

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 ([Equality Intranet page](#)).

HUMAN RIGHTS ACT - refer to the [Equality Intranet page](#)

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 - refer to the [Equality Intranet page](#).

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

Roads Policy & Procedure Guide: RsPPG E030 Major Works Schemes: Inception to Construction.

Is this an existing, revised or a new policy?

Revised.

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

The Investment Decision Maker (IDM) role for Strategic Road Improvements and other Major Works road projects had been the Roads and Rivers Management Group and RSPPG_E030 was established on that basis. Latterly, with the standing down of the role of the Roads and Rivers Management Group as IDM, the role of the IDM will now vary with each decision stage. Taking direction from senior management, in particular the Transport and Road Asset Management (TRAM) Deputy Secretary and Director of Major Projects, a revised IDM process has been developed, which will be reflected in the updated RsPPG.

The revised policy and procedure guide will provide updated guidance for DfI TRAM Staff and consultant staff when developing major road improvement schemes from inception to construction.

Are there any Section 75 categories which might be expected to benefit from the intended policy?
If so, explain how.

No.

Who initiated or wrote the policy?

DfI TRAM Major Projects Programme Office.

Who owns and who implements the policy?

DfI TRAM Major Projects Programme Office.

Background

[Author please provide information that will allow readers an understanding of what the policy is, and why it is required].

The Policy & Procedure Guide (RsPPG E030) is aimed at DfI TRAM staff and consultancy staff involved with developing major road improvement schemes through the key development and planning stages from inception to construction.

It provides formal policy and procedural guidance for how major road improvement schemes are developed and managed from inception through to construction.

The original RSPPG brought together the processes required to bring major road improvement schemes through from inception to construction and was issued in July 2004. There have been a number of revisions over the years, with the most recent Version 5, issued in June 2021.

This latest revision has been prompted by the standing down of the role of the Roads and Rivers Management Group as Investment Decision Maker (IDM) for Major Road Improvement Schemes. The role of IDM will now vary with each decision stage. Taking direction from senior management, in particular the TRAM Deputy Secretary and Director of Major Projects, a revised IDM process has been developed, which will be reflected in the updated RsPPG.

The Director has also indicated that consideration be given to the inclusion of additional formal decision points, for example at Notice of Intention to Proceed. Such fundamental changes will require a parallel overhaul of the Major Works Scheme Database.

The update will also:

- Reflect the dissolution of the Consultancy Services Programme Board.
- Reflects the inclusion of the role of a Project Board.
- Reflects the inclusion of the TRAM Management Peer Review Group.
- Reflects the inclusion of the Active Travel Programme Board.
- Change the term Gateway Approvals to avoid confusion with the separate NI Gateway Review Process.
- Address ambiguities arising from the establishment of the department's P3O including the appointment of Senior Responsible Owners (SROs) and the validation of Risk Potential Assessments (RPAs).
- Reflect the rebranding of the holistic framework for assessing sustainability in the global built environment from CEEQUAL (Civil Engineering Environmental Quality Assessment and Award Scheme) to BREEAM (Building Research Establishment Environmental Method) Infrastructure (along with revised rating categories).
- Reflect the updated Directorate structure responsible for delivery of Major Works road projects
- Remove a lot of dated background content to create a more succinct, forward-looking document.

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)

DfI TRAM staff and Consultancy staff.

other, please specify

Other policies with a bearing on this policy

- what are they?

- The Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB)
- Department for Transport's Transport Analysis Guide (WebTAG)
- Other RSPPGs and Director of Engineering Memorandums (DEMs)
- Better Business Cases NI.

- who owns them?

- DMRB is owned by Highways England, Transport Scotland, the Welsh Government and the Department for Infrastructure.
- WEBTAG is owned by the Department for Transport.
- RSPPGs and DEMs are owned by the Department for Infrastructure.
- Better Business Cases NI is owned by the Department of Finance.

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](#). Also refer to the [Equality Intranet page](#) for some evidence sources.

What evidence/information (both qualitative and quantitative) have you gathered to inform this policy? Specify details for each of the Section 75 categories. This forms part of guidance for DfI TRAM officials and consultants' staff when developing major road improvement schemes from inception to construction. No section 75 impact was reported during the lifetime of the policy and procedure guide. This amended version does not change this situation. Groups will not be contacted directly to gather information but any interested parties will have an opportunity to comment as part of the statutory procedures for each individual scheme advanced through this process. The screening form will be included in the Department's quarterly consultation exercise with Section 75 consultees. Any issues identified relating to this S75 group will be fully considered. Each individual major works road improvement scheme developed in accordance with these procedures will be subject to EQIA Screening.

Religious belief evidence / information:

This forms part of guidance for DfI TRAM officials and consultants' staff when developing major road improvement schemes from inception to construction. As such there is no evidence of higher or lower uptake of this Section 75 group.

Political Opinion evidence / information:

As for Religious Belief

Racial Group evidence / information:

As for Religious Belief

Age evidence / information:

As for Religious Belief

Marital Status evidence / information:

As for Religious Belief

Sexual Orientation evidence / information:

As for Religious Belief

Men & Women generally evidence / information:

As for Religious Belief

Disability evidence / information:

As for Religious Belief

Dependants evidence / information:

As for Religious Belief

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 are no specific needs identified for this group in connection with this process. No needs/experiences/priorities were identified during the lifetime of the policy and procedure guide. This amended version does not change this situation. Any needs identified in due course will be fully considered. Each individual major works road improvement scheme developed in accordance with these procedures will be subject to EQIA Screening.

Political Opinion

As for Religious Belief

Racial Group

As for Religious Belief

Age

As for Religious Belief

Marital status

As for Religious Belief

Sexual orientation

As for Religious Belief

Men and Women Generally

As for Religious Belief

Disability

As for Religious Belief

Dependants

As for Religious Belief

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**: The policy and procedure guide for developing major road improvement schemes from inception to construction is technical in nature for use by DfI TRAM officials and consultants' staff and will not impact on equality of opportunity for this group.

Each individual major works road improvement scheme developed in accordance with these procedures will be subject to EQIA Screening.

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

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Political Opinion**: **As for Religious Belief**

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

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Racial Group**: **As for Religious Belief**

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

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Age**: **As for Religious Belief**

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

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Marital Status**: **As for Religious Belief**

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

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Sexual Orientation**: **As for Religious Belief**

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

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Men and Women**: **As for Religious Belief**

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

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Disability**: [As for Religious Belief](#)

What is the level of impact? [None](#).

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Dependants**: [As for Religious Belief](#)

What is the level of impact? [None](#).

2. Are there opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity for people within the Section 75 equalities categories?

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

Religious Belief - If Yes, provide details:

If No, provide reasons: [The policy and procedure guide for developing major road improvement schemes from inception to construction is technical in nature for use by DfI TRAM officials and consultants' staff and will have no bearing in terms of its likely impact on equality of opportunity or good relations.](#)

[Each individual major works road improvement scheme developed in accordance with these procedures will be subject to EQIA Screening.](#)

Political Opinion - If Yes, provide details:

If No, provide reasons: [As for Religious Belief](#)

Racial Group - If Yes, provide details:

If No, provide reasons: [As for Religious Belief](#)

Age - If Yes, provide details:

If No, provide reasons: [As for Religious Belief](#)

Marital Status - If Yes, provide details:

If No, provide reasons: [As for Religious Belief](#)

Sexual Orientation - If Yes, provide details:

If No, provide reasons: [As for Religious Belief](#)

Men and Women generally - If Yes, provide details:

If No, provide reasons: [As for Religious Belief](#)

Disability - If Yes, provide details:

If No, provide reasons: [As for Religious Belief](#)

Dependants - If Yes, provide details:

If No, provide reasons: [As for Religious Belief](#)

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**: [The policy and procedure guide for developing major road improvement schemes from inception to construction is technical in nature for use by Dfl TRAM officials and consultants' staff and will have no bearing in terms of its likely impact on equality of opportunity or good relations.](#)

[Each individual major works road improvement scheme developed in accordance with these procedures will be subject to EQIA Screening.](#)

What is the level of impact? [None.](#)

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Political Opinion**: [As for Religious Belief](#)

What is the level of impact? [None.](#)

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Racial Group**: [As for Religious Belief](#)

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 - If Yes, provide details:

If No, provide reasons: [The policy and procedure guide for developing major road improvement schemes from inception to construction is technical in nature for use by Dfl TRAM officials and consultants' staff and will have no](#)

bearing in terms of its likely impact on equality of opportunity or good relations.

Each individual major works road improvement scheme developed in accordance with these procedures will be subject to EQIA Screening.

Political Opinion - If Yes, provide details:

If No, provide reasons: As for Religious Belief

Racial Group - If Yes, provide details:

If No, provide reasons: As for Religious Belief

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?

(Every citizen belongs to more than one group - 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 purpose of this RsPPG is to provide updated guidance for DfI TRAM Staff and consultant's staff when developing major road improvement schemes from inception to construction. The policy is technical in nature and will have no bearing in terms of its likely impact on equality of opportunity or good relations.

On that basis this policy is considered neutral in terms of its impact on Section 75 groupings and therefore an EQIA is not required.

Each individual major works road improvement scheme developed in accordance with these procedures will be subject to EQIA Screening.

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 of this consideration.

N/A

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?

N/A

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 [choose 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?

No

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.

Part 5 - Approval and authorisation

Screened by: [Gerry Gilhooly](#)

Position/Job Title: [Major Projects Programme Office - SPTO](#)

Date: [09/03/2026](#)

Approved by: [Raymond Glass](#)

Position/Job Title: [Major Projects Programme Office - PPTO](#)

Date: [09/03/2026](#)

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: 02/07/2026

Amendments Requested: Yes

Date Returned to Business Area: 08/07/2026

Date Final Version Received / Agreed: 09/07/2026

Date Published on DfI's Section 75 webpage: 10/07/2026