

## 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**

Review of Permitted Development Rights

#### **Is this an existing, revised or a new policy?**

Existing

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

To extend existing permitted development rights for telecommunications infrastructure.

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

**If so, explain how.**

There are no particular Section 75 (S75) categories likely to benefit from the policy. However, all S75 groups may potentially benefit from improved telecommunications infrastructure and connectivity. The extent of any benefit will depend on individuals' use of telecommunications services and whether the infrastructure improvements result in enhanced coverage, capacity, or service quality in areas where they live, work, or travel.

#### **Who initiated or wrote the policy?**

The former Department of the Environment.

## Who owns and who implements the policy?

The Department for Infrastructure (DfI).

## Background

DfI is consulting on a number of proposed amendments to Part 18 of the Schedule to the Planning (General Permitted Development) Order (Northern Ireland) 2015 (GPDO), which relates to Development by Electronic Communications Code Operators.

The proposals are intended to support the delivery and upgrading of telecommunications infrastructure, including infrastructure required for the continued rollout of 5G networks, while ensuring that environmental and amenity impacts are appropriately managed.

The GPDO sets out types of development which can be undertaken without requiring a planning application. These are referred to as permitted development rights and often relate to minor building works that have minimal impact to amenity and the environment. In most cases permitted development rights are subject to conditions and limitations specified in the GPDO. These may, for example, specify the maximum size or scale of what is permitted, restrict or dis-apply the rights in certain locations (e.g. conservation areas, World Heritage Sites etc.) or provide that the permitted development rights only apply to certain developers (e.g. councils, or statutory undertakers). Proposed developments that do not fall within the scope of permitted development rights, including any conditions, must be the subject of a planning application.

The Department is continuing its review of permitted development rights as part of its commitment to better regulation. This consultation forms part of that ongoing review and seeks views on proposals intended to reduce unnecessary regulatory requirements and align permitted development rights for telecommunications infrastructure more closely with those operating elsewhere in the United Kingdom (UK), whilst continuing to protect amenity, environmental interests and public safety.

The consultation includes proposals relating to new ground based masts, existing ground based masts and other apparatus, apparatus mounted on buildings and the emergency period.

The Northern Ireland Barrier Busting Taskforce (NIBBT) Communication Subgroup, chaired by the Department for the Economy (DfE), aims to raise awareness of the benefits and opportunities presented by mobile technologies while also addressing public concerns about any perceived risks. As part of the Mobile Action Plan for Northern Ireland (MAP NI), DfE works collaboratively with industry and other stakeholders to provide information on new mobile technologies, helping to inform citizens of their economic and societal benefits and to address concerns associated with their deployment.

In relation to health concerns surrounding telecommunications infrastructure, including 5G networks, the UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA) has undertaken extensive research into

exposure to radio waves from 5G base stations. The findings<sup>1</sup> show that exposure levels are well below the international safety guidelines set by the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) and are generally similar to, or lower than, those associated with existing 4G networks. Based on the available evidence, UKHSA's advice remains that 5G technologies operate within recognised international safety standards.

## Implementation factors

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

Legislative – The implementation of the policy will require amendments to subordinate legislation.

## 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 - in particular telecommunications network operators, Electronic Communications Code Operators, telecommunications infrastructure installers and contractors, landowners hosting telecommunications equipment, and local planning authorities responsible for processing and determining telecommunications related planning applications.

## Other policies with a bearing on this policy

### **• what are they?**

The Electronic Communications Code (Conditions and Restrictions) Regulations 2003.

### **• who owns them?**

---

<sup>1</sup> [5G technologies: radio waves and health - GOV.UK](https://www.gov.uk/government/news/5g-technologies-radio-waves-and-health)

Responsibility for the Electronic Communications Code (Conditions and Restrictions) Regulations 2003 rests with the UK Government, as it is legislation made under the Communications Act 2003.

## 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.

### Religious belief evidence / information:

The Department does not envisage or consider that there are likely to be any specific negative impacts associated with this policy. In 2016 the Department made similar amendments to the GPDO and found that there were no adverse impacts associated with the policy at that time.

A review of similar policy changes undertaken elsewhere in the UK identified the Scottish Government's 2017 Equality Impact Assessment<sup>2</sup> on the relaxation of planning controls for digital communications infrastructure. The assessment concluded that the changes were not expected to have differential impacts across equality groups. No evidence was identified through consultation to suggest adverse impacts on protected groups.

In addition to the Scottish Government's 2017 Equality Impact Assessment, more recent publications across the UK and Ireland continue to highlight the benefits of improved digital connectivity. These publications identify improved access to services, employment, education, healthcare and social opportunities as key benefits of enhanced telecommunications infrastructure.

No evidence has been identified to suggest that policies facilitating the development of telecommunications infrastructure would have adverse impacts on any equality group. Instead, improved connectivity is generally recognised as supporting greater digital inclusion and reducing barriers to accessing services and opportunities.

---

<sup>2</sup> [Contents - Relaxation of planning controls for digital communications infrastructure: equality impact assessment results - gov.scot](#)

Published in 2023 the UK Government's Wireless Infrastructure Strategy<sup>3</sup> states that improved wireless connectivity supports economic growth, productivity, innovation, public services and social inclusion. It cites analysis suggesting widespread adoption of 5G could generate £159 billion in productivity benefits by 2035. The Strategy also highlights benefits for sectors including healthcare, transport, education, manufacturing, ports and rural communities, with advanced wireless infrastructure supporting improved access to services and economic opportunities.

A 2025 Mobile UK/Assembly Research report<sup>4</sup> argues that investment in mobile infrastructure is fundamental to productivity, innovation and emerging technologies such as AI, and identifies mobile connectivity as a key enabler of the Government's growth agenda.

A 2025 BT/Assembly Research report<sup>5</sup> estimated that improvements to UK mobile networks could unlock up to £230 billion in economic benefits by 2035, including benefits for rural economies, transport, public services and industrial innovation.

While no S75 category is uniquely or disproportionately likely to benefit from the policy, all S75 groups may potentially benefit from improved telecommunications infrastructure and connectivity. The extent of any benefit would depend on how individuals use telecommunications services and whether infrastructure enhancements improve coverage, capacity, or service quality in the areas where they live, work, or travel.

### **Political Opinion** evidence / information:

As above for Religious belief.

### **Racial Group** evidence / information:

As above for Religious belief.

### **Age** evidence / information:

As above for Religious belief.

### **Marital Status** evidence / information:

As above for Religious belief.

---

<sup>3</sup> [UK Wireless Infrastructure Strategy - GOV.UK](#)

<sup>4</sup> [New Report: Securing UK Growth: Why Government Must Prioritise Mobile Infrastructure Now](#)

<sup>5</sup> [BT report reveals £230bn in economic benefits from improved UK mobile coverage](#)

## **Sexual Orientation** evidence / information:

As above for Religious belief.

## **Men & Women generally** evidence / information:

As above for Religious belief.

## **Disability** evidence / information:

As above for Religious belief.

## **Dependants** evidence / information:

As above 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**

Enhanced digital connectivity can help improve access to services, information, employment, education and social networks, contributing to wider economic and social opportunities for all society.

No specific needs, experiences or priorities have been identified for this group, in relation to this policy. Individuals from all S75 groups may benefit equally from improved connectivity and access to digital services.

### **Political Opinion**

As above for Religious belief.

## **Racial Group**

As above for Religious belief.

## **Age**

As above for Religious belief.

Reliable connectivity is important for all ages. Younger people are more likely to depend on digital services for education, training, employment and social interaction, while older people may rely on mobile connectivity for healthcare, telecare, emergency contact and reducing social isolation.

## **Marital status**

As above for Religious belief.

## **Sexual orientation**

As above for Religious belief.

## **Men and Women Generally**

As above for Religious belief.

## **Disability**

As above for Religious belief.

People with disabilities may depend heavily on telecommunications services, assistive technologies, accessible digital platforms, remote access to services and emergency communications. Improved network coverage potentially could enhance independence, inclusion and access to public services.

## **Dependants**

As above 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**:

Improved connectivity may enhance access to information, services and social networks for all society. No particular impacts have been identified for this S75 category.

What is the level of impact? Minor positive

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

Improved connectivity may enhance access to information, services, and social networks for all society. No particular impacts have been identified for this S75 category.

What is the level of impact? Minor positive

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

Improved connectivity may enhance access to information, services and community networks for all society. No particular impacts have been identified for this S75 category.

What is the level of impact? Minor positive

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

Improved connectivity may benefit people of all ages in society. Younger people may experience enhanced access to education, training and digital opportunities, while older people may benefit from improved access to services, communication technologies, healthcare and social inclusion.

What is the level of impact? Minor positive

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

Improved telecommunications services may support better access to information, services and community networks for all society. No particular impacts have been identified for this S75 category.

What is the level of impact? Minor positive

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

Improved telecommunications services may improve access to information, services and social networks for all society. No particular impacts have been identified for this S75 category.

What is the level of impact? Minor positive

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

Improved telecommunications infrastructure may support access to information, services and social networks for all society. No particular impacts have been identified for this S75 category.

What is the level of impact? Minor positive

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

Improved telecommunications infrastructure may have particular benefits for disabled people through enhanced access to digital services, assistive technologies, remote healthcare, home working and online communications.

While benefits may be greater for some disabled people due to reliance on digital connectivity, no adverse impacts have been identified.

What is the level of impact? Minor positive

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

Improved telecommunications infrastructure may support access to information, public services and social networks for all society. No particular impacts have been identified for this S75 category.

What is the level of impact? Minor positive

**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: No

Improvements in telecommunications infrastructure and connectivity may improve access to digital services, information, employment, education, healthcare and social connections for all society.

There have been no opportunities identified to better promote equality of opportunity for this S75 category at this stage. Should any be identified, this form can be reviewed and updated, as appropriate.

**Political Opinion** - If Yes, provide details: No

Improvements in telecommunications infrastructure and connectivity may improve access to digital services, information, employment, education, healthcare and social connections for all society.

There have been no opportunities identified to better promote equality of opportunity for this S75 category at this stage. Should any be identified, this form can be reviewed and updated, as appropriate.

**Racial Group** - If Yes, provide details: No

Improvements in telecommunications infrastructure and connectivity may improve access to access to digital services, information, employment, education, healthcare and social connections for all society.

There have been no opportunities identified to better promote equality of opportunity for this S75 category at this stage. Should any be identified, this form can be reviewed and updated, as appropriate.

**Age** - If Yes, provide details: No

Improvements in telecommunications infrastructure and connectivity may improve access to access to digital services, information, employment, education, healthcare and social connections for all society. Older people may benefit through improved access to healthcare services, social connections, online information and essential public services, helping to reduce social isolation and digital exclusion.

There have been no opportunities identified to better promote equality of opportunity at this stage. Should any be identified, this form can be reviewed and updated, as appropriate.

**Marital Status** - If Yes, provide details: **No**

Improvements in telecommunications infrastructure and connectivity may improve access to access to digital services, information, employment, education, healthcare and social connections for all society.

There have been no opportunities identified to better promote equality of opportunity at this stage. Should any be identified, this form can be reviewed and updated, as appropriate.

**Sexual Orientation** - If Yes, provide details: **No**

Improvements in telecommunications infrastructure and connectivity may improve access to access to digital services, information, employment, education, healthcare and social connections for all society.

There have been no opportunities identified to better promote equality of opportunity at this stage. Should any be identified, this form can be reviewed and updated, as appropriate.

**Men and Women generally** - If Yes, provide details: **No**

Improvements in telecommunications infrastructure and connectivity may improve access to access to digital services, information, employment, education, healthcare and social connections for all society.

There have been no opportunities identified to better promote equality of opportunity for this S75 category at this stage. Should any be identified, this form can be reviewed and updated, as appropriate.

**Disability** - If Yes, provide details: **No**

Improved telecommunications infrastructure may provide particular opportunities to promote equality of opportunity for disabled people through better access to assistive technologies, remote healthcare, online services, education, employment opportunities and social interaction.

Greater connectivity may help reduce barriers faced by some disabled individuals in accessing services and social participation.

**Dependants - If Yes, provide details: No**

Improvements in telecommunications infrastructure and connectivity may improve access to access to digital services, information, employment, education, healthcare and social connections for all society including those with caring responsibilities.

There have been no opportunities identified to better promote equality of opportunity for this S75 category at this stage. Should any be identified, this form can be reviewed and updated, as appropriate.

**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 is intended to facilitate improved telecommunications infrastructure and connectivity. Any benefits arising from enhanced digital connectivity, such as improved access to services, information and economic opportunities, would be available broadly across society.

No likely impacts on good relations between people in this S75 category have been identified.

What is the level of impact? None

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

As above for Religious belief.

What is the level of impact? None

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

As above 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 - No**

If No, provide reasons:

The policy is intended to facilitate improved telecommunications infrastructure and connectivity. Any benefits arising from enhanced digital connectivity, such as improved access to services, information and economic opportunities, would be available broadly across society.

No likely opportunities to better promote good relations between people in this S75 category have been identified.

**Political Opinion - No**

If No, provide reasons

As above for Religious belief.

**Racial Group - No**

If No, provide reasons

As above 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).*

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

The available evidence does not indicate that the policy is likely to have any adverse impacts on individuals with multiple identities. As the policy relates to facilitating improvements in telecommunications infrastructure and connectivity, any benefits arising from enhanced coverage, capacity and service quality are expected to be broadly available across society.

There may, however, be opportunities for individuals with multiple identities to experience cumulative benefits from improved connectivity. For example:

- Older disabled people may benefit from improved access to digital healthcare services, assistive technologies and opportunities to maintain social connections.
- People with disabilities who also have caring responsibilities may benefit from enhanced access to remote services, flexible working arrangements and digital communications.
- People from minority ethnic communities may benefit from improved access to information, public services, employment opportunities and the ability to maintain cultural and family connections.

While the extent of any benefit will depend on individual circumstances and the availability of improved telecommunications services in particular locations, no evidence has been identified to suggest that people with multiple identities would experience disproportionate negative impacts as a result of the policy.

### Part 3. Screening decision

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

The Department has considered the available evidence and concludes that a full Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA) is not necessary for this policy.

The policy relates to amendments to planning controls for telecommunications infrastructure and is intended to facilitate improvements in telecommunications networks and connectivity. The evidence gathered through the screening process indicates that the policy is not likely to have significant implications for equality of opportunity or good relations across any of the S75 categories.

In reaching this conclusion, the Department has taken account of:

- The findings of previous amendments to the GPDO, which identified no adverse equality impacts.
- Evidence from the Scottish Government's Equality Impact Assessment on similar policy changes, which concluded that no differential impacts across equality groups were anticipated.
- Wider evidence demonstrating the economic and social benefits of improved digital connectivity, including enhanced access to services, employment, education, healthcare and communications.
- The absence of evidence indicating that any Section 75 category would experience a disproportionate adverse impact as a result of the policy.

The screening assessment found that:

- No Section 75 group is likely to experience a major adverse impact.
- The policy does not differentially affect people based on religious belief, political opinion, racial group, age, marital status, sexual orientation, sex, disability or dependency status.
- Any impacts are likely to be broadly positive and relate to improved telecommunications infrastructure and connectivity.
- The policy is not expected to have a significant impact on good relations between people of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group.

Accordingly, the Department is satisfied that the policy is unlikely to have significant adverse implications for equality of opportunity or good relations and that a full Equality Impact Assessment is therefore not required.

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.

The Department will continue to consider equality implications as the policy is implemented and will keep the position under review should new evidence emerge. This form can be reviewed and updated, at any stage, as required.

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? **No**

The UKHSA has undertaken extensive research into exposure to radio waves from 5G base stations in relation to health with surrounding telecommunications infrastructure, including 5G networks.

The findings show that exposure levels are well below the international safety guidelines set by the ICNIRP and are generally similar to, or lower than, those associated with existing 4G networks. Based on the available evidence, UKHSA's advice remains that 5G technologies operate within recognised international safety standards.

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?

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: [Eilish Coey](#)  
Position/Job Title: [Deputy Principal](#)  
Date: [27/07/26](#)

Approved by: [David Doherty](#)  
Position/Job Title: [Grade 7](#)  
Date: [05/08/26](#)

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: [27/07/2026](#)  
Amendments Requested: Yes / No [Yes](#)  
Date Returned to Business Area: [05/08/2026](#)  
Date Final Version Received / Agreed: [21/09/2026](#)  
Date Published on DfI's Section 75 webpage: [02/10/2026](#)