

Equality Screening Form

INTRODUCTION

The information contained in this Equality Screening Form has been extracted from the Equality Commission for Northern Ireland's Guide for Public Authorities (2010). Additional information about the 5 parts of the form and a flowchart to demonstrate the process of completion is detailed in **Appendix 1** of the form.

This template document and further guidance can be found by clicking the following link - www.equalityni.org/S75duties

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 Policy	Translink Environmental Noise Action Plan 2023-2028			
Is it existing, revised or a new policy?	Existing <input type="checkbox"/>	New <input type="checkbox"/>	Revised <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
If revised, please outline main updates:	The previous action plan has been updated to include new modelling data and additional actions consistent with current Translink strategic plans.			
What is it trying to achieve? (Intended aims/outcomes)	The development of an action plan on a five yearly cycle is a statutory requirement of the Environmental Noise Regulations (NI) 2006. The plan must meet the requirements of Schedule 4 (of the regulations), be designed to manage noise issues and its effects, aim to protect quiet areas in agglomerations and address priorities			
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?	ESG Manager			
Who owns and who implements the policy?	The Policy is owned by Translink SH&E Department. Different elements of the Plan will be implemented by Divisions within Translink.			

Implementation Factors

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

Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----	-------------------------------------	----	--------------------------

If yes, are they: (Select all applicable)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Financial
<input type="checkbox"/>	Legislative
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other – please specify:

Main stakeholders affected

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Staff	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Service Users	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other Public Sector Organisations	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Voluntary/ Community/ Trade Unions	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other – please specify:	People living and working next to the railway in the Belfast Metropolitan Area may be affected, However, as no noise management or Candidate Noise Management Areas have been designated, it is highly unlikely any action will be required.

Other policies with a bearing on this policy (please list):

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety, Health and Environmental Policy

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 following document should help you source data - [Section 75 - Evidence Signposting Guide](#)

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

Section 75 category	Details of evidence/information
Religious belief	The modelled track passes through a range of communities.
Political opinion	Noise Action Plans have been publicly consulted on in accordance with the Regulations since 2006 with no notable comments made.
Racial group	The modelled track passes through a range of communities.

Age	The modelled track passes through a range of communities.
Marital status	The modelled track passes through a range of communities.
Sexual orientation	The modelled track passes through a range of communities.
Men and women generally	The modelled track passes through a range of communities.
Disability	The modelled track passes through a range of communities.
Dependants	The modelled track passes through a range of communities.

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 for each of the Section 75 categories

Section 75 category	Details of needs/experiences/priorities
Religious belief	None – noise emission exposure is identical, irrespective of whether or not an individual falls within a S. 75 group.
Political opinion	None – noise emission exposure is identical, irrespective of whether or not an individual falls within a S. 75 group.
Racial group	None – noise emission exposure is identical, irrespective of whether or not an individual falls within a S. 75 group.
Age	None – noise emission exposure is identical, irrespective of whether or not an individual falls within a S. 75 group.
Marital status	None – noise emission exposure is identical, irrespective of whether or not an individual falls within a S. 75 group.

Sexual orientation	None – noise emission exposure is identical, irrespective of whether or not an individual falls within a S. 75 group.
Men and women generally	None – noise emission exposure is identical, irrespective of whether or not an individual falls within a S. 75 group.
Disability	None – noise emission exposure is identical, irrespective of whether or not an individual falls within a S. 75 group.
Dependants	None – noise emission exposure is identical, irrespective of whether or not an individual falls within a S. 75 group.

PART 2 - SCREENING QUESTIONS

Introduction

In making a decision as to whether or not there is a need to carry out an equality impact assessment, the public authority should consider its answers to the questions 1-4 which are given on pages 66-68 of the Guide: [Guide for Public Authorities April 2010](#)

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.

Impact: Major / Minor / None

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.

In favour of '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.

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 '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.

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.

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.

Screening Questions 1 - 4

Screening Question 1
What is the likely impact on equality of opportunity for those affected by this policy, for each of the Section 75 equality categories? Minor/ Major/ None

Section 75 category	Details of policy impact	Level of impact? Minor/Major/None
Religious belief	N/A	None
Political opinion	N/A	None
Racial group	N/A	None
Age	N/A	None
Marital status	N/A	None
Sexual orientation	N/A	None
Men and women generally	N/A	None
Disability	N/A	None
Dependants	N/A	None

Screening Question 2		
Are there opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity for people within the Section 75 equalities categories?		
Section 75 category	If Yes , provide details	If No , provide reasons

Religious belief		noise emission exposure is identical, irrespective of whether or not an individual falls within a S. 75 group.
Political opinion		noise emission exposure is identical, irrespective of whether or not an individual falls within a S. 75 group.
Racial group		noise emission exposure is identical, irrespective of whether or not an individual falls within a S. 75 group.
Age		noise emission exposure is identical, irrespective of whether or not an individual falls within a S. 75 group.
Marital status		noise emission exposure is identical, irrespective of whether or not an individual falls within a S. 75 group.
Sexual orientation		noise emission exposure is identical, irrespective of whether or not an individual falls within a S. 75 group.
Men and women generally		noise emission exposure is identical, irrespective of whether or not an individual falls within a S. 75 group.
Disability		noise emission exposure is identical, irrespective of whether or not an individual falls within a S. 75 group.
Dependants		noise emission exposure is identical, irrespective of whether or not an individual falls within a S. 75 group.

Screening Question 3

To what extent is the policy likely to impact on good relations between people of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group? Minor/ Major/ None

Good relations category	Details of policy impact	Level of impact Minor/Major/None
Religious belief	noise emission exposure is identical, irrespective of whether or not an individual falls within a S. 75 group.	None
Political opinion	noise emission exposure is identical, irrespective of whether or not an individual falls within a S. 75 group.	None
Racial group	noise emission exposure is identical, irrespective of whether or not an individual falls within a S. 75 group.	None

Screening Question 4

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

Good relations category	If Yes , provide details	If No , provide reasons
Religious belief		noise emission exposure is identical, irrespective of whether or not an individual falls within a S. 75 group.
Political opinion		noise emission exposure is identical, irrespective of whether or not an individual falls within a S. 75 group.
Racial group		noise emission exposure is identical, irrespective of whether or not an individual falls within a S. 75 group.

Additional Considerations

Multiple Identity

Generally speaking, people can fall into more than one Section 75 category. Taking this into consideration, are there any potential impacts of the policy/decision on people with multiple identities? (For example: disabled minority ethnic people; disabled women; young Protestant men; and young lesbians, gay and bisexual people).

No

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

N/A

PART 3 - SCREENING DECISION

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

An Equality Impact Assessment will not be conducted as there are no identified equality impacts.

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**.

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?

If so, give the **reasons** to support your decision, together with the proposed changes/amendments or alternative policy.

N/A. The plan, as drafted complies with legislative requirements

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	Rating (1-3)
Effect on equality of opportunity and good relations	Not Applicable
Social need	Not Applicable
Effect on people's daily lives	Not Applicable
Relevance to a public authority's functions	Not Applicable

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:

Yes. The Environmental Noise Regulations (NI) 2006 require it to be reviewed every five years.

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.

If applicable, please comment on how you will monitor the impact of this policy.

N/A

PART 5 - APPROVAL AND AUTHORISATION

Policy Title:	Translink Environmental Noise Action Plan 2023-2028	Version No:	0.7 (Draft for public consultation)
Print Name	Position/Job Title	Signature	Date
Screened By:			
Christopher Allen	ESG Manager		04/07/2025
Approved by:			

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.

APPENDIX 1

Part	Part Title	Description
1	<u>Policy Scoping</u>	Asks public authorities to provide details about the policy, procedure, practice and/or decision being screened and what available evidence you have gathered to help make an assessment of the likely impact on equality of opportunity and good relations
2	<u>Screening Questions</u>	Asks about the extent of the likely impact of the policy on groups of people within each of the Section 75 categories. Details of the groups consulted and the level of assessment of the likely impact. This includes consideration of multiple identity and good relations issues.
3	<u>Screening Decision</u>	Guides the public authority to reach a screening decision as to whether or not there is a need to carry out an equality impact assessment (EQIA), or to introduce measures to mitigate the likely impact, or the introduction of an alternative policy to better promote equality of opportunity and/or good relations.
4	<u>Monitoring</u>	Provides guidance to public authorities on monitoring for adverse impact and broader monitoring.
5	<u>Approval and Authorisation</u>	Verifies the public authority's approval of a screening decision by a senior manager responsible for the policy.

