



# **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 <u>S75 Guide for Public Authorities April 2010</u>. 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 <u>early stage</u> when developing or reviewing a policy.

# 1.1 Name of the policy

Policy on Health and Safety at Work (Personal Safety)

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

Revised

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

The aim of this policy is to support the provision of a safe working environment for PBNI employees across a range of situations where they are in contact with service users and the public.

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

The application of this policy should benefit all employees by assisting to secure their safety at work.

# 1.5 Who initiated or wrote the policy?

H&S Dept

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

Head of HR owns policy and H&S Dept implements policy

# Implementation factors

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

# • Contribute: -

- Staff awareness of policy and procedures
- Consistency in the application of the policy
- Detract:-
- Staff not aware of policy and procedures
- Inconsistent application of the policy
- Staff failure to report health and safety issues/incidents Resources

If yes, are they

- 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

$\boxtimes$	service	users
	301 1100	u3013

- other public sector organisations
- voluntary/community/trade unions

other, please	
specify	

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

• what are they?

Policy on H&S at Work (Main)

• who owns them?

Head of HR

# 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/inf	ormation				
Religious	Service U	ser Data (Se	rvice User	s Survey 20	015)		
belief	Religion	Roman Cathol	ic		509	16	
	J J	Protestant			359		
		Other			49	%	
		None			109	6	
	Workforce	e figures (Oc	t 2016)				
	Non-Dete	er <u>P</u> ro	testant	Catho	olic	Blank	
	18		158	189	9	42	
	4%		39%	46%	6	10%	
Political opinion	this informa	-	hose who			2011/12 (la -	ast time su
	this informa	ation) <b>)pinion</b>	hose who PSRs N=2,917 (4	New N= 7%) (4	Orders 1,626 14%)	2011/12 (la - -	ast time su
	this informa	ation) Opinion	PSRs	New N=	Orders 1,626	2011/12 (la - -	ast time su
	this informative Political C Unionist Nationalist None	ation) Opinion	PSRs N=2,917 (4	New N= 7%) (4 10% 12% 60%	Orders 1,626 14%) 11% 12% 58%	2011/12 (la - -	ast time su
	this informative Political C Unionist Nationalist None Other	ation) <b>Opinion</b>	PSRs N=2,917 (4	New N= 7%) (2 10% 12% 60% 2%	Orders :1,626 <u>14%)</u> 11% 12% 58% 2%	2011/12 (la - -	ast time su
	this informative Political C Unionist Nationalist None Other Prefer Not	ation) Opinion	PSRs N=2,917 (4	New N= 7%) (4 10% 12% 60%	Orders 1,626 14%) 11% 12% 58%	2011/12 (la - -	ast time su
	this informative Political C Unionist Nationalist None Other Prefer Not	ation) <b>Opinion</b>	PSRs N=2,917 (4	New N= 7%) (2 10% 12% 60% 2%	Orders 1,626 14%) 11% 12% 58% 2% 17%	• -	ast time su
	this informative Political C Unionist Nationalist None Other Prefer Not	ation) Opinion	PSRs N=2,917 (4	New N= 7%) (2 10% 12% 60% 2%	Orders 1,626 14%) 11% 12% 58% 2% 17%	2011/12 (la - - r Not to	ast time su Blank
	this informative Political C Unionist Nationalist None Other Prefer Not	ation) Opinion To Say Data (Oct 2	PSRs N=2,917 (4 016)	New N= 7%) (4 10% 12% 60% 2% 17%	Orders :1,626 14%) 11% 12% 58% 2% 17% Prefe	• -	

Racial group	Service User I	Data (Service Users	Survey 2015)		
group	Ethnicity Wh	ite	98	3%	
	Oth	ier	2	2%	
	Workforce Da	ta (Oct 2016)		_	
	White	Mixed Race	Not-Disclosed	Blank	
	355	2	2	5	
	98%	1%	1%	1%	
Age	Service User	Data (Service Users	Survey 2015)		
	Age 18	-24 26%	6		
		-29 20%			
	30	-39 25%	/ 0		
	40	-49 16%	/ 0		
	50	+ 13%	, 0		
	Workforce Da	ta (Oct 2016)			
	18-25	26-35	36-45	45-55	56+
	2	43	115	118	86
	1%	12%	32%	32%	24%
Marital	Service User	Data on those who st	arted an order in	2011/12 (last	time surveyed fo
STATUS				, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
status	this information	ר)		_	
status		ו) PSRs	New Orders		
status	this informatior	n) PSRs N=2,958 (48%	New Orders 5) N=1,635 (45%	5)	
status	this information Marital Status Single (Never	n) PSRs N=2,958 (48% 70'	New Orders 5) N=1,635 (45% % 77	5) %	
status	this information Marital Status Single (Never Married	ו) PSRs N=2,958 (48% 70' 16'	New Orders 6) N=1,635 (45% % 77 % 12	6) % %	
status	this information Marital Status Single (Never Married Separated	n) PSRs N=2,958 (48% 70' 16' 7'	New Orders 5) N=1,635 (45% % 77 % 12 % 5	5) % %	
status	this information Marital Status Single (Never Married Separated Divorced	n) PSRs N=2,958 (48% 70' 16' 7' 6'	New Orders           b)         N=1,635 (45%)           %         77'           %         12'           %         5'           %         5'	5) % % %	
status	this information Marital Status Single (Never Married Separated	n) PSRs N=2,958 (48% 70' 16' 7' 6'	New Orders           b)         N=1,635 (45%)           %         77'           %         12'           %         5'           %         5'           %         5'	5) % %	
status	this information Marital Status Single (Never Married Separated Divorced	n) PSRs N=2,958 (48% 70' 16' 7' 6' 1'	New Orders           b)         N=1,635 (45%)           %         77'           %         12'           %         5'           %         5'           %         5'	5) % % %	
status	this information Marital Status Single (Never Married Separated Divorced Widowed	n) PSRs N=2,958 (48% 70' 16' 7' 6' 1'	New Orders           b)         N=1,635 (45%)           %         77'           %         12'           %         5'           %         5'           %         5'	5) % % %	
status	this information Marital Status Single (Never Married Separated Divorced Widowed Workforce Da	n) PSRs N=2,958 (48% 70° 16° 7° 6° 1° 1° ta (Oct 2016)	New Orders 5) N=1,635 (45% % 77' % 12' % 5' % 5' % 1'	5) % % % %	
status	this information Marital Status Single (Never Married Separated Divorced Widowed Workforce Da Single	n) PSRs N=2,958 (48% 70° 16° 7° 6° 1° ta (Oct 2016) Married	New Orders           b)         N=1,635 (45%)           %         77'           %         12'           %         5'           %         5'           %         5'           %         5'           %         1'           Widowed/SP         Vidowed/SP	5) % % % % Separated	
status	this information Marital Status Single (Never Married Separated Divorced Widowed Workforce Da Single 92	n) PSRs N=2,958 (48% 70° 16° 7° 6° 1° ta (Oct 2016) Married 210	New Orders           b)         N=1,635 (45%)           %         77'           %         12'           %         5'           %         5'           %         5'           %         5'           %         5'           %         1'           Widowed/SP         3	5) % % % % <u>%</u> Separated 8	

	3%	8%		1%		2%		
	570	070		170		Ζ70		
Sexual orientation	Service User this information	<b>Data</b> on those v n)	who sta	arted an oro	der in 2	:011/12 (la	ast time sur	veyed for
	Sexual Orient		SRs	New O				
			2,914 7%)	N=1,6				
	Heterosexual/		<u>1 %)</u> 99%	(44%	<u>/%)</u> 99%			
	Gay/ Lesbian	Ottalgitt	19		1%			
	Bisexual			*	*			
	Workforce Da	ta (Oct 2016)						
	Heterosexual	Bi-Sexual	Gay	//Lesbian	Not-E	Disclosed	Blank	
	301	1		3		9	50	
	83%	0%		1%		2%	14%	
Men and women		data (Service U		_	5)			
generally		ale	88%					
	F	emale	12%	-				
	Workforce Da	ta (Oct 2016)						
	Male	Female		Total				
	106	258		364				
	29%	71%		100%				
Disability	Service User	Data (Service L	Jsers S	Survey 2018	5)			
	Disability N	lone			52%			
		Aental Health C	onditic	n	35%			
		earning Disabili			12%			
		ong Term Illnes	-	inconcy	11%			
		Physical Impairm			8%			
		Dther			4%			
		ensory Impairm	nent		1%			
	Workforce Da	ta (Oct 2016)		1				
	Yes	No						
	11	353						
	3%	97%						

#### Dependants Service User Data on those who started an order in 2011/12 (last time surveyed for this information) Dependants New Orders PSRs N=1,658 N=2,993 (48%) (45%) None 53% 56% Child/ Children 45% 42% Person with disability 2% 2% **Elderly Person** 2% 1%

# Workforce Data (Oct 2016)

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

Section 75 category	Details of needs/experiences/priorities
Religious belief	No specific different needs, experiences or priorities have been identified related to this policy
Political opinion	No specific different needs, experiences or priorities have been identified related to this policy
Racial group	No specific different needs, experiences or priorities have been identified related to this policy
Age	No specific different needs, experiences or priorities have been identified related to this policy
Marital status	No specific different needs, experiences or priorities have been identified related to this policy
Sexual	No specific different needs, experiences or priorities have been

orientation	identified related to this policy
Men and women generally	No specific different needs, experiences or priorities have been identified related to this policy
Disability	No specific different needs, experiences or priorities have been identified related to this policy
Dependants	No specific different needs, experiences or priorities have been identified related to 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 <u>none</u> 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 <u>minor</u> 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 <u>major</u> 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	The policy is in place to protect all staff and service users and as a result should assist in the promotion of opportunity.	None	
Political opinion	As above	None	
Racial group	As above	None	
Age	As above	None	
Marital status	As above	None	
Sexual orientation	As above	None	
Men and women generally	As above	None	
Disability	As above	None	
Dependants	As above	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		The policy is designed to protect staff and service users as well as the organisation and as a result should assist in the promotion of opportunity.		
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		

# 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</b>   <b>Major   None</b>		
Religious belief	The policy is designed to protect staff and service users as well as the organisation and as a result should assist in the promotion of opportunity.	None		
Political opinion	As above	None		
Racial group	As above	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		The policy is designed to protect staff and service users as well as the organisation and as a result should assist in the promotion of opportunity.		
Political opinion		As above		
Racial group		As 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).

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

None

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

Yes	
100	

No 🖂	
------	--

If answered yes detail how this will be achieved: -

# 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 specific equality issues throughout this screening process.

**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.

N/a

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

N/a

### 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.

N/a

Date Screening Completed:	22 <sup>nd</sup> January	/ 2019
<b>Department Completing this</b>	Screening:	Human Resources &
		Health & Safety Dept.