

Section 75 Policy Screening Form

Part 1: Policy Scoping

The first stage of the screening process involves scoping the policy or policy area. 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.

You 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 or policy area:

Accelerator Programme

Is this an existing, revised or a new policy/policy area?

Existing	Revised	New
x		

Brief Description

The over-arching purpose of the Accelerator programme is to:

Support technology based, high growth potential start-ups (HPSUs) to access early stage venture capital/angel investment and establish in Northern Ireland

What is it trying to achieve? (intended aims and outcomes)

By supporting a small number of highly specialised, scalable teams, the Accelerator will help to rebalance the Northern Ireland economy, providing a strong pool of HPSUs which have the potential to grow into global businesses.

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

YES	NO	N/A
x		

If YES, explain how.

Accelerator is open to all new start up businesses who meet the relevant criteria .

Who initiated or wrote the policy?

Invest NI

Who owns and who implements each element of the policy?

Invest NI owns the programme, an appointed delivery organisation will implement/deliver the programme on behalf of Invest NI.

Implementation factors

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

YES	NO	N/A
x		

If YES, are they

Financial: YES (If YES, please detail)

Legislative: Y / N (If YES, please detail)

Other, please specify:

Willingness of NI companies to engage and time constraints.

Main stakeholders affected

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

Staff:

Staff of Skills & Strategy who will manage the programme.
Invest NI CEs who will be allocated to programme participants.
Invest NI Communications Team and Heads of other appropriate teams/divisions who will be involved in the promotion of the programme.

Service users:

Entrepreneurs who will participate on the programme.

Other public sector organisations:

Voluntary/community/trade unions:

Other, please specify:

The delivery organisation who will be appointed through a competitive tending procedure.

Other policies with a bearing on this policy

What are they and who owns them?

Policies and programmes emerging from the Invest NI Board Working Group on High Performance Start Ups. These will be owned by Invest NI.

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 relevant Section 75 categories.

Section 75 Category	Details of Evidence/Information
	An Economic Appraisal was undertaken, starting in December 2012, by Cogent, however no particular concerns were raised in relation to equality groups.

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
ALL	None identified, however we will continue to monitor the uptake of the programme in order to identify any emerging inequalities.

Part 2: Screening Questions

Introduction

1. If the conclusion is **none** in respect of all of the Section 75 categories, then you may decide to screen the policy **out**. If a policy is 'screened out', you should give details of the reasons for the decision taken.
2. If the conclusion is **major** in respect of one or more of the Section 75 categories, then consideration should be given to subjecting the policy to an EQIA.
3. If the conclusion is **minor** in respect of one or more of the Section 75 categories, then consideration should still be given to proceeding with an EQIA, or to measures to mitigate the adverse impact; or an alternative policy.

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 hence it would be appropriate to conduct an EQIA;
- 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 among 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 earlier evidence, consider and comment on the likely impact on equality of opportunity / good relations for those affected by this policy, by applying the following screening questions and the 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 grounds? Minor/Major/None		
Section 75 Category	Details of Policy Impact	Level of Impact? Minor/Major/None
Religious belief	No specific needs identified in relation to this programme	
Political opinion	No specific needs identified in relation to this programme	
Racial / ethnic group	Potentially require programme information in alternative formats	
Age	No specific needs identified in relation to this programme	
Marital status	No specific needs identified in relation to this programme	
Sexual orientation	No specific needs identified in relation to this programme	
Men and women generally	No specific needs identified in relation to this programme	
Disability	Potentially require programme information in alternative formats and or reasonable adjustments made which will be made available	
Dependants	No specific needs identified in relation to this programme	

2 Are there opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity for people within any of the Section 75 categories?		
Section 75 Category	If Yes, provide details	If No, provide reasons
All		As this programme is available to all start up companies meeting the relevant criteria, no opportunity exists to better promote any particular group.

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		none
Political opinion		none
Racial group		none

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
		No, while the programme is promoted throughout Northern Ireland through a wide range of mediums that reach people of different religious beliefs, political opinions and racial groupings, there is no specific action to better promote 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).

none

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

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 (with no mitigating measures required)
2. Not be subject to an EQIA (with mitigating measures /alternative policies)
3. Not be subject to an EQIA at this time
4. Be subject to an EQIA

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

No envisaged detrimental impact on any S75 category.

If 2. (i.e. not be subject to an EQIA), in what ways can identified adverse impacts attaching to the policy be mitigated or an alternative policy be introduced?

In light of these revisions, is there a need to re-screen the revised/alternative policy at a future date? YES / NO

If YES, when & why?

If 3. or 4. (i.e. to conduct an EQIA), please provide details of the reasons:

Timetabling and Prioritising EQIA

If 3. or 4., is the policy affected by timetables established by other relevant public authorities? YES / NO

If YES, please provide details:

Please answer the following questions to determine priority for timetabling the EQIA. 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 EQIA.

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 EQIA. This list of priorities will assist you in timetabling the EQIA. Details of your EQIA timetable should be included in the quarterly Section 75 report.

Proposed date for commencing EQIA: _____

Any further comments on the screening process and any subsequent actions?

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:

Invest NI and the appointed Delivery Organisation will have responsibility for on-going monitoring of the programme in terms of programme inputs, activities, outputs and outcomes.

In addition, an interim evaluation will be scheduled with further interim evaluations and a final evaluation scheduled for subsequent years through the duration of the programme.

Part 5: Approval and Authorisation

Screened by:	Position/Job Title	Date
<i>Karawaddy</i>		
KARAN DONNELLY	SO	17/6/14
Approved by:		
<i>Niall Casey</i>		
NIALL CASEY	DIRECTOR	17/6/14

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.

