

**Consultation Responses Q3 (by date received)**

This table presents responses mapped to Questions 3 of the Commission’s consultation. Where submissions were not structured by consultation question, we have allocated comments to this question based on the relevance of the information provided.

	<b>Organisation/ Individual</b>	<b>Question 3</b>  <i>In relation to the implications of the FWS judgment, on what issues would you particularly wish to see final guidance from the Commission?</i>
#1	Individual	<p>Affirm that trans women with a GRC and full surgical transition are women under the law, and should be treated as such by default.</p> <p>Require that any exception to this principle must be lawful, proportionate, and evidence- based, not ideological or speculative.</p> <p>Offer employers and service providers clear language and examples to avoid indirect discrimination and to support inclusive practices.</p>
#2	Individual	<p>(The FWS Decision has NO direct implications for NI law. It is specifically intended to ONLY deal with interpretation of the EA, as per para 2 of the Decision. (see above).</p> <p>Guidance from the ECNI should address ONLY NI law and the obligations upon NI arising from NI law, WF, applicable CJEU Jurisprudence and our reading of our laws to give effect to Convention Rights, per s3 HRA. Accordingly:- I would hope to see that the ECNI does NOT attempt any definition of ANY terms touching upon human “biology” without proper medical expert input and consultation. I would hope to see proper understanding of the biological and legal realities of Intersex people.</p> <p>I would hope to see evidence of proper consultation with representatives of the Intersex and trans communities BEFORE and Guidance is issued.</p>
#3	Individual	That “sex” in NI equality law means biological sex, unaffected by a GRC, as confirmed by FWS.

		<p>That sexual orientation in the SODR 2006 is tied to biological sex, ensuring lesbians are protected in defining their relationships and associations accordingly.</p> <p>That gender reassignment is a distinct protected ground and cannot be conflated with sex.</p> <p>That lawful single-sex provisions, including those designed to protect privacy, dignity, and safety, remain fully lawful for women and lesbians.</p> <p>That EU-derived occupational health and safety provisions that explicitly rely on biological sex continue to apply in NI under the Windsor Framework.</p>
#4	Individual	<p>Final guidance should confirm that “sex” means biological sex. It should provide clear application in high-risk settings such as prisons, refuges, schools, hospitals, and changing rooms, while also confirming that trans people continue to have protection from discrimination directly and indirectly. Worked proportionality tests and case studies would give service providers confidence in applying the law. Employers would also benefit from model policies addressing occupational requirements, workplace facilities, and harassment.</p>
#5	Lewis Silkin Solicitors	<p>There are a number of areas which will be necessary in the final guidance, following the outcome of this process, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whether we will continue to follow CJEU Jurisprudence and a clear summary of where we are with this.</li> <li>• Distilled findings from the High Court on definition of “Man” and “Woman” and</li> <li>• whether this will include trans persons generally or whether this will include only those with a gender recognition certificate.</li> <li>• Guidance on the rights of a trans person not having gone through or intending to go through medical supervision.</li> <li>• Guidance on a trans person’s (or someone of any other gender identity) continued use of facilities of their identified-gender.</li> <li>• What exactly is meant by “universal facilities”.</li> <li>• Implications on policy and procedure following the information from the High Court.</li> <li>• Clear examples on direct &amp; indirect discrimination and harassment following the findings of the High Court.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whether there are defences for employers in applying any such policies.</li> <li>• Guidance on the promotion of a harmonious working environment including objective justifications.</li> </ul>
#6	Individual	N/R
#7	LGSC	N/R
#8	Fermanagh Omagh DC	<p>Interim and Final Guidance</p> <p>Fermanagh and Omagh District Council is concerned with the lack of clarity provided by the Equality Commission to date in relation to this matter and have made no changes to Council policies or access arrangements to Council facilities, such as leisure centres and public conveniences.</p> <p>The Council has resolved to await full detailed guidance from the Equality Commission and following this relevant Council policies will be reviewed in the context of the guidance and any associated recommendations will be reported to the Council for consideration. The Council suggests that guidance needs to be developed with a people first, rights-based approach, thoroughly considered and consulted upon and notes that it is important that the guidance will be sufficiently detailed to assist various organisations in programme delivery, facility management and employee policies.</p> <p>The Council would specifically welcome guidance from the Equality Commission on what the ruling will mean for the use of spaces by mixed gender groups, in particular in sporting facilities which incorporate changing rooms and toilets. This includes guidance on how the facilities will operate, signage requirements and advice to be given to the public.</p> <p>The Council would also request detailed guidance in relation to any proposal to prohibit some people from using some single sex public facilities and how this would be managed and monitored. In particular clarity is requested on which public body would have responsibility for monitoring and what reporting mechanisms would be proposed for any breaches.</p>

		<p>Finally, despite the roadmap set out by the Equality Commission, and which this consultation is the first of six steps, clarity is needed on the specific timeframe. The Council further requests an assurance that local government will be fully and meaningfully engaged at all key stages of the consultation process.</p> <p>The Council suggests that guidance needs to be developed with a people first, rights-based approach, thoroughly considered and consulted upon and notes that it is important that the guidance will be sufficiently detailed to assist various organisations in programme delivery, facility management and employee policies.</p> <p>The Council would specifically welcome guidance from the Equality Commission on what the ruling will mean for the use of spaces by mixed gender groups, in particular in sporting facilities which incorporate changing rooms and toilets. This includes guidance on how the facilities will operate, signage requirements and advice to be given to the public.</p> <p>The Council would also request detailed guidance in relation to any proposal to prohibit some people from using some single sex public facilities and how this would be managed and monitored. In particular clarity is requested on which public body would have responsibility for monitoring and what reporting mechanisms would be proposed for any breaches.</p>
#9	Individual	N/R
#10	Individual	N/R
#11	Girl Guiding Ulster	<p>Girlguiding Ulster is a Northern Ireland organisation, with a 'parent' organisation in GB. Girlguiding Ulster follows the policies and procedures of Girlguiding UK, and as such is a single-sex charity which is currently trans-inclusive. We would like to see guidance from the Commission on the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Is there any way that Girlguiding Ulster can continue to be trans-inclusive without the need to change the beneficiary class outlined in our charitable purpose?</li> <li>- If Girlguiding UK is required to change their policies to exclude trans people, would Girlguiding Ulster be discriminating if they must follow the same policies and exclude trans people?</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- UK have said that people are to ‘presume’ gender – how can this be done without falling foul of other equality legislation?</li> <li>- If someone states that they are a woman or girl, how far does the obligation to check this extend, and what is the extent of our liability if we have not checked?</li> <li>- Girlguiding is an organisation for women and girls who tend to use spaces which aren’t our own (for example church halls etc.). How far would any obligation to provide suitable spaces extend to our units who do not have control over the spaces?</li> </ul>
#12	<p>Response on behalf of each of the health trusts, ambulance service and BSO.</p>	<p>In summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not enough real-life practical examples, including the more complex and difficult scenarios – such as those outlined. The examples provided under practical guidance on pg. 44 and 45 are more simplistic and straightforward, in our experience it is the more complex queries as we have highlighted in our response which are challenging to address.</li> <li>• Not enough practical guidance on the issues which are commonly raised such as access to changing facilities, toilets, washing facilities (sinks and showers) and Wards.</li> <li>• We note reference is made to Universal/ gender neutral facilities which would help in some cases, however we are mindful to point out that the Health and Social Care Service in Northern Ireland in particular is working within a funding crisis with limited monies available, an aging estate and competing priorities for space in much of the facilities, so this is not always a viable option.</li> <li>• Revision of data classification and disclosure of individuals’ biological sex for the provision of healthcare.</li> </ul> <p>Does the principle of legal precedent (Stare decisis) not apply in terms of FWS for courts of NI? Is NI obligated by the UK Parliament to ignore the judgment or is it strictly bound to follow the judgment of the Supreme Court in FWS? There is confusion around the aspect of the ruling being highly persuasive for courts. Will courts be required to depart from FWS due to Article 2? If not, FWS ruling will be considered legally required interpretation of the EPA 1970, the SDO 1976 and S75 NIA 1998.</p> <p>If FWS ruling is applicable to NI, we need clear definitions of ‘sex’, ‘men’ and ‘women’. Will this be sought by the Equality Commission on behalf of NI or does this need to be independently requested by the HSC Trusts?</p>

		<p>A Code of Practice with examples of policies, case studies and training would be beneficial. It would also need to outline the impact of the FWS ruling on other legislation, in particular, FETO.</p> <p>Trusts would welcome much more practical guidance on appropriate access to toilets, washing and changing facilities both for staff and service users. As large employers and service providers we anticipate these are the main issues that will arise for us and in the absence of detailed legal guidance it leaves us vulnerable to challenge. We would ask for more practical guidance on issues that have been raised in the past in how to manage and address specific scenarios as outlined in the examples below:</p> <p>Clarity is required on access to toilets, changing and showering facilities, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A transgender member of staff requests to use shared changing facilities according to their new gender identity. This is opposed by a colleague who also uses this changing area, on the basis that they have religious beliefs that conflict with sharing the space with a transgender individual. On a separate but not dissimilar theme of competing rights,</li> <li>• A biologically female member of staff with religious views on sexual orientation does not want to share a changing room with a biologically female lesbian. What is a 'pragmatic way' of managing the use of toilet/changing facilities? How do we deal with incidents where a service user or staff member makes a complaint about another individual sharing the facilities based on an assumption of their biological sex? How can we prevent allegations of harassment made on grounds of perceived biological sex?</li> </ul> <p>In addition, guidance specifically for the health and social care sector would be beneficial in regard to scenarios such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• • A patient requests a gender specific clinician. The available clinician is transgender and their biological gender does not match the patient's request.</li> <li>• • A key concern is the appropriate accommodation for someone who is transgender on a ward – due to the high profile case in Scotland, we are already receiving queries about what is</li> </ul>
--	--	---

		<p>the correct process – i.e. should a trans woman who is pre-surgery be accommodated on an all-female ward – particularly if a side room is not available? What is the Trust’s obligation if other patients object?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A patient requests that their GP records their gender/sex differently which results in them not being called for the correct screening programme for their biological sex. Or indeed, the potential for a patient to receive inappropriate clinical care resulting from their biological sex information not being provided to clinicians as a consequence of the Gender Recognition Act 2004, Section 22 Prohibition on disclosure of information (as HSC are not a designated entity for the sharing of protected information).</li> </ul> <p>If we place the transgender woman in a male ward as deemed a biological male, how do we protect that patient presenting as a woman in a male environment?</p> <p>Clarity is also needed around Genuine Occupational Requirement and how this will be applied. Clarity around appropriate signage (reference pg. 47 of the consultation document) what is deemed as “appropriate”? Again, an example would be helpful for service providers.</p> <p>How do we deal with complaints from service users/ staff not being able to access the particular service/ location/ facilities or their data recorded reflective of how they wish in line with how they identify and wish to be treated?</p>
#13	CAJ	<p><b>ECNI Guidance on the Interpretation of Section 75</b></p> <p>29. The ECNI Legal Paper makes no reference to what Guidance and advice the ECNI has previously given on the question of interpreting ‘men and women generally’ in s75.</p> <p>30. Chapters 5-7 of the ‘Section 75 of the Northern Ireland Act 1998: A Guide for Public Authorities’ (<i>see endnote 16</i>) constitute the most formal guidance in the form of ECNI guidelines, approved by the Secretary of State, on form or content of Equality Schemes. There is no reference in these or other chapters of the Guide to transgender, gender identity, or gender reassignment.</p>

		<p>31. There appears to be no tailored guidance from the ECNI on s75 and gender identity or the interpretation of men and women generally.</p> <p>32. The body of the ECNI 2005 practical guidelines and the 2010 ECNI Model (Equality) Scheme also contain no reference to gender identity, etc. However, an appendix in both documents, provides example lists of groups which would fall into each s75 ground (e.g. Protestant, Catholic, Hindu for religious belief). These appendices include under the category of 'men and women generally: "Men (including boys); women (including girls); transgender people; transsexual people."</p> <p>33. It appears therefore the ECNI has not put in its formal guidelines or general guidance an interpretation of this s75 category to include gender identity but has implied this in an appendix in two of its s75 documents. As alluded to earlier, LGBT groups have also stated that the ECNI has verbally informed them of an interpretation (prior to FWS) that the S75 criteria did extend to gender identity.</p> <p>34. In the absence of reference to this in the ECNI Legal Paper (or on how the ECNI has advised on this matter), it is not clear the extent to which public authority practice has been to include this consideration in screenings and how it has operated. Therefore, we would suggest that the ECNI clarifies its previous advice on this s75 ground and gender identity and how this has been reflected in public authority practice and any learning from this.</p> <p>....</p> <p><b>Current ECNI Guidance and Practical Implications for Section 75</b></p> <p>40. To summarise the ECNI position and approach, in general terms, it appears to be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As things stand the terms 'men' and 'women' in s75 mean and are to be interpreted as referring to biological sex only.</li> </ul>
--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• However, sometime before the end of 2020 (possibly back before 1998) there might have been a significant development in EU law (unnoticed at the time by the ECNI or other authorities) that means s75 could or should also be interpreted as encompassing gender identity.</li> <li>• If this is the case, it is possible that this EU law development might engage rights given continued effect by Art. 2 WF, so could retrospectively apply in NI.</li> <li>• The ECNI is asking the Courts for a ruling if this is the case or not.</li> </ul> <p>41. The ECNI Legal Paper consequently states as interim guidance that, until there is such a ruling, public authorities in applying s75 must consider 'biological sex' but 'could' also consider 'gender reassignment' if and until the courts rule otherwise:</p> <p><i>In terms of s75, whilst there is uncertainty about the extent to which the public sector equality duty extends to the protected characteristic of gender reassignment, this should not distract organisations from having 'due regard' to the need to promote equality of opportunity between 'men and women generally' in relation to biological sex. Public bodies could also consider the impact on people with the protected characteristic of 'gender reassignment' pending clarification on how far this duty extends. (see endnote 21)</i></p> <p>42. Whilst the above implies the extension to 'gender identity' is an option, the following paragraph appears to go further by recommending that, where possible, both 'biological sex' and 'gender identity' are both considered when assessing conflicts of rights over separate and single sex services (whilst reiterating screening must be done for biological sex). The ECNI sets out the comparator for 'gender identity' as between transgender and non-transgender persons. The ECNI Legal Paper states:</p> <p>It is recognised that there may be some circumstances in which there is the potential for a 'clash of rights', for example, between biological women and transwomen in relation to matters like separate sex and single sex services. In these circumstances, it is recommended that, in so far as is possible, a public authority considers the impacts that their proposed decisions may have on (a) men and women generally, and (b) on transgender people compared to non-transgender people. There must always be due regard given to the need to promote equality of opportunity between men and women generally. (see endnote 22)</p>
--	--	--

		<p>43. The ECNI guidance in the Legal Paper at present does not further elaborate on balancing exercises and considerations that may take place in assessing the interface of competing rights (within a s75 process or otherwise). It also does not elaborate as to a reading of whether the application of FWS would involve a prohibitive or permissive approach in different scenarios. There may be rights under consideration in relation to matters such as women’s only changing rooms (safety, dignity, etc.) that differ to considerations regarding general women’s only groups (free association, etc).</p> <p>44. There are also practical complexities regarding seeking to conduct a s75 assessment on two separate grounds, with potential interfaces of rights between them, within the same protected characteristic in s75.</p> <p>45. This does not arise as such in the case of the equivalent PSED in Great Britain, as ‘sex’ and ‘gender reassignment’ are separate protected grounds. FWS did though consider the scenario if ‘sex’ had differential meanings in the PSED (i.e., covering both ‘biological sex’ and ‘gender reassignment’ within one ground), highlighting some the complexities to consider:</p> <p><i>239. If, in the context of equality between the sexes, the interests of trans women (biological males) who have GRCs (so are legally female) must be considered and advanced as part of the group that share the protected characteristic of being “women”, the PSED will require data collection and consideration of a heterogenous group containing biological women, some biological males with a GRC (trans women who are legally female) and excluding some biological females with a GRC (trans men who are legally male). This is a confusing group to envisage because it cuts across and fragments both biological sex and gender reassignment into heterogenous groupings which may have little in common. Any data collection exercise will be distorted by the heterogenous nature of such a group. Moreover, the distinct discrimination and disadvantage faced by women as a group (or trans people) would simply not be capable of being addressed by the PSED because the group being considered would not be a group that, because of the shared protected characteristic of sex, has experienced discrimination or disadvantage flowing from shared biology, societal norms or prejudice. Whereas the interests of biological women (or men) can be rationally considered and addressed, and likewise, the interests of trans people (who are</i></p>
--	--	--

	<p><i>vulnerable and often disadvantaged for different reasons), we do not understand how the interests of this heterogenous group can begin to be considered and addressed.</i></p> <p><i>242. Moreover, the different needs of and disadvantages faced by transsexual people (whether or not they have a GRC) can – and in the case of the PSED must – be considered separately without conflating these distinct protected characteristics. To do otherwise is detrimental to both groups. Indeed, a certificated sex reading of sex suggests that the needs and interests of transsexuals without a GRC are different from those with a GRC, though their circumstances may often be indistinguishable. In addressing the need for greater representation of women on public boards, it is hard to see what possible difference it could make to the board in question whether the trans woman in question does or does not hold a GRC.</i></p> <p><i>243. ... The group based rights and duties are concerned with identifying the shared needs and disadvantages that affect women as a group, or trans people as a group. If the first group were to include men and the second group people who are not trans people, it is unlikely that they would have the same needs or share the same disadvantages that would justify their inclusion in the particular group. Equally, the fact that some members of the group do not wish to benefit from a particular measure designed to reduce, say under-representation of that group, does not mean that they do not share the same needs and disadvantages as the group in question.</i></p> <p>46. The complexities are also present with the issue of a comparator. The ECNI is recommending that the comparator for transgender persons is non-transgender persons. Whilst this is clearly the comparator for gender-identity based discrimination, its application to contestation over access to female only spaces is more complex. If a transwoman who is biologically male's comparator is a non- transperson who is also biologically male, then there is no differential treatment in being excluded from women's only spaces. Some of the complexities of this are discussed in FWS:</p> <p><i>Accordingly, where sex is the protected characteristic, a woman relying on [the relevant anti-discrimination provisions] must compare her treatment with the treatment that was or would have been afforded to a man whose circumstances are not materially different to hers; in other words, a similarly situated man.</i></p>
--	--

		<p><i>Where gender reassignment is the protected characteristic, in the case of a male person proposing to or undergoing gender reassignment to the opposite sex, the correct comparator is likely to be a man without the protected characteristic of gender reassignment --and similarly for a woman...(see endnote 23)</i></p> <p>47. Given this ECNI guidance (in a scenario where the courts hold gender identity can be considered within this same s75 category), should further consider the complexities of having two separate protected characteristics and an interface between them protected under one s75 ground would work in practical terms.</p> <p><b>Endnotes</b></p> <p><b>6.</b> Section 75 of the Northern Ireland Act 1998: A Guide for Public Authorities.  <b>21.</b> ECNI Legal Paper, Annex 2, para 24.  <b>22.</b> ECNI Legal Paper, Annex 2, para 25.  <b>23.</b> FWS, para 124.</p>
#14	Ulster University	<p>We would welcome final guidance on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The lawful provision of single-sex and/or universal facilities, as this can have an impact on our current provision of changing, showering and toileting facilities, which differ in our three campuses.</li> <li>• Employment policies, including recruitment and equal opportunities.</li> <li>• The reconciliation of Section 75 obligations with evolving legal definitions for gender, sex and sexual orientation.</li> </ul>
#15	Individual	<p>I wish to see urgent, final guidance mirroring that of England, helping service providers implement FWS to the letter. This should include actions to protect:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Women &amp; girls via single-sex spaces, services, sports, and facilities</li> <li>• Same-sex attracted people (lesbians and gay men) who wish to associate freely without members of the opposite sex intruding</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pregnancy and maternity. If you fail to implement FWS this will reduce the rights and protections for pregnant women who describe themselves as transmen.</li> </ul>
#16	Individual	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Protection of association and from discrimination for lesbians</li> <li>2. Protection of pregnancy and maternity rights for all women, even if they identify as a man</li> <li>3. Clarity about single-sex spaces, resources, short-lists and sports.</li> </ol>
#17	Individual	<p>Clear protection of all women’s single-sex spaces, including (but not limited to) toilets, changing rooms, DV refuges, rape crisis centres, prisons, hospitals wards, same sex intimate care. This is to ensure the dignity, privacy and safeguarding of women and girls.</p> <p>Clear protection of women’s and girls’ sports (I.e. the exclusion of trans-identified males). This is to ensure fairness and increase safety for women and girls.</p> <p>Clear protection of lesbian spaces against the intrusion of men.</p> <p>Accurate recording by the police of the sex of trans-identified individuals who have committed a crime.</p>
#18	Individual	N/R
#19	Gaels For Fair Play	<p>We believe, had it not been for the confusing and illogical position taken by ECNI on this matter, the Ladies Gaelic Football Association would have updated its unfair and unsafe transgender participation policy in NI to reflect the SC ruling.</p> <p>As things stand, there are thousands of women and girls playing Gaelic football in Northern Ireland who are being denied safety, fairness, dignity and privacy in their sport.</p> <p>Their rights should not be diminished. We urge you to produce clear guidance without delay.</p>
#20	Women’s Rights Network	<p>Our expectation is that the implications of the FWS judgement and the outcome of this process will be clarification of the biologically sex based meanings of woman, man and sex in NI legislation.</p> <p>We would therefore expect the final guidance from the Commission to track and mirror EVERY key stage and point of the FWS Supreme Court judgement including:</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● the protection of association and from discrimination for lesbians;</li> <li>● the protection of the pregnancy and maternity rights for all women irrespective of whether they identify as a man;</li> <li>● the absolute clarity about single sex spaces, particularly female single sex spaces including toilets and changing rooms;</li> <li>● the clarity about single sex organisations, opportunities, resources and shortlists;</li> <li>● the clarity about single sex sports;</li> <li>● the possible lawful exclusion of a trans identified woman with a highly masculinised appearance from sensitive single sex spaces such as a domestic violence support group in which the trans identified woman’s masculinised appearance might cause extreme distress and difficulties.</li> </ul>
#21	Individual	I expect Northern Ireland to follow the ruling of the United Kingdom Supreme Court, in it’s entirely
#22	Individual	N/R
#23	Women’s Policy Group	<p>The WPG would like to see final guidance that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Affirms the rights of trans people to exist and use public spaces and services.</li> <li>2) Addresses the impact of the judgment on the safety and dignity of trans, non- binary and intersex people.</li> <li>3) Reflects the intended scope of the judgment, which explicitly states that the judgment should not be interpreted as disadvantaging or removing protections from trans people (with or without GRCs).<sup>7</sup></li> <li>4) Uses inclusive language and has been written in consultation with trans people</li> </ol>
#24	Individual	N/R

#25	For Women Scotland	N/R
#26	HERE NI and Rainbow Project	<p>Practically, we do not foresee a situation that publishing any guidance, whereby trans people are excluded from accessing spaces on the basis of their assigned gender, would be acceptable. Guidance that affirms trans people’s right to exist in public spaces on the basis of their assigned gender could help support an inclusive and rights-based model for employers, service providers and public authorities to follow.</p> <p>We are particularly concerned by some of the language used by the Commission both in its wider paper and the interim information in Part 3. Guidance or information, particularly that is issued to employers and service providers, must not reinforce harmful biases about transgender people. For instance, referring to trans women as “biological males”, which is a contested, ill-defined term, or “transwomen”, which is generally perceived as a dog whistle suggesting that ‘transwomen’ and ‘women’ are completely separate and distinct categories, has been taken to indicate that the Commission has accepted, without issue, an anti-trans and anti-LGBTQIA+ framing of trans identities and lives.</p> <p>This has already caused harm to the Commission’s standing within trans communities, due to discussion of the language used online, and has the potential to further damage the reputation of the Commission if this language is maintained. The Commission could take steps to improve the language, through consultation with the trans community when drafting final guidance.</p> <p>It is important also to consider the remit and role of the Equality Commission in its development of guidance, and its analysis of legal issues stemming from this judgment. The Equality Commission’s Corporate Plan 2025 - 2028 states:</p> <p>“We are seeing a divisive and heated debate around equality and human rights across the world. We must remember that equality and human rights protections were central to the Belfast (Good Friday) Agreement and are just as crucial to creating a peaceful Northern Ireland as they were back in 1998.</p>

		<p>We must work together not only to protect these rights but to work for an acceptance of the rights of others and for good relations between neighbours as we build a Northern Ireland where everyone - no matter their age, disability, orientation, race, religion or sex - feels safe, respected and truly at home.”<sup>6</sup></p> <p>The Commission’s interim information, as currently written, would amount to a segregation order for transgender people in public spaces, in the workplace, in access to goods and services. It would shut transgender individuals out of public life in meaningful ways, limiting their ability to move freely through society, to access basic facilities such as bathrooms and changing rooms, to enjoy recreational activities and build a career. Vague assurances that there must still be provision for trans people through gender neutral/accessible facilities, while maintaining their exclusion from mainstream gendered spaces, is no comfort to those subject to this segregation. This should be considered an unacceptable outcome which goes against the very role of the Equality Commission - to promote and protect equality and human rights, to ‘build a Northern Ireland where everyone feels safe, respected, and truly at home’.</p> <p>The Commission’s work on this judgment thus far has been focused on interpretation, on analysis of legal arguments and ‘seeking clarity’ on how it should be applied. While we understand and accept that the Commission must provide up-to-date, legally sound guidance for employers and service providers, its duties to meaningfully promote and uphold equality and human rights for everyone in society is being lost in the name of ‘legal certainty’.</p> <p>If this legal certainty requires the marginalisation and segregation of transgender individuals within our society, the Commission must have a view as to how the legal frameworks which exist to protect all communities should be altered or amended to meaningfully protect and uphold the basic rights and liberties of transgender people. To date, the Commission has not been forthcoming as to its views on the impact this judgment may have on these rights, and of the legal basis on which it will work to reaffirm those rights.</p> <p>6 Equality Commission Corporate Plan 2025 - 2028</p>
#27	Anurag Deb Colin Murray	<p>In light of the confusion and misinformation over the applicability of the <i>For Women Scotland</i> decision in Northern Ireland, the ECNI’s final guidance must clearly assert the following</p>

	Aoife O'Donoghue Sylvia de Mars	fundamental elements of equality law in Northern Ireland. Northern Ireland has a significantly longer history of non-discrimination law than other parts of the UK. Notably, the main provisions of the Equality Act 2010 do not extend to Northern Ireland. Additionally, equality law is a devolved matter in Northern Ireland. This sets it apart from Scotland, as the devolution of equality law means that legislation such as the Representation on Public Boards (Scotland) Act 2018, even in its original form, would have fallen within the legislative competence of the Northern Ireland Assembly and issues over compatibility with the Equality Act would not have provided the same trigger for litigation as they did in Scotland. Finally, the Windsor Framework provides a baseline of rights and equality protections in Northern Ireland law which is directly connected to the requirements of EU law.
#28	Sinn Fein	N/R
#29	Individual	N/R
#30	Individual	<p>I wish to see clarification of the biologically sex-based meanings of woman, man and sex in NI legislation.</p> <p>I wish to see the clarification of the right to single sex spaces etc.</p> <p>I wish to see the rights of lesbians protected from discrimination and their right to same sex association clarified.</p> <p>I wish to see women who identify as men retain their sex-based protections to maternity leave.</p>
#31	Individual	<p>Clear guidance to the public, employers and employees that the meaning of woman and man is, and always has been biological.</p> <p>Acknowledgment to these groups that ECNI has given advice that goes against this definition and that they were wrong in doing so.</p> <p>Make employers aware of their legal requirements and risk if they do not follow the legislation.</p>

		<p>Publicly and widely inform the women and girls of the protections they have, as so much damage has been done over the years with wrong advice and policies.</p> <p>Advice that mirrors that in Britain.</p>
#32	Unison NI	N/R
#33	Individual	<p>I would like to see clear definitions of the words “woman”, “man” and “sex”, as being based on biological sex, in the Northern Ireland legislation.</p> <p>I want the Commission’s final guidance to provide for the protection of the right of lesbians to free association and protection from discrimination, the protection of pregnancy and maternity rights for all women (whether or not they identify as a man), clear guidance on women’s right to single-sex spaces in toilets and changing rooms, women only sports, and women-only opportunities and resources.</p> <p>Should the Commission decide to diverge from the ruling of the UK Supreme Court, I would expect it would explain this in the guidance.</p>
#34	Individual	<p>Women would like you to actually produce guidance like the suggestion in the legal paper that women should have sex based spaces and that gender neutral options be provided for trans identifying men. Women would most likely be supportive of this but you have been cowed by the trans lobby to back down on that advice. Women would like to see ECNI be brave on this and follow the actual reality of sex based oppression to protect our rights.</p> <p>If you refuse to produce guidance I would like to see the ECNI explain to women why they are happy to destroy our rights.</p>
#35	Individual	<p>Final guidance confirming that sex means biological sex, and the exemptions allowed in law for, eg men to be excluded from women's sport to be enforced.</p>

#36	Newry, Mourne and Down District Council	Council is not in a position to respond to questions 1, 2, 3 or 6 as they involve the analysis of complex legal issues.
#37	Mid & East Antrim	Mid and East Antrim Borough Council is of the view that, given the complexity and sensitivity of the legal issues involved, it would not be appropriate to offer comment at this time.
#38	Armagh, Banbridge, Craigavon DC	N/R
#39	NICCY	NICCY recommends that in light of the Roadmap and the interim uncertainty as set out in the Paper, that it would be beneficial for consideration to be given to making this information publicly available in order for children and young people themselves, their parents, carers or guardians and those providing services for children and young people to be in a position to participate meaningfully in this and any related consultation process. NICCY would welcome information on the development of any child-specific consultation process to ensure that it is meaningful and rights-complaint.