

## PBNI Equality Impact Screening

### Part 1 Policy Scoping

#### Information about the policy

This form should be read in conjunction with the Equality Commission's revised Section 75, "A Guide for Public Authorities" April 2010 and available via the following link [S75 Guide for Public Authorities April 2010](#). Staff should complete a form for each new or revised policy for which they are responsible (see page 6 for a definition of policy in respect of section 75).

The purpose of screening is to identify those policies that are likely to have an impact on equality of opportunity and/or good relations and so determine whether an Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA) is necessary. Screening should be introduced at an early stage when developing or reviewing a policy.

#### 1.1 Name of the policy

*Financial Assistance to Offenders Policy*

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

Revised

#### 1.3 What is it trying to achieve? (Intended aims/outcomes)

Payments may be made to offenders for assistance for offenders to travel to supervision or programmes as required by PBNI under the terms of their order/licence.

#### 1.4 Are there any Section 75 categories which might be expected to benefit from the intended policy? If so, explain how.

The policy applies equally to all groups of service user's, however disabled offenders with mobility difficulties will be able to access assistance.

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

Head of Finance

#### 1.6 Which Dept. owns and who implements the policy?

Finance department owns implemented by Assistant Directors

#### Implementation factors

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

Yes –Budget constraints if over used

If yes, are they

financial

legislative

other, please specify

**Main stakeholders affected**

**1.8** 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

**1.9** Other policies with a bearing on this policy

- what are they?

PBNI Counter Fraud Policy  
PBNI Fraud Response Plan

- who owns them?

Finance Department

**Available evidence**

**1.10** 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																																				
<b>Religious belief</b>	<p><b>Service User Data</b> (Service Users Survey 2015)</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Religion</td> <td>Roman Catholic</td> <td>50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Protestant</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Other</td> <td>4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>None</td> <td>10%</td> </tr> </table> <p><b>Workforce figures (Oct 2016)</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Non-Deter</th> <th>Protestant</th> <th>Catholic</th> <th>Blank</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>18</td> <td>158</td> <td>189</td> <td>42</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4%</td> <td>39%</td> <td>46%</td> <td>10%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Religion	Roman Catholic	50%		Protestant	35%		Other	4%		None	10%	Non-Deter	Protestant	Catholic	Blank	18	158	189	42	4%	39%	46%	10%												
Religion	Roman Catholic	50%																																			
	Protestant	35%																																			
	Other	4%																																			
	None	10%																																			
Non-Deter	Protestant	Catholic	Blank																																		
18	158	189	42																																		
4%	39%	46%	10%																																		
<b>Political opinion</b>	<p><b>Service User Data</b> on those who started an order in 2011/12 (last time surveyed for this information)</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Political Opinion</th> <th>PSRs N=2,917 (47%)</th> <th>New Orders N=1,626 (44%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Unionist</td> <td>10%</td> <td>11%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Nationalist</td> <td>12%</td> <td>12%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>None</td> <td>60%</td> <td>58%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other</td> <td>2%</td> <td>2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Prefer Not To Say</td> <td>17%</td> <td>17%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Workforce Data (Oct 2016)</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Unionist</th> <th>Nationalist</th> <th>Other</th> <th>None</th> <th>Prefer Not to Say</th> <th>Blank</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>7</td> <td>7</td> <td>35</td> <td>2</td> <td>307</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2%</td> <td>2%</td> <td>2%</td> <td>10%</td> <td>1%</td> <td>84%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Political Opinion	PSRs N=2,917 (47%)	New Orders N=1,626 (44%)	Unionist	10%	11%	Nationalist	12%	12%	None	60%	58%	Other	2%	2%	Prefer Not To Say	17%	17%	Unionist	Nationalist	Other	None	Prefer Not to Say	Blank	6	7	7	35	2	307	2%	2%	2%	10%	1%	84%
Political Opinion	PSRs N=2,917 (47%)	New Orders N=1,626 (44%)																																			
Unionist	10%	11%																																			
Nationalist	12%	12%																																			
None	60%	58%																																			
Other	2%	2%																																			
Prefer Not To Say	17%	17%																																			
Unionist	Nationalist	Other	None	Prefer Not to Say	Blank																																
6	7	7	35	2	307																																
2%	2%	2%	10%	1%	84%																																
<b>Racial group</b>	<p><b>Service User Data</b> (Service Users Survey 2015)</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Ethnicity</th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>White</td> <td>98%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other</td> <td>2%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Workforce Data (Oct 2016)</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>White</th> <th>Mixed Race</th> <th>Not-Disclosed</th> <th>Blank</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Ethnicity		White	98%	Other	2%	White	Mixed Race	Not-Disclosed	Blank																										
Ethnicity																																					
White	98%																																				
Other	2%																																				
White	Mixed Race	Not-Disclosed	Blank																																		

	355	2	2	5	
	98%	1%	1%	1%	
<b>Age</b>	<b>Service User Data</b> (Service Users Survey 2015)				
	Age	18-24	26%		
		25-29	20%		
		30-39	25%		
	40-49	16%			
	50+	13%			
	<b>Workforce Data (Oct 2016)</b>				
	18-25	26-35	36-45	45-55	56+
	2	43	115	118	86
	1%	12%	32%	32%	24%
<b>Marital status</b>	<b>Service User Data</b> on those who started an order in 2011/12 (last time surveyed for this information)				
	<b>Marital Status</b>	PSRs N=2,958 (48%)	New Orders N=1,635 (45%)		
	Single (Never Married)	70%	77%		
	Married	16%	12%		
	Separated	7%	5%		
	Divorced	6%	5%		
	Widowed	1%	1%		
	<b>Workforce Data (Oct 2016)</b>				
	Single	Married	Widowed/SP	Separated	
	92	210	3	8	
25%	58%	1%	2%		
Divorced	Cohabit	Not-Disclosed	Blank		
10	30	4	7		
3%	8%	1%	2%		
<b>Sexual orientation</b>	<b>Service User Data</b> on those who started an order in 2011/12 (last time surveyed for this information)				
	<b>Sexual Orientation</b>	PSRs N=2,914 (47%)	New Orders N=1,615 (44%)		
	Heterosexual/ Straight	99%	99%		
	Gay/ Lesbian	1%	1%		
	Bisexual	*	*		
	<b>Workforce Data (Oct 2016)</b>				
	Heterosexual	Bi-Sexual	Gay/Lesbian	Not-Disclosed	Blank

	301	1	3	9	50
	83%	0%	1%	2%	14%
<b>Men and women generally</b>	<b>Service user data</b> (Service Users Survey 2015)				
	Gender Male		88%		
	Female		12%		
<b>Disability</b>	<b>Service User Data</b> (Service Users Survey 2015)				
	Disability	None	52%		
		Mental Health Condition	35%		
		Learning Disability / Difficulty	12%		
		Long Term Illness	11%		
		Physical Impairment	8%		
		Other	4%		
		Sensory Impairment	1%		
<b>Dependants</b>	<b>Service User Data</b> on those who started an order in 2011/12 (last time surveyed for this information)				
	<b>Dependants</b>		PSRs N=2,993 (48%)	New Orders N=1,658 (45%)	
	None		53%	56%	
Child/ Children		45%	42%		
Person with disability		2%	2%		
Elderly Person		2%	1%		
<b>Workforce Data (Oct 2016)</b>	<b>Workforce Data (Oct 2016)</b>				
	Yes	No			
	11	353			
	3%	97%			
<b>Workforce Data (Oct 2016)</b>	<b>Workforce Data (Oct 2016)</b>				
	A Child	Person with Disability	Elderly Person	Not-Disclosed	Blank
	144	7	6	8	199
	40%	2%	2%	2%	55%

**Needs, experiences and priorities**

**1.11** 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

<b>Section 75 category</b>	<b>Details of needs/experiences/priorities</b>
<b>Religious belief</b>	This group has no specific identified need in relation to the application of this policy
<b>Political opinion</b>	This group has no specific identified need in relation to the application of this policy
<b>Racial group</b>	This group has no specific identified need in relation to the application of this policy
<b>Age</b>	This group has no specific identified need in relation to the application of this policy
<b>Marital status</b>	This group has no specific identified need in relation to the application of this policy
<b>Sexual orientation</b>	This group has no specific identified need in relation to the application of this policy
<b>Men and women generally</b>	This group has no specific identified need in relation to the application of this policy
<b>Disability</b>	Disabled offenders will be considered in relation to their specific needs in relation to the application of this policy
<b>Dependants</b>	This group has no specific identified need in relation to the application of this policy

## Part 2 Equality Screening Questions

### SCREENING QUESTIONS

- 2.1** In making a decision as to whether or not there is a need to carry out an equality impact assessment, consider questions 2.5 -2.8 listed below.
- 2.2** If the conclusion is **none** in respect of all of the Section 75 equality of opportunity and/or good relations categories, then the decision may to screen the policy out. If a policy is 'screened out' as having no relevance to equality of opportunity or good relations, give details of the reasons for the decision taken.
- 2.3** If the 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:
- i.measures to mitigate the adverse impact; or
  - ii.the introduction of an alternative policy to better promote equality of opportunity and/or good relations.
- 2.4** If the 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.

## 2.5 Equality Impact

What is the likely impact on equality of opportunity for those affected by this policy, for each of the Section 75 equality categories? <b>Minor   Major   None</b>		
Section 75 category	Details of policy impact	Level of impact? <b>Minor   Major   None</b>
Religious belief	No identified policy impact.	None
Political opinion	No identified policy impact.	None
Racial group	No identified policy impact.	None
Age	No identified policy impact.	None
Marital status	No identified policy impact.	None
Sexual orientation	No identified policy impact.	None
Men and women generally	No identified policy impact.	None
Disability	This policy is designed to have a positive policy impact on disabled people who need financial assistance to overcome a barrier associated with their disability in relation to travel arrangements	None
Dependants	No identified policy impact.	None



## 2.6 Promotion of Equality

Are there opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity for people within the Section 75 equalities categories?		
Section 75 category	If <b>Yes</b> , provide details	If <b>No</b> , provide reasons
Religious belief		This is a policy applies regardless of equality group with the exception of disabled offenders
Political opinion		See above
Racial group		See above
Age		See above
Marital status		See above
Sexual orientation		See above
Men and women generally		See above
Disability		Disability is already factored into the decision making process of this policy
Dependants		See above

## 2.7 Good Relation Impact

To what extent is the policy likely to impact on good relations between people of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group? <b>Minor   Major   None</b>		
Good relations category	Details of policy impact	Level of impact <b>Minor   Major   None</b>
Religious belief		This policy covers payment of expenses and is not thought likely to have any impact of bettering community relations
Political opinion		None
Racial group		None

## 2.8 Promotion of Good Relations

4 Are there opportunities to better promote good relations between people of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group?		
Good relations category	If <b>Yes</b> , provide details	If <b>No</b> , provide reasons
Religious belief		This policy covers payment of expenses and is not thought likely to have any impact of bettering community relations
Political opinion		See above
Racial group		See above

## Additional considerations

### Multiple identities

**2.9** 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 women; young Protestant men; and young lesbians, gay and bisexual people).*

The majority of PBNI's clients are young men and therefore more likely to avail of the provision of this policy.

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

The majority of PBNI's clients are young and therefore more likely to avail of the provision of this policy.

**2.11** Is there an opportunity through this policy for PBNI to promote positive attitudes towards disabled people or encourage the participation of disabled people in public life?

Yes

No

If answered yes detail how this will be achieved: -

PBNI promotes positive attitudes towards disabled people through the removal of the financial and physical barriers that may prevent full engagement in the supervision of offenders.

### Part 3 Screening decision

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

PBNI has not identified any significant equality concerns in relation to the implementation of this policy. Sufficient mitigation has been factored into the policy to ensure that equality of opportunity is promoted.

**3.2** If the decision is not to conduct an equality impact assessment consider if the policy should be mitigated or an alternative policy be introduced.

Not Applicable

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

Not Applicable

#### Mitigation

**3.4** When the likely impact is 'minor' an equality impact assessment is not to be conducted, mitigation may 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 and if so, give the **reasons** to support your decision, together with the proposed changes/amendments or alternative policy.

Not Applicable

**Date Screening Completed: 15/11/2017**

**Department Completing this Screening: Staff Officer Finance**