

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:

Social Entrepreneurship Programme (SEP)

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

Existing	Revised	New
	X	

Brief Description

The revised Social Entrepreneurship Programme (SEP) seeks to develop and support social enterprises throughout Northern Ireland, therefore leading to increased economic growth in the region. This is closely aligned with the Northern Ireland Executive Economic Strategy which highlights that “the main driver of economic growth in Northern Ireland will be the private sector. It is local companies, including social economy businesses, through innovation and workforce development, who will exploit export opportunities by seeking to continuously improve the quality and standard of the goods and services they provide.

The proposed programme aligns with UK policy documents. In particular, the UK Coalition’s programme for government identifies social action as a key priority moving forward - specifically identifying social enterprises as a support priority. The SEP makes a direct contribution to this priority as it will develop and support social enterprises.

It is intended via the Review of Public Administration that social economy activity, will be part of the package of regional/local economic development powers that will transfer from central to local government in 2015. Accordingly this phase of the SEP will be an interim one until that time.

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

The recent social economy sector evaluation carried out by Invest NI, highlighted that NI has lost ground in terms of innovation within policy/ strategy development for the sector. Indeed some of the long established SEE’s in the sector in NI interviewed for this evaluation felt that NI was ahead ten years ago, but that the policy environment elsewhere in GB was now much more enabling and advanced relative to NI - in terms of public procurement, outcome based commissioning with weighting for social impacts, community asset transfer and civil society delivering public services. It was viewed that developments such as the ‘Community Right to Bid’ aspect of the Localism Bill, which is a cornerstone¹ of the ‘Big Society’ strategy and the Public Services (Social Enterprise and Social Value) Bill recently developed in England and Wales would further reinforce progress.

It is important therefore that NI regains ground as an innovating region in relation to SE policy and the SEP, as an established and successful programme intervention will play a key role in this regard, linking in with other activity such as the Jobs Fund and the SIF to actively tackle systemic and inter-generational disadvantage in deprived areas of NI. Accordingly the SEP will contribute to developing the regional credibility and visibility of NI as an enterprising and innovating region, with respect to the social economy.

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.

The programme will target groups owned or controlled by the local community and which service a disadvantaged group or area as well as any specific social enterprise which meet our criteria. This might be expected to benefit people with disabilities as well as other groups living within areas of disadvantage, including cross community groups. Funding is available to all eligible groups who meet our criteria. The funding is available across Northern Ireland and is therefore not limited to particular geographical areas.

Who initiated or wrote the policy?

Invest NI Regional Business Group

Who owns and who implements each element of the policy?

Invest NI Regional Business Programme Team

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:

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:

Other policies with a bearing on this policy

What are they and who owns them?

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
All	An evaluation report and economic appraisal was carried out in 2012, which has informed this revised programme. As a result there is now greater focus on business start ups rather than more established Social Enterprise companies.

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	No specific needs identified, other than reasonable adjustment for groups who require them, such as information available in alternative formats.

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
ALL	The creation of more social enterprises creates employment which provides an economic and social benefit to both the local community and wider N Ireland economy. Some of these groups act on a cross community basis and across a number of Section 75 categories and may provide improved equality of opportunity as a result. For example, some of the groups availing of support will be focused on providing employment to people with disabilities and others provide child care to the local community, thus benefiting those with dependants.	Minor

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
	Yes, as above	

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
ALL	As some social enterprises work on a cross community basis, it is reasonable to expect there to be a potentially beneficial impact on good relations, particularly within areas of disadvantage.	

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
ALL	As above	

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).

No applicable in terms of impact.

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 requirement at this point.

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:

An end of programme evaluation will be carried out.

Part 5: Approval and Authorisation

Screened by:	Position/Job Title	Date
Pamela Marron	Equality Manager	27/09/12
<i>Pamela Marron</i>		
Approved by:		
Frankie McCourt		
<i>F. McCourt</i>	<i>SEI PROGRAMMER MANAGER</i>	27/09/12

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.