



The
Executive Office

TEO Section 75

EQUALITY IMPACT SCREENING FORM

Title of Policy:

Equality Matters

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
Equality Matters

Is this an existing, revised or a new policy?
New but replaces a screening for an earlier prototype

What is it trying to achieve? (intended aims/outcomes)
The aim of the policy is 'to improve access to and dissemination of equality data across the NICS to provide transparency to decision making for effective policy development'. Practically this means making key equality data across departments readily accessible to stakeholders to fulfil statutory NIA s.75 equality duties; provide better evidence to underpin coherent Executive/departmental /public body strategic decisions and improve public trust.

Are there any Section 75 categories which might be expected to benefit from the intended policy?
If so, explain how.
Ultimately all groups are expected to benefit because it should support access to all NICS equality data. The tool will initially from its 2026-27 launch provide some 800 plus data pages: this is expected to grow as further data becomes available over the life cycle of the policy.

Who initiated or wrote the policy?
TEO's Equality, Rights and Identity and Corporate Services Divisions.

Who owns and who implements the policy?
Both of the above.

Implementation factors

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

If yes, are they

- ☒ financial
- ☐ legislative
- ☒ other, please specify

The lack of data harmonisation across the NICS potentially constrains some data comparisons/output. However, this is ameliorated by a key early project deliverable: agreeing data harmonisation standards and their subsequent implementation.

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, please specify:
General public.

Other policies with a bearing on this policy

what are they?

This is a distinct, standalone policy which aids the better identification of inequalities in support of the development of transparent, coherent Executive/departmental/public body strategic decisions/policies and improvement in public trust. It is therefore integral to delivery of NIA 1998 Section 75.

who owns them?

NIA 1998 Section 75 is not owned by any one department, but instead places a statutory duty on all public authorities, including Executive departments.

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.

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 policy only seeks to increase both accessibility and the ability to interpret pre-existing NICS equality data which obviates the need for collation of supporting evidence. It is for departments to collate the data sets which drive the policy's deliverables.
Political opinion	The policy only seeks to increase both accessibility and the ability to interpret pre-existing NICS equality data which obviates the need for collation of supporting evidence. It is for departments to collate the data sets which drive the policy's deliverables.
Racial group	The policy only seeks to increase both accessibility and the ability to interpret pre-existing NICS equality data which obviates the need for collation of supporting evidence. It is for departments to collate the data sets which drive the policy's deliverables.
Marital status	The policy only seeks to increase both accessibility and the ability to interpret pre-existing NICS equality data which obviates the need for collation of supporting evidence. It is for departments to collate the data sets which drive the policy's deliverables.
Sexual orientation	The policy only seeks to increase both accessibility and the ability to interpret pre-existing NICS equality data which obviates the need for collation of supporting evidence. It is for departments to collate the data sets which drive the policy's deliverables.
Men and women generally	The policy only seeks to increase both accessibility and the ability to interpret pre-existing NICS equality data which obviates the need for collation of supporting evidence. It is for departments to collate the data sets which drive the policy's deliverables.
Disability	The policy only seeks to increase both accessibility and the ability to interpret pre-existing NICS equality data which obviates the need for collation of supporting evidence. It is for departments to collate the data sets which drive the policy's deliverables.
Dependants	The policy only seeks to increase both accessibility and the ability to interpret pre-existing NICS equality data which obviates the need for

	collation of supporting evidence. It is for departments to collate the data sets which drive the policy's deliverables.
--	---

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	The policy delivery mechanism meets NICS/NISRA accessibility requirements.
Political opinion	The policy delivery mechanism meets NICS/NISRA accessibility requirements.
Racial group	The policy delivery mechanism meets NICS/NISRA accessibility requirements.
Age	Feedback and wider engagement evidence highlighted that some users may experience difficulties with digital interfaces due to factors such as sensory or cognitive impairments. These considerations have directly informed the development of the website. Accessibility has been built into the design from the outset, including clear and consistent navigation, plain-language content, compatibility with assistive technologies, and flexibility in how information is presented. The aim has been to minimise unnecessary complexity and ensure the portal is usable by people with a wide range of needs and abilities, rather than relying on a one-size-fits-all design.
Marital status	The policy delivery mechanism meets NICS/NISRA accessibility requirements.
Sexual orientation	The policy delivery mechanism meets NICS/NISRA accessibility requirements.
Men and women generally	The policy delivery mechanism meets NICS/NISRA accessibility requirements.

Disability	Feedback and wider engagement evidence highlighted that some users may experience difficulties with digital interfaces due to factors such as sensory or cognitive impairments. These considerations have directly informed the development of the website. Accessibility has been built into the design from the outset, including clear and consistent navigation, plain-language content, compatibility with assistive technologies, and flexibility in how information is presented. The aim has been to minimise unnecessary complexity and ensure the portal is usable by people with a wide range of needs and abilities, rather than relying on a one-size-fits-all design.
Dependants	The policy delivery mechanism meets NICS/NISRA accessibility requirements.

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

The policy is significant in terms of its strategic importance;

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;

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;

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;

The policy is likely to be challenged by way of judicial review;

The policy is significant in terms of expenditure.

In favour of 'minor' impact

The policy is not unlawfully discriminatory and any residual potential impacts on people are judged to be negligible;

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;

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;

By amending the policy there are better opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity and/or good relations.

In favour of none

The policy has no relevance to equality of opportunity or good relations.

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? minor/major/none		
Section 75 category	Details of policy impact	Level of impact? minor/major/none
Religious belief	Positive: it aids the better identification of inequalities in support of the development of transparent, coherent Executive/ departmental/public body strategic decisions/policies and improvement in public trust. The policy is therefore integral to successful delivery of the associated statutory duty.	Minor – improved access to data supports better decision making thus there isn't a disproportionate effect .
Political opinion	Positive: it aids the better identification of inequalities in support of the development of transparent, coherent Executive/ departmental/public body strategic decisions/policies and improvement in public trust. The policy is therefore integral to successful delivery of the associated statutory duty.	Minor – improved access to data supports better decision making thus there isn't a disproportionate effect .
Racial group	Positive: it aids the better identification of inequalities in support of the development of transparent, coherent Executive/ departmental/public body strategic decisions/policies and improvement in public trust. The policy is therefore integral to successful delivery of the associated statutory duty.	Minor – improved access to data supports better decision making thus there isn't a disproportionate effect .
Age	Positive: it aids the better identification of inequalities in support of the development of transparent, coherent Executive/ departmental/public body strategic decisions/policies and improvement in public trust. The policy is therefore integral to successful delivery of the associated statutory duty.	Minor – improved access to data supports better decision making thus there isn't a disproportionate effect .
Marital status	Positive: it aids the better identification of inequalities in support of the development of transparent, coherent Executive/ departmental/public body strategic decisions/policies and improvement in public trust. The policy is therefore integral to successful delivery of the associated statutory duty.	Minor – improved access to data supports better decision making thus there isn't a disproportionate effect .

Sexual orientation	Positive: it aids the better identification of inequalities in support of the development of transparent, coherent Executive/ departmental/public body strategic decisions/policies and improvement in public trust. The policy is therefore integral to successful delivery of the associated statutory duty.	Minor – improved access to data supports better decision making thus there isn't a disproportionate effect .
Men and women generally	Positive: it aids the better identification of inequalities in support of the development of transparent, coherent Executive/ departmental/public body strategic decisions/policies and improvement in public trust. The policy is therefore integral to successful delivery of the associated statutory duty.	Minor – improved access to data supports better decision making thus there isn't a disproportionate effect .
Disability	Positive: it aids the better identification of inequalities in support of the development of transparent, coherent Executive/ departmental/public body strategic decisions/policies and improvement in public trust. The policy is therefore integral to successful delivery of the associated statutory duty.	Minor – improved access to data supports better decision making thus there isn't a disproportionate effect .
Dependants	Positive: it aids the better identification of inequalities in support of the development of transparent, coherent Executive/departmental/public body strategic decisions/policies and improvement in public trust. The policy is therefore integral to successful delivery of the associated statutory duty.	Minor – improved access to data supports better decision making thus there isn't a disproportionate effect .

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	Improved access to data supports better informed Executive/ departmental decisions/policies with the concomitant impact on equality of opportunity.	
Political opinion	Improved access to data supports better informed Executive/ departmental decisions/policies with the concomitant impact on equality of opportunity.	

Racial group	Improved access to data supports better informed Executive/departmental decisions/policies with the concomitant impact on equality of opportunity.	
Age	Improved access to data supports better informed Executive/departmental decisions/policies with the concomitant impact on equality of opportunity.	
Marital status	Improved access to data supports better informed Executive/departmental decisions/policies with the concomitant impact on equality of opportunity.	
Sexual orientation	Improved access to data supports better informed Executive/departmental decisions/policies with the concomitant impact on equality of opportunity.	
Men and women generally	Improved access to data supports better informed Executive/departmental decisions/policies with the concomitant impact on equality of opportunity.	
Disability	Improved access to data supports better informed Executive/departmental decisions/policies with the concomitant impact on equality of opportunity.	
Dependants	Improved access to data supports better informed Executive/departmental decisions/policies with the concomitant impact on equality of opportunity.	

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	Positive: it aids the better identification of inequalities in support of the development of transparent, coherent Executive/departmental/public body strategic decisions/policies and improvement in public trust. The policy is	Minor – improved access to data supports better decision making thus there isn't a

	therefore integral to successful delivery of the associated statutory duty.	disproportionate effect.
Political opinion	Positive: it aids the better identification of inequalities in support of the development of transparent, coherent Executive/departmental/public body strategic decisions/policies and improvement in public trust. The policy is therefore integral to successful delivery of the associated statutory duty.	Minor – improved access to data supports better decision making thus there isn't a disproportionate effect.
Racial group	Positive: it aids the better identification of inequalities in support of the development of transparent, coherent Executive/departmental/public body strategic decisions/policies and improvement in public trust. The policy is therefore integral to successful delivery of the associated statutory duty.	Minor – improved access to data supports better decision making thus there isn't a disproportionate effect.

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	It aids the better identification of inequalities in support of the development of transparent, coherent Executive/departmental/public body strategic decisions/policies and improvement in public trust with the concomitant impact on good relations.	
Political opinion	It aids the better identification of inequalities in support of the development of transparent, coherent Executive/departmental/public body strategic decisions/policies and improvement in public trust with the concomitant impact on good relations.	
Racial group	It aids the better identification of inequalities in support of the development of transparent, coherent Executive/departmental/public body strategic decisions/policies and improvement in public trust with the concomitant impact on good relations.	

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).

The policy aids the better identification of inequalities in support of the development of transparent, coherent Executive/departmental /public body strategic decisions/policies and improvement in public trust. This should contribute to better supporting people with multiple identities.

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

The policy could potentially generate information on the inequalities associated with multiple identities and this may be explored over its life cycle.

Part 3. Screening decision

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

The aim of this policy is *'to improve access to and dissemination of equality data across the NICS to provide transparency to decision making for effective policy development'*. Consequently, across all NIA 1998 S.75 groups it supports equality of opportunity; better promotion of good relations; and delivers a minor positive impact overall so obviating the need for an equality impact assessment.

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.

As per the above mitigation/alternative policy is not required.

If the decision is to subject the policy to an equality impact assessment, please provide details of the reasons.

Not applicable.

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.

The policy's aim is *'to improve access to and dissemination of equality data across the NICS to provide transparency to decision making for effective policy development'*. Its impact is assessed as having a minor positive impact on better promotion of equality of opportunity and/or good relations and therefore no mitigation is felt to be necessary.

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.

Not applicable

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	
Social need	
Effect on people's daily lives	

Relevance to a public authority's functions	
---	--

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:	Position/Job Title	Date
Charlie Harte	Windsor Framework Rights	10 October 2025 and amended 27 May 2026
Approved by:		

Rosalind Dempsey	Windsor Framework Rights	29 May 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.