



# Section 75 Screening Form

## **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**

Historic Environment Fund 2021-22

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

~~Existing~~/Revised/~~New~~

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

The proposed Historic Environment Fund 2021-22 has been developed by Historic Environment Division (HED) whose aim is 'to help communities to enjoy and realise the value of the historic environment'. Through heritage protection, this ties into the Department's overall 'purpose' to 'support people, build communities, and shape places.'

Stimulating and encouraging work by third parties is key to realising this aim and the Historic Environment Fund (HEF) was set up for this purpose in 2016. Each subsequent year it has been divided into four streams; this year because of constrained budgets, funding will be limited to the Repair Stream (Encouraging sustainability and the preservation of the historic environment) and the Revival Stream (Promoting the social value of our historic environment and the innate contribution this can make to wellbeing and sustainable employment.).

A total of £450,000 will be allocated to the fund, £300,000 of which will be allocated to an open call Roof Repair Stream, with small sums of £5,000 and £10,000 per successful application dependent on roof type (non-thatch or thatch).

---

**Are there any Section 75 categories which might be expected to benefit from the intended policy?**

Yes No\* (see comment)

**If Yes, explain how.**

\*The funding initiative seeks to generate 3rd party action to conserve heritage; the funding is within a single year cycle and is to be spent by financial year end March 2022.

While socio-economic disadvantage is not a specified ground under Section 75, the barriers and inequalities experienced by equality groups can be exacerbated by poverty and social exclusion.

Those applicants on income and guaranteed pension support are prioritised within scoring of applications to redress financial imbalances encountered in maintaining listed buildings for those groups.

---

**Who initiated or wrote the policy?**

Historic Environment Division, within Department of Communities

---

**Who owns and who implements the policy?**

### 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 time pressures for delivery of schemes

### Main stakeholders affected

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

- X staff
- X service users
- X other public sector organisations
- X voluntary/community/trade unions
- X other, please specify **Owners of listed Buildings or those employed to work on them**

### Other policies with a bearing on this policy

**What are they and who owns them?**

N/A

---



## 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.

<b>Section 75 Category</b>	<b>Details of Evidence/Information</b>
<b>All</b>	<p>The 2020 HEF review recorded that heritage is undervalued by the private market which is unable to directly recover sufficient value to outweigh the costs of maintaining, repairing or restoring their assets to their full architectural/ archaeological merit. The gap between these costs and the market value of its asset in its repaired condition is known as the <b>conservation</b> or <b>heritage deficit</b>. To reduce costs of the conservation deficit in Northern Ireland, during a period where there are limited funds available from government, the 2021 HEF seeks to nurture a strong culture of regular maintenance of heritage assets.</p> <p>Over previous 4 years of HEF, of 74 successful and supported applications, 9 (12%) fell into priority categories in receipt of income or pension support.</p> <p>Section 75 data/evidence is not routinely collected as the initiative is technical in nature.</p> <p>As part of the statutory procedure, this screening form will be included in the Department's quarterly consultation exercise with section 75 consultees. Any issues identified at this stage relating to S75 groups will be fully considered</p>

**Note to reader** - If you are aware of and would like the Department to take into account any further evidence or information relevant to this policy, please send this to **historicenvironmentfund@communities-ni.gov.uk**

## **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

<b>Section 75 Category</b>	<b>Details of Needs/Experiences/Priorities</b>
<b>All</b>	The Department considers this initiative to be of a technical nature and therefore deems there to be no needs, experiences or priorities for any of the Section 75 groups in relation to this funding initiative. The 'conservation deficit' described above will affect all categories within the wider community.

## **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

<b>1 What is the likely impact on equality of opportunity for those affected by this policy, for each of the Section 75 grounds? Minor/Major/None</b>		
<b>Section 75 Category</b>	<b>Details of Policy Impact</b>	<b>Level of Impact? Minor/Major/None</b>
<b>Religious belief</b>	<b>This programme is technical in nature, and is not expected to have any adverse impact on this section 75 category.</b>	None
<b>Political opinion</b>	<b>This programme is technical in nature, and is not expected to have any adverse impact on this section 75 category</b>	None
<b>Racial group</b>	<b>This programme is technical in nature, and is not expected to have any adverse impact on this section 75 category</b>	None
<b>Age</b>	<b>This programme is technical in nature, and is not expected to have any adverse impact on this section 75 category.</b>	None
<b>Marital status</b>	<b>This programme is technical in nature, and is not expected to have any adverse impact on this section 75 category</b>	None
<b>Sexual orientation</b>	<b>This programme is technical in nature, and is not expected to have any adverse impact on this section 75 category</b>	None
<b>Men and women generally</b>	<b>This programme is technical in nature, and is not expected to have any adverse impact on this section 75 category</b>	None
<b>Disability</b>	<b>This programme is technical in nature, and is not expected to have any adverse impact on this section 75 category</b>	None
<b>Dependants</b>	<b>This programme is technical in nature, and is not expected to have any adverse impact on this section 75 category</b>	None

**2. Are there opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity for people within any of the Section 75 categories?**

<b>Section 75 Category</b>	<b>If Yes, provide details</b>	<b>If No, provide reasons</b>
<b>Religious belief</b>	No opportunities identified	N/A
<b>Political opinion</b>	No opportunities identified	N/A
<b>Racial group</b>	No opportunities identified	N/A
<b>Age</b>	Positive impact through prioritising funding for those on pension credit which will be implemented.	N/A
<b>Marital status</b>	No opportunities identified	N/A
<b>Sexual orientation</b>	No opportunities identified	N/A
<b>Men and women generally</b>	No opportunities identified	N/A
<b>Disability</b>	No opportunities identified	N/A
<b>Dependants</b>	No opportunities identified	N/A

**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**

<b>Good Relations Category</b>	<b>Details of policy impact</b>	<b>Level of impact Minor/Major/None</b>
<b>Religious belief</b>	No impact identified	None
<b>Political opinion</b>	No impact identified	None
<b>Racial group</b>	No impact identified	None

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

<b>Good relations category</b>	<b>If Yes, provide details</b>	<b>If No, provide reasons</b>
<b>Religious belief</b>	No opportunities identified	N/A
<b>Political opinion</b>	No opportunities identified	N/A
<b>Racial group</b>	No opportunities identified	N/A

## **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**

In light of your answers to the previous questions, do you feel that the policy should: (please underline one)

1. **Not be subject to an EQIA**
2. **Not be subject to an EQIA (with mitigating measures /alternative policies)**
3. **Be subject to an EQIA**

**If 1 or 2 (i.e. not be subject to an EQIA), please provide details of the reasons why:**

This programme is technical in nature and it is not expected to have any impact on Equality of Opportunity or Good Relations for any of the Section 75 groups, therefore an EQIA is not required.

**If 3. (i.e. to conduct an EQIA), please provide details of the reasons:**

**N/A**

## **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**

---

## **Part 4: Monitoring**

Effective monitoring will help identify any future adverse impacts arising from the policy which may lead you to conduct an EQIA, as well as help with future planning and policy development.

You 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, then you should monitor more broadly than for adverse impact (See Benefits, P.9-10, paras 2.13 – 2.20 of the Monitoring Guidance).

Please detail proposed monitoring arrangements below:

This policy is technical in nature and will be kept under review by the Department.

## **Part 5: Approval and Authorisation**

<b>Screened by:</b>	<b>Position/Job Title</b>	<b>Date</b>
Jacqui Stokes	SPTO	14/5/21
<b>Approved by:</b>	PPTO	14/5/21
Manus Deery		

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 your website as soon as possible following completion and made available on request.