



Screening Template for

Microsoft Windows Client Security Policy Policy

Date: *15 January 2024*

LNI Policy Screening Template

Part 1. Policy Scoping

Information about the policy

Name of the policy Microsoft Windows Client Security Policy
Is this an existing, revised or a new policy? Revised
What is it trying to achieve? (intended aims/outcomes) To provide the minimum-security standard applicable to Microsoft Windows based PCs, supplied by Libraries NI and operating within Library sites across Northern Ireland. It is suggested that the statements and recommendations laid down in this standard are similarly applied to both the corporate and public devices, for which on-going responsibility lies with Libraries NI.
Are there any Section 75 categories which might be expected to benefit from the intended policy? If so, explain how. It benefits users by providing a more secure network.
Who initiated or wrote the policy? Libraries NI IT Security Manager
Who owns and who implements the policy? Head of ICU/ICT

Implementation Factors

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

No factors identified

☐

Financial

☒

Legislative

☐

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_Board Members, Departments etc

Other policies with a bearing on this policy

- **What are they? – the suite of IT Security Policies**
- **Who owns them? – Head of ICU/ICT**

Available evidence

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
Religious belief	30% of Catholics, 26% of Protestants and 36% of others (Equality data from CHS 2013/14) YPB&AS 2013 – 58% Catholic and 57% Protestant Equality data from HR 43% Catholic and 51% Protestant
Political opinion	No data available
Racial group	No data available
Age	Usage of the public library service decreased with age, with those aged 12 years and under almost twice as likely to have used the public library service than those aged 16 years and over (78% and 40% respectively) (source EQIA OHR 2015). Lowest use in ages 55-64 years.
Marital status	More single people (32%) than those married (28%) or widowed (20%) or separated/divorced (31%) (CHS 2013/14)
Sexual orientation	No data available
Men women generally	More females (35%) than males (23%) are service users (CHS 2013/14) YPB&AS 2013 52% boys and 62% girls The workforce is predominantly female – approximately 80%
Disability	Fewer people with a disability are service users (CHS 2013/14) except amongst younger users where 56% have disability and 58% do not have a disability (YPB&AS 2013)
Dependants	Fewer people who do not have dependents are service users (CHS 2013/14)

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 for each of the section 75 categories.

Section 75 category	Details of needs/experiences/priorities
Religious belief	None
Political opinion	None
Racial group	Greater use of service by newcomers will benefit from better security
Age	Older and younger people are less aware of security issues and therefore will benefit from better security
Marital status	None
Sexual orientation	None
Men women generally	None
Disability	None
Dependants	None

Part 2. Screening questions

1 What is the likely impact on equality of opportunity for those affected by this policy, for each of the Section 75 equality categories?		
Section 75 category	Details of policy impact	Level of impact? Minor/major/none
Religious belief		None
Political opinion		None
Racial group		None
Age		None
Marital status		None
Sexual orientation		None
Men women generally		None
Disability		None
Dependants		None

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

Section 75 category	If yes, provide details	If no, provide reasons
Religious belief		Internal technical policy
Political opinion		Internal technical policy
Racial group		Internal technical policy
Age		Internal technical policy
Marital status		Internal technical policy
Sexual orientation		Internal technical policy
Men women generally		Internal technical policy
Disability		Internal technical policy
Dependants		Internal technical policy

**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**

Section 75 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?

Section 75 category	If yes, provide details	If no, provide reasons
Religious belief		Internal technical policy
Political opinion		Internal technical policy
Racial group		Internal technical policy

Additional considerations

Multiple identity

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

Currently no data on people with multiple identities.

Part 3. Screening decision

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

The decision is not to conduct an equality impact assessment as this is an internal technical policy

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

If the decision is to subject the policy to an equality impact assessment. Please provide details of the reason.

Not applicable

Mitigation

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.

Not applicable

Timetabling and prioritising

If the policy has been 'screened in' for equality impact assessment, then please answer the following questions to determine its priority for timetabling the equality impact assessment.

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 equality impact assessment.

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 screening in for equality impact assessment. This list of priorities will assist in timetabling. Details of the Equality Impact Assessment Timetable should be included in the quarterly Screening Report.



Is the policy affected by timetables established by other relevant public authorities?

If yes, please provide details:

Part 4. Monitoring

The policy will be monitored for impact and effectiveness through the analysis of feedback from stakeholders and will be reviewed periodically to ensure compliance with legislative changes.

Part 5. Approval and authorisation

Screened by:	Position/Job Title:	Date:
	Head of ICU/ICT	15/01/2024
Approved by:		
	Director of Business Support	15/01/2024

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