

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

DEM169/22 - Surfacing aggregate PSV standards for non-trunk A-Class Roads

Is this an existing, revised or a new policy?

Revision of existing policy

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

This memorandum permits the Divisional Roads Manager to approve Departures from Standard CD236, relating to the specification of Polished Stone Value (PSV) of surface course aggregate on non-trunk A-class roads.

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 Roads – SHEPE branch

Who owns and who implements the policy?

Department for Infrastructure, implemented by all involved in designing surfacing projects on the public road network (non-trunk A roads).

Background

The DMRB (CS228 and CD236) is the national standard for the design of road surfacing material and associated PSV/surface friction, however full compliance with this standard is deemed over-onerous, and unnecessary, for use on the NI non-trunk road network. This memorandum assists the Designer in specifying surface course materials through prescribing minimum values of Polished Stone Value (PSV) for the coarse aggregate and chippings in surfacing mixes for use on Northern Ireland's non-trunk (A-class) road network. It relates to the provision of adequate surface friction which contributes towards maintaining road safety on the minor road network.

Implementation factors

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

Yes

A change in National Standards (DMRB & MCHW)

Main stakeholders affected

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

Staff

Utility companies (that open and reinstate public roads)

Surfacing contractors

Road users

Other policies with a bearing on this policy

- what are they? DMRB CD236, DMRB CS228 and RSPPG E073
- who owns them? National Highways (national standards) and DfI Roads

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:

The aim is to update the existing policy with procedures to allow for departure from standards, assessed and approved within division, regarding road surface specification, and will apply equally to all road users. There is no data to suggest this policy will have any specific impact on this Section 75 grouping. Any issues identified relating to this Section 75 group during the statutory consultation process will be fully considered.

Political Opinion evidence / information:

As above

Racial Group evidence / information:

As above

Age evidence / information:

As above

Marital Status evidence / information:

As above

Sexual Orientation evidence / information:

As above

Men & Women generally evidence / information:

As above

Disability evidence / information:

As above

Dependants evidence / information:

As above

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

The provision of DEM 169/22 is technical in nature and does not impact on equality of opportunity for any Section 75 group. No issues have been identified.

Political Opinion

As Above

Racial Group

As Above.

Age

As Above.

Marital status

As Above

Sexual orientation

As Above

Men and Women Generally

As Above

Disability

As Above

Dependants

As Above

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 provision of DEM 169/22 is technical guidance in nature and does not impact on equality of opportunity for any Section 75 group. No issues have been identified.

What is the level of impact? None

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

As above

What is the level of impact? None

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

As above

What is the level of impact? None

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

As above

What is the level of impact? None

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

As above

What is the level of impact? None

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

As above

What is the level of impact? None

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

As above

What is the level of impact? None

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

As above

What is the level of impact? None

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

[As above](#)

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?** No

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 is purely technical in nature. It is not intended as a means to promote equality of opportunity for this Section 75 group.](#)

Political Opinion - If Yes, provide details:

If No, provide reasons:

[As above](#)

Racial Group - If Yes, provide details:

If No, provide reasons:

[As above](#)

Age - If Yes, provide details:

If No, provide reasons:

[As above](#)

Marital Status - If Yes, provide details:

If No, provide reasons:

[As above](#)

Sexual Orientation - If Yes, provide details:

If No, provide reasons:

[As above](#)

Men and Women generally - If Yes, provide details:

If No, provide reasons:

[As above](#)

Disability - If Yes, provide details:

If No, provide reasons:

As above

Dependants - If Yes, provide details:

If No, provide reasons:

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**:

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

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

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

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

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:

No. The policy will not impact on good relations. DEM 169/22 is revised technical guidance to address an engineering matter.

Political Opinion - If Yes, provide details:

If No, provide reasons:

No. The policy will not impact on good relations. DEM 169/22 is revised technical guidance to address an engineering matter.

Racial Group - If Yes, provide details:

If No, provide reasons:

No. The policy will not impact on good relations. DEM 169/22 is revised technical guidance to address an engineering matter.

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).

None

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.

DEM 169/22 has been developed to address an engineering matter. As a technical policy for the design of road surfacing it does not have any implications for equality of opportunity, nor does it identify any needs, experiences or priorities for any Section 75 categories. Therefore on this basis it is considered that a full Equality Impact Assessment is 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.

No mitigation has been identified at present.

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.

As this is revised technical guidance regarding the design of road surfacing material and associated PSV/surface friction there is no scope to mitigate as the guidance it has no impact on equality of opportunity and/or good relations.

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: Paul Braniff
Position/Job Title: SPTO
Date: 28 March 2022

Approved by: Stephen Tweed
Position/Job Title: PPTO
Date: 28 March 2022

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:	20.04.22
Amendments Requested:	Yes
Date Returned to Business Area:	25.04.22
Date Final Version Received / Confirmed:	26.04.22
Date Published on DfI's Section 75 webpage:	27.04.22