality Statistics for the Northern Ireland Civil Service - 2023 | Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency (nisra.gov.uk)

Age evidence / information:

The age profile of the NICS in 2024 was as follows: 16-24 1.4%, 25-34 12%, 35-44 28.9%, 45-54 29%, 55-64 25.9%, 65+ 2.9%.
(NISRA 2024)

Marital Status evidence / information:

There is no evidence available on the marital status of employees at James House or the NI Civil Service generally

Sexual Orientation evidence / information:

There is no published evidence available on the sexual orientation of employees at James House or the NI Civil Service generally.
Of recent NICS external appointments at 2022 (1,174) 6.4% recorded Same or Both Sexes and 93.6% recorded Different Sex. (NISRA 2023)

Men & Women generally evidence / information:

Of 2,903 staff in the Department for Infrastructure at 2025 2,171 are men and 768 are women.

In the NI Civil Service as a whole in 2025 there are 24,513 staff of which 50.1% are female.

Employment in the Northern Ireland Civil Service - Quarterly Report (nisra.gov.uk)

Disability evidence / information:

At 2024 6.1% of 23,976 NICS staff declared a disability.

NICS-Equality-Statistics-2024-Tables.xlsx (live.com)

Dependants evidence / information:

There is no published evidence available in relation to dependants of employees at James House or the NI Civil Service generally.

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 of the needs, experiences and priorities for each of the Section 75 categories below:

Religious belief

There is no evidence to suggest different needs, experiences, or priorities for this group.

Political Opinion

There is no evidence to suggest different needs, experiences, or priorities for this group.

Racial Group

There is no evidence to suggest different needs, experiences, or priorities for this group.

Age

There is no evidence to suggest different needs, experiences, or priorities for this group.

Marital status

There is no evidence to suggest different needs, experiences, or priorities for this group.

Sexual orientation

There is no evidence to suggest different needs, experiences, or priorities for this group.

Men and Women Generally

There is no evidence to suggest different needs, experiences, or priorities for this group.

Disability

As the policy prioritises DDA in line with legislation, there may be a minor positive to those people in this group

Dependants

There is no evidence to suggest different needs, experiences, or priorities for this group.

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 this Guide.

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.

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.

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 a '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.

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.

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.

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.

Screening questions

1. What is the likely impact on equality of opportunity for those affected by this policy, for each of the Section 75 equality categories?

Please provide details of the likely policy impacts and determine the level of impact for each S75 categories below i.e. either minor, major or none.

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Religious belief**: (insert text here)

What is the level of impact? **None**

As noted in the previous section there is no evidence to suggest different needs, experiences, or priorities for this group

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Political Opinion**: (insert text here)

What is the level of impact? **None**

As noted in the previous section there is no evidence to suggest different needs, experiences, or priorities for this group

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Racial Group**: (insert text here)

What is the level of impact? **None**

As noted in the previous section there is no evidence to suggest different needs, experiences, or priorities for this group

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Age**: (insert text here)

What is the level of impact? **None**

As noted in the previous section there is no evidence to suggest different needs, experiences, or priorities for this group

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Marital Status**: (insert text here)

What is the level of impact? **None**

As noted in the previous section there is no evidence to suggest different needs, experiences, or priorities for this group

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Sexual Orientation**:(insert text here)

What is the level of impact? **None**

As noted in the previous section there is no evidence to suggest different needs, experiences, or priorities for this group

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Men and Women**: (insert text here)

What is the level of impact? **None**

As noted in the previous section there is no evidence to suggest different needs, experiences, or priorities for this group

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Disability**: (insert text here)

What is the level of impact? **Minor Positive**

As the policy prioritises DDA in line with legislation, there may be a minor benefit to those people in this group

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Dependants**:(insert text here)

What is the level of impact? **None**

As noted in the previous section there is no evidence to suggest different needs, experiences, or priorities for this group

2. Are there opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity for people within the Section 75 equalities categories? Yes/No

Detail opportunities of how this policy could promote equality of opportunity for people within each of the Section 75 Categories below:

Religious Belief - No

There are no opportunities to identify ways to better promote equality of opportunity for people within this Section 75 category as a result of this policy.

Political Opinion - No – As above

Racial Group - No – As above

Age - No – As above

Marital Status - No – As above

Sexual Orientation - No – As above

Men and Women generally - No – As above

Disability – Minor – As the policy prioritises DDA in line with legislation, there may be a minor benefit to those people in this group

Dependants - No – As above

3. To what extent is the policy likely to impact on good relations between people of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group?

Please provide details of the likely policy impact and determine the level of impact for each of the categories below i.e. either minor, major or none.

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Religious belief**: (insert text here)
What is the level of impact? **None**

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Political Opinion**: (insert text here)
What is the level of impact? **None**

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Racial Group**: (insert text here)
What is the level of impact? **None**

4. Are there opportunities to better promote good relations between people of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group?

Detail opportunities of how this policy could better promote good relations for people within each of the Section 75 Categories below:

Religious Belief - No - There is no impact on good relations between any of these groups.

Political Opinion - No - There is no impact on good relations between any of these groups.

Racial Group - No - There is no impact on good relations between any of these groups.

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).

No

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.

The Department considers that an EQIA is not necessary as:

- The policy is open to all staff

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 - please provide details.

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.

Currently no. The policy will be reviewed regularly going forward.

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 [Author pick 1 2 or 3 if a full EQIA is to take place]

Effect on equality of opportunity and good relations **Rating 1, 2 or 3**

Social need **Rating 1, 2 or 3**

Effect on people’s daily lives **Rating 1, 2 or 3**

Relevance to a public authority’s functions **Rating 1, 2 or 3**

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.

Part 5 - Approval and authorisation

Screened by: [Jim Derby](#)

Position/Job Title: [Deputy Principal – Facilities Management Unit](#)

Date: [29 June 2026](#)

Approved by: [Bernard McClure](#)

Position/Job Title: [G7 Head of Facilities Management Unit](#)

Date: [07/07/26](#)

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.

For Equality Team Completion:

Date Received:	6 th July 2026
Amendments Requested:	No
Date Returned to Business Area:	7 th July 2026
Date Final Version Received / Confirmed:	7 th July 2026
Date Published on Dfl's Section 75 webpage:	10 th July 2026