

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

DFI Transport & Road Asset Management Roads Policy & Procedure Guide for Development of Active Travel Minor Works and Large Minor Works Schemes (<£10m) within DfI Active Travel Teams.

Is this an existing, revised or a new policy?

New Policy – replacing previous RSPPG EO32.

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

This DfI Roads Policy & Procedure Guide (RsPPG) is aimed at all DfI staff involved with developing dedicated active travel capital projects within DfI's active travel teams from initial identification through to completion and post-project evaluation. This guidance sets out the governance framework, processes and requirements for the development, approval and delivery of active travel capital projects with a value of up to £10m.

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 Transport and Asset Management Group – Active Travel Programme Management Office.

Who owns and who implements the policy?

The Department for Infrastructure owns and will implement this policy internally.

Background

This guidance replaces previous guidance (RSPPG EO32) for dedicated active travel capital projects.

The Climate Change Act (Northern Ireland) 2022 recognises the importance of active travel. Section 22 refers to a minimum spend on active travel from the overall transport budget of 10%. Meeting this commitment will require a significant increase in investment. This updated guidance is part of the new governance arrangements going forward. These changes are intended to support an increase in its delivery capacity and ensure that active travel projects are managed in a way that delivers value for money.

Implementation factors

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

If yes, are they (please delete as appropriate)

Yes

Financial

- Legislative
- Other – Implementation takes time and depends on coordination across programme management, delivery teams, technical expertise and consistent application. Maintaining alignment as the programme evolves, supported by appropriate controls, will help ensure intended outcomes are achieved. As this is new guidance, it will be kept under continuous review throughout its first year. Any lessons learned or issues identified during implementation will inform updates, ensuring the guidance remains practical, relevant, and effective as it is rolled out

Main stakeholders affected

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

Dfl staff involved in the development, approval and delivery of dedicated active travel schemes.

other, please specify

Service users and the wider public

Other public sector organisations, including local councils and statutory bodies, may be involved in scheme development, approvals and stakeholder engagement processes.

Contractors, consultants and other delivery partners

Other policies with a bearing on this policy

- what are they? who owns them?
- Managing Public Money Northern Ireland (MPMNI) - Department of Finance (DoF)
- Better Business Cases Northern Ireland guidance - Department of Finance (DoF)
- Belfast Cycling Network Delivery Plan - Department for Infrastructure (DfI)
- Strategic Plan for Greenways - Department for Infrastructure (DfI)
- Climate Change Act (Northern Ireland) 2022 - Northern Ireland Executive
- Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) (where applicable) - National Highways on behalf of the UK Government (Department for Transport)

As this is new Guidance, it will be subject to ongoing review, particularly in its first year, and updated in line with any relevant policies (including active travel) within the Department for Infrastructure.

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.

General Evidence [Include any qualitative and quantitative evidence related to the policy]

The evidence used to inform the Guidance include the following:

- Existing Departmental governance frameworks and wider NI Civil Service guidance developed by the Department of Finance such as Managing Public Money NI and Better Business Cases NI, which set out requirements for transparency, accountability and value for money in public expenditure
- Previous Roads Policy and Procedure Guidance and established internal processes for scheme delivery
- Experience and feedback from DfI staff involved in the development and delivery of Active Travel schemes
- Alignment with wider DfI Active Travel policy and delivery plans to ensure consistency in programme management

As the Guidance does not directly determine infrastructure design, location or prioritisation, it has not been informed by equality-specific quantitative or qualitative data for individual Section 75 groups.

Any equality-related evidence and data relevant to Section 75 categories are instead considered at the scheme level, and through associated policies such as the draft Active Travel Design Guide, which directly influence design outcomes and user experience.

Religious belief evidence / information:

There is **no specific evidence** to indicate that this Guidance will impact differently on individuals or groups based on religious belief.

This forms part of guidance for DfI staff involved in the development, approval and delivery of dedicated active travel schemes.

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, experiences or priorities identified for individuals or groups based on religious belief in relation to this Guidance.

This guidance sets out the governance framework, processes and requirements for the development, approval and delivery of dedicated active travel capital projects with a value of up to £10m, it does not directly influence service provision, infrastructure design or access to services.

The Guidance applies consistently across all schemes and staff functions and does not engage with or differentiate between individuals on the basis of religious belief.

Any needs or priorities relating to religious belief would arise at the scheme design and delivery stage, where local context and stakeholder engagement may be considered.

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**:

There is no likely impact on equality of opportunity in relation to religious belief.

This guidance sets out the governance framework, processes and requirements for the development, approval and delivery of dedicated active travel capital projects with a value of up to £10m. It does not directly influence the design, location or implementation of infrastructure, nor does it affect access to services or facilities.

The policy applies consistently across all staff and schemes and does not differentiate between individuals or groups on the basis of religious belief.

Any equality considerations would arise at the scheme level, where local context may be relevant.

What is the level of impact? ~~Minor~~ / ~~Major~~ / **None**

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Political Opinion**:

There is no likely impact on equality of opportunity in relation to political opinion.

As for Religious Belief

What is the level of impact? ~~Minor~~ / ~~Major~~ / **None**

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Racial Group**:

As for Religious Belief

What is the level of impact? ~~Minor~~ / ~~Major~~ / **None**

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Age**:

As for Religious Belief

What is the level of impact? ~~+/Minor~~ / ~~+/Major~~ / None

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Marital Status**:

As for Religious Belief

What is the level of impact? ~~+/Minor~~ / ~~+/Major~~ / None

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Sexual Orientation**:

As for Religious Belief

What is the level of impact? ~~+/Minor~~ / ~~+/Major~~ / None

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Men and Women**:

As for Religious Belief

What is the level of impact? ~~+/Minor~~ / ~~+/Major~~ / None

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Disability**:

As for Religious Belief

What is the level of impact? ~~+/Minor~~ / ~~+/Major~~ / None

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Dependants**:

As for Religious Belief

What is the level of impact? ~~+/Minor~~ / ~~+/Major~~ / 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: N/A

If No, provide reasons:

This guidance sets out the governance framework, processes and requirements for the development, approval and delivery of dedicated active travel capital projects with a value of up to £10m, it does not directly influence service provision, infrastructure design or user outcomes. It applies consistently across all schemes and staff functions and does not present opportunities to promote equality of opportunity in relation to religious belief. Any such opportunities would arise at the scheme design and delivery stage.

Political Opinion - If Yes, provide details: [N/A](#)

If No, provide reasons:

[As for Religious Belief](#)

Racial Group - If Yes, provide details: [N/A](#)

If No, provide reasons:

[As for Religious Belief](#)

Age - If Yes, provide details: [N/A](#)

If No, provide reasons:

[As for Religious Belief](#)

Marital Status - If Yes, provide details: [N/A](#)

If No, provide reasons:

[As for Religious Belief](#)

Sexual Orientation - If Yes, provide details: [N/A](#)

If No, provide reasons:

[As for Religious Belief](#)

Men and Women generally - If Yes, provide details: [N/A](#)

If No, provide reasons:

[As for Religious Belief](#)

Disability - If Yes, provide details: N/A

If No, provide reasons:

As for Religious Belief

Dependants - If Yes, provide details: N/A

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**:

There is no likely impact on good relations between people of different religious belief.

This guidance sets out the governance framework, processes and requirements for the development, approval and delivery of dedicated active travel capital projects with a value of up to £10m, it does not directly influence interactions between different groups in society.

It does not affect how services are delivered to the public or how different communities interact, and therefore does not create impacts (positive or negative) on good relations.

What is the level of impact? ~~+-Minor~~ / ~~+-Major~~ / None

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Political Opinion**:

As for Religious Belief

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Racial Group**:

As for Religious Belief

What is the level of impact? ~~Minor~~ / ~~Major~~ / **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: **N/A**

If No, provide reasons:

This guidance sets out the governance framework, processes and requirements for the development, approval and delivery of dedicated active travel capital projects with a value of up to £10m, it does not influence interactions between individuals or communities. It does not involve public engagement or service delivery and therefore does not create opportunities to promote good relations between people of different religious belief. Any such opportunities would arise at the scheme design and delivery stage.

Political Opinion - If Yes, provide details: **N/A**

If No, provide reasons:

As for Religious Belief

Racial Group - If Yes, provide details: **N/A**

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 decision is not to conduct an Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA).

This guidance sets out the governance framework, processes and requirements for the development, approval and delivery of dedicated active travel capital projects with a value of up to £10m. It is technical in nature and does not directly influence service provision, infrastructure design, or access to services.

The screening exercise has identified no likely impact (major, minor or adverse) on any of the Section 75 equality of opportunity or good relations categories.

The Guidance applies consistently across all staff and schemes and does not differentiate between individuals or groups.

While this guidance does not in itself determine infrastructure design or service delivery, it influences decision-making processes. Equality considerations are therefore embedded through scheme-level assessments and associated design guidance, rather than arising directly from this policy.

Any potential equality impacts would arise at the scheme design and delivery stage, where individual projects are developed and assessed, rather than from this overarching governance framework.

On this basis, the policy is considered to fall within the category of a technical/procedural policy with no relevance to equality of opportunity or good relations, and it is therefore appropriate to screen out with no requirement for a full EQIA.

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: Sharan Dustagheer

Position/Job Title: Head of Active Travel Programme Management Office

Date: 26 May 2026

Approved by: Colin Hutchinson

Position/Job Title: Director of A5WTC and Active Travel

Date: 29 June 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: 06/07/2026

Amendments Requested: Yes / No Yes

Date Returned to Business Area: 23/07/2026

Date Final Version Received / Agreed: 28/08/2026

Date Published on DfI's Section 75 webpage: 01/09/2026