

## Annex: Public Accounts Committee Recommendations

The majority of the recommendations made by the Public Accounts Committee since 2000 have been implemented. This annex provides further information on progress with implementing any outstanding recommendations.

### 2003-04

Criminal Records Bureau: delivering safer recruitment?																	
Recommendation	Update																
PAC conclusion (viii): The Bureau has achieved significant improvement in the turnaround times for handling Disclosures, with the majority now dealt with within target times. The turnaround target times were, however, less onerous in 2003–04 than for 2002–03, and the Bureau should look to improve the speed of service delivery now that its activities have stabilised.	<p>In December 2010 amendments were made to regulations under the Police Act 1997 which changed the search criteria for the CRB process so that police forces are only asked to look at cases where information exists or where the position is carried out in the applicant's home. This means that more applicants will receive their certificates quicker but without creating any new risks to the service.</p> <p>This along with other work undertaken with local police forces has driven a significant improvement in performance with the target of 90% in 28 days for Enhanced CRB Checks being achieved since December 2010. Average turnaround times for Enhanced Checks have also shown a marked improvement in the last two months as the full benefits of the work with local police forces have come through. The results are as follows:</p>																
	<table><tr><th>Month</th><th>% completed in 28 days</th><th>Average</th></tr><tr><td>December</td><td>93.5%</td><td>24.44</td></tr><tr><td>January</td><td>93.3%</td><td>24.36</td></tr><tr><td>February</td><td>94.6%</td><td>18.07</td></tr><tr><td>March</td><td>95.4%</td><td>15.25</td></tr></table>		Month	% completed in 28 days	Average	December	93.5%	24.44	January	93.3%	24.36	February	94.6%	18.07	March	95.4%	15.25
	Month	% completed in 28 days	Average														
	December	93.5%	24.44														
January	93.3%	24.36															
February	94.6%	18.07															
March	95.4%	15.25															
<p>For Standard CRB Checks performance has been above 99% (against a target of 95% within 10 days) each month since June 2010.</p> <p>The Criminal Records Bureau's (CRB) original service standards were set before the launch of a new service and at the time it was difficult to predict the optimum service levels that could be delivered. The first 12 months operation indicated that the standards were overly ambitious and new service standards were introduced in April 2003.</p> <p>The CRB element of the processing has improved year on year since 2003/04 both in terms of the quality and timeliness of processing.</p> <p>The data sets checked by the CRB as part of the CRB process have also expanded since 2003/04 with the introduction of the Police Local Cross-Referencing system (PLX) and the incorporation of new data-sources such as SOCA, British Transport Police and the Military police forces.</p>																	
PAC conclusion (xi): The range of vulnerable groups includes both old and young and it is important that the Bureau sets its priorities to ensure that proper protection is extended to all.																	
	<p>The Criminal Records Bureau was established in March 2002 and provides a comprehensive and effective system that allows appropriate employers (both paid and unpaid) obtain access to an individuals criminal record.</p> <p>The CRB administer the functions set out in Part V of the Police Act in relation to the provision of a Standard check (Conviction, Caution, Warning or Reprimand) or an Enhanced check (Conviction, Caution, Warning or Reprimand plus any relevant local information plus barring information).</p>																

	<p>The primary purpose of the CRB is to provide criminal record information, relevant local information and barring information to those who work (paid and unpaid) primarily with children and vulnerable adults.</p> <p>The CRB operate within an agreed Framework Document which is published on an annual basis. This framework document is support by an annual business plan. The CRB is also governed by a wider Home Office Strategic Business Plan that operates on a three year cycle.</p> <p>In February a review by Sunita Mason "A Common Sense Approach" into the Criminal Record Regime identified a number of strategic and operational improvements. In addition the Governments review of the VBS has impacted on the delivery objectives for CRB. We expect the CRB to incorporate the revised approach to criminal record arrangements set out in the Rights &amp; Freedoms Bill which is expected to gain Royal Assent in early 2012.</p>
--	--

## 2004-2005

Improving the Speed and Quality of Asylum Decisions	
Recommendation	Update
<p>PAC conclusion (vii): Over the last five years, the proportion of appeals allowed has consistently exceeded the Directorate's target of 15 per cent, and has frequently exceeded 20 per cent. The appeals allowed rate has also varied significantly for applicants from different countries. The Directorate should examine why appeals are upheld, particularly amongst nationalities where appeal allowed rates are highest, and disseminate the lessons for improved decision-making to its caseworkers.</p>	<p>There are measures which the Agency has taken to specifically address its performance at the appeal stage. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A new UK Border Agency unit (the Central Appeals and Litigation unit), has been set up to work with the Tribunals Service to manage changes to the appeals process;</li> <li>• The governance structure has been improved to monitor the appeals change programme. The High Level Working Group has been set up - this is co-chaired by the Head of Immigration and the Chief Executive of the TSIA. A new Appeals Board has been set up – with pan UK Border Agency and TSIA attendance. A joint TS/ UK Border Agency Operational Board which meets regularly to discuss operational interactions for daily effectiveness;</li> <li>• More formalised mechanisms for providing feedback from our staff who present the appeals;</li> <li>• The creation of country-specific working groups which seek to provide expert advice to staff who appear in court; and</li> <li>• Development and delivery of bespoke training covering specific technical and legal issues, focussed on improving performance.</li> </ul> <p>The UK Border Agency no longer has a 15% target for asylum appeals and its performance is now measured by a basket of indicators to ensure the asylum system is kept in balance.</p> <p>The range of indicators includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intake.</li> <li>• Decisions taken within 30 days.</li> <li>• Quality of decision.</li> <li>• Grant rate.</li> <li>• Percentage of decisions overturned at appeal.</li> <li>• Conclusions at 6, 12, 18 and 36 months.</li> <li>• Cases removed by 12 months.</li> <li>• Number and age profile of the outstanding caseload.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Asylum support costs.</li> <li>• Productivity (conclusion per caseowner FTE).</li> <li>• Unit cost.</li> </ul> <p>For the majority of these indicators we have not set an arbitrary percentage target preferring to look at what we have achieved previously and look to improve on that performance. Whilst we acknowledge there will always be factors affecting appeal outcomes that will be difficult for UKBA to influence, through the recent UK-wide roll out of the Allowed Appeals Reduction Plan the Agency is seeking to achieve a downward trend in asylum allowed appeal rates and to further improve the quality of initial decision-making. The roll out of the plan will help us to understand many of the reasons behind cases being allowed, to identify trends and issues that impact on (allowed) appeal outcomes and to put in place activities to address them. The allowed appeal reduction plan was rolled out in April 2011.</p>
<p>PAC conclusion (x): The Directorate has put in place procedures to detect possible multiple applications, but has not always acted promptly to investigate concerns raised by third parties about potentially fraudulent claims. There should be a clear contact point within the Directorate for whistleblowers and for following up information received, and robust procedures for acting upon likely cases of fraud.</p>	<p>We have made it easier for individuals or organisations to raise concerns with us either in person, by telephone or email. From 1 April 2010 until 28 February 2011 the Immigration Enquiry Bureau handled 3,100 allegations from members of the public by telephone and 24,533 by e-mail. Of those received by e-mail, an average of 337 per month were forwarded to UK Border Agency from Crime stoppers. Crime stoppers were and are still receiving emailed reports of immigration crime and are advised of a single point of contact in UK Border Agency (IEB) to forward these reports to. Details of all allegations received are forwarded to the relevant Local Immigration Team.</p> <p>The Independent Chief Inspector of the UK Border Agency recently concluded a full thematic inspection of UKBA's intelligence function. This review looked at how we respond to information received from third parties, for example allegations from members of the public regarding fraudulent immigration claims. This report, and our response to it, was published on 13 May.</p> <p>We have a project underway to improve the end-to-end process of allegations handling by making the reporting of allegations easier for the public, enhancing the quality of material received, and improving subsequent management and tasking, both within the agency and in its sharing with relevant partners. We plan to put in place a central data management system which will record the contribution that allegations make to the prevention and detection of immigration and customs offences.</p> <p>Allegations against agency staff are also within the scope of the project. We are working closely with the agency's Security and Anti Corruption Unit to design a reporting mechanism for this purpose; this is likely to comprise an internal version of the external web form used by members of the public to report allegations against suspected immigration offenders.</p> <p>This project has cross-agency support and will report interim findings later this month, which will include a revised allegation handling model and options for appropriate investments in processes and technology.</p> <p>The UK Border Agency follows the Home Office fraud response plan which makes provision for those wishing to make an allegation about a staff member. All allegations</p>

	about staff are investigated by a dedicated team of trained officers. The UK Border Agency expects the highest level of integrity from its staff, instances of staff corruption are rare.
--	---

<b>Reducing crime: the Home Office working with Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRPs)</b>	
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Update</b>
PAC conclusion (xi): The Home Office should explore the scope for sharing successful initiatives from elsewhere. One option would be to adopt the zero tolerance of low level crime and disorder used in New York, which helped to underline that crime is unacceptable and contributed to the reductions in crime in the city.	<p>The Home Office has a commitment in its business plan to develop and publish plans for the dissemination of effective practice, with a deadline of June 2011. This is based on a framework designed to gather, quality assure, disseminate and sustain the sharing of effective practice in forces from local crime analyst networks.</p> <p>Home Office Business Plan - Action Point 3.3.2: Develop and publish plans to spread best practice and information on which techniques are most effective for use by communities, police, their partners and sentencers at preventing and cutting crime, working with the Ministry of Justice (Status: Start Date - Started, End Date - June 2011)</p>

## 2005-2006

<b>Visa Entry to the United Kingdom: The entry clearance operation</b>	
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Update</b>
PAC conclusion (v): There is currently no systematic check on whether visa holders comply with the conditions of their visa once they are in the United Kingdom. So UKvisas is not able to evaluate whether it is achieving its objectives in entry clearance. The Home Office's 'e-Borders' programme is intended to provide the facility to electronically track everyone entering and leaving the country. The Home Office and UK visas should use this information to provide systematic feedback to entry clearance staff on when visa holders leave the United Kingdom.	<p>The e-Borders system went live in May 2009. It is now building travel histories of passenger movements and the UK Border Agency International Group is able to interrogate the e-Borders database to check compliance of visa nationals. e-Borders is currently tracking around 55% of inbound and 60% of outbound passenger movements to and from the UK. This equates to approximately 126 million passengers a year on over 2800 routes, and includes over 90% of non-EU aviation passengers.</p> <p>The e-Borders system already has the capacity to process increasing passenger volumes and coverage is planned to increase over the next two years.</p> <p>Following termination of the Raytheon contract those parts of the e-Borders programme already delivered continue to run normally, so the increased capability we do have in place is unaffected. The services that were delivered by Raytheon have all now been secured by novating or transferring the contracts governing these services to new suppliers. The Semaphore system was novated to the UK Border Agency in November 2010. The National Border Targeting Centre and the Carrier Gateway were novated to the UK Border Agency on 15 April. There will be no further reliance on Raytheon for services following novation. e-Borders continues to collect and check passenger information against watchlists before individuals travel into or out of the UK. The further enhancement of capabilities for risk assessing and analysing data on passengers and visa applications before they travel will continue once an alternative supplier has been sourced.</p> <p>Completion of the e-Borders programme will be determined by approval of the business case and agreement with suppliers on delivery timescales. Requirements are being worked through with potential new suppliers, delivery timescales and costs are being verified.</p>

Returning failed asylum applicants	
Recommendation	Update
<p>PAC conclusion (v): The Directorate needs to undertake a fundamental review of its approach to removals, building on progress it has already made and on the following specific proposals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A removals strategy with integrated functions, targets and IT.</li> <li>• Tailor approach to different segments of the population, making appropriate use of detention, monitoring and tagging and good practice from the US.</li> <li>• Improve effectiveness and awareness of voluntary removals.</li> <li>• Speed up enforcement through better use of arrests and learning lessons.</li> <li>• Reduce overhead costs.</li> </ul>	<p>The agency has developed a removals strategy that covers all (individual) case types for those without lawful permission to remain in the UK. This includes illegal migrants; overstayers; failed asylum seekers and foreign national prisoners.</p> <p>The removals strategy outlines our approach to: increasing the volume of removals year on year: supporting the reduction in net migration maintaining a balanced asylum system and increasing the number of high cost and high harm removals.</p> <p>The three core strands of the removals strategy include:</p> <p>Building the capability to deliver removals across the broadest spectrum of countries by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generating returns plans that monitor and track country performance and identify levers for return</li> <li>• Increasing our Charter capabilities and;</li> <li>• Working with European and international partners to ensure returns are part of the wider migration debate</li> </ul> <p>Improving the efficiency of the process by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Restructuring removals delivery and changing our business processes which will improve use of, and access to, IT; budgets and expertise.</li> <li>• Maximising benefits of prime contracts (ticketing and escorting) developing an interface agreement to drive performance improvements and cost efficiencies and;</li> <li>• Reviewing the tasking process for enforcement.</li> </ul> <p>Taking full account of the needs of those being returned by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developing a more innovative and active outreach programme for voluntary returns (with a new AVR service delivery partner).</li> <li>• Expanding access to re-integration projects in core countries such as Afghanistan and Iraq.</li> <li>• Implementing a new family returns process.</li> </ul> <p>The removals strategy has to balance what is required across a range of activity. The UK Border Agency has been tasked with increasing the number of Foreign National Prisoners (FNPs) removed year on year and driving up the number of total removals from the UK (FNPs, Failed Asylum Seekers (FAS), and Immigration offenders). These use the same detention, documentation, flight and escorting resources. As part of this strategy, there is an integrated approach to the removal of FAS in place which has specifically aligned detention with the strategy, invested in increasing awareness of support available to increase voluntary returns focussed around tailored packages for target groups aligning marketing of voluntary returns with enforcement activity to shift the relative attractiveness of voluntary returns to FAS. The voluntary return scheme for FNPs is promoted widely in prisons, Immigration Removal Centres and with Non-Government Organisations to ensure maximum take up of the scheme.</p> <p>In parallel, the Agency has improved processes to obtain documents as well as reduce the number of failed removals by integrating flight and escort bookings better and strengthening the contract management arrangements of the external suppliers providing these services. The</p>

	<p>Removals Services project is focusing on reasons for removal failures and working to standardise and streamline removals processes within and between removals teams. These along with refinements to the policy on judicial reviews are reducing overhead by increasing the proportion of successful asylum removals.</p> <p>Awareness raising of Assisted Voluntary Return (AVR) schemes both within UK Border Agency and with stakeholders has been significantly augmented since 1 April 2010, particularly with the introduction of AVR for Families and Children (AVRFC). A network of AVR leads is proving effective in this respect. Presentations to social workers are beginning to take effect and the number of removals under the AVRFC programme remains consistently good.</p> <p>AVRs constitute 26% of FAS removals between April 2010 and February 2011, 1% down on the same period in 2009/10.</p> <p>In 2010, the total number of enforced removals and voluntary departures from the UK was 39,035 (9,850 asylum and 29,185 non-asylum).</p>
--	--

<b>Asset Recovery Agency (ARA)</b>	
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Update</b>
<p>PAC conclusion (iii): Management information systems do not include a comprehensive database of cases referred to and being handled by the Agency, nor a time recording system for staff. The cost of pursuing individual cases and the productivity of staff cannot therefore be easily assessed by management, hindering effective decision making on, for example, the prioritisation of cases and the most effective deployment of staff resources. The Agency and Serious Organised Crime Agency should implement management information systems to provide reliable and easily accessible information on total caseload activity, prioritisation of work, cost of handling cases, productivity of staff and monitoring of case progression.</p>	<p>In May 2008, the SOCA Board agreed to implement a basic interim time recording system for CRT staff. The Civil Recovery and Tax Branch (CRT) investigators populate a monthly SOCA 'resource usage chart' to show activity broken down by officer and operation. This is recorded in hours of activity for formally tasked operations and project work; and for assessments by name of individual, which are undertaken prior to adoption. CRT are able therefore to (a) account for each officers time in relation to each operation or project and (b) total how many staff hours have been spent on each operation or project.</p> <p>SOCA Legal does not currently contribute to a monthly resource chart, but do calculate their time separately for certain operations, when it is thought appropriate to seek costs at Court if SOCA wins. There are no provisions to include investigators costs in civil litigation, as all Court work must be done by a lawyer; but if required they too could calculate staff hours on specific case work. SOCA Legal has approval to purchase specialist software to record their time on all cases and is engaged in the process to procure this.</p> <p>An integrated time recording system applicable to all of SOCA (including Legal), both aligned to Case Management and Workflow, is included in SOCA's total set of tender requirements for a new IT supplier. It is anticipated that due to budgetary constraints, only core infrastructure will be replaced in the first tranche of funding; however the remaining requirements which are new applications will come on stream in due course.</p> <p>This is a long term project for SOCA that will have little movement over the next few years and nothing to report.</p>

## 2007-2008

<b>Reducing the Risk of Violent Crime</b>	
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Update</b>
PAC conclusion (vi): Gang activity and gang violence is a factor in violent crime but the Home Office has a limited understanding of the nature of gang membership and activity, and how such activity has changed over time. The Home Office should conduct further research into the reasons why youths join gangs and use this understanding to provide guidance to local communities in their efforts to develop targeted diversions away from gang membership.	The third phase of the Tackling Knives and Serious Youth Violence Programme (TKAP) has just ended 31 <sup>st</sup> March 2011. The 52 local areas that participated in the Programme developed problem profiles to gain a better understanding of their local serious youth violence patterns including their total gang problem. On Feb 2 <sup>nd</sup> this year £18m funding was announced over two years to tackle knife, gun and gang related crime. £3.75m has been allocated to the three police force areas where more than half of the country's knife crime occurs, this funding will include interventions to address gang and gun related violence where this has been identified as an issue locally. This funding will help support local partnership activity. The good practice arising from the previous TKAP programme including in relation to gang violence will be shared with Community Safety Partnerships. We intend to continue to support partners to build upon examples of good practice and enable all communities to share what works.

## 2008-09

<b>Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC)</b>	
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Update</b>
PAC conclusion (ix): The IPCC has a number of performance measures to identify how well it is handling its workload but does not have any measures which monitor the wider impacts that its work is having on the police. The IPCC should introduce performance measures that would help to establish its overall impact in improving the performance of the police.	<p>Working with stakeholders, the IPCC has developed a Police Complaints Performance Framework, which is currently capturing data from all 43 forces and British Transport Police. It includes a set of performance indicators that inform the IPCC as to whether defined outcomes, such as greater access and improved confidence in the police complaints system and evidence of lessons learned being fed back in to operational policing, are being achieved.</p> <p>Data collection from all forces took place in Oct 2010, and was used to produce the IPCC annual publication Police Complaints: Statistics for England and Wales 2009/10 (published on 24 February 2011).</p> <p>Following a further collection of force data in January 2011, individual force Bulletins for quarter 3 2010/11 year to date (April-December 2010) were produced and circulated. These and further quarterly bulletins are published on the IPCC website.</p>

## 2009-2010

<b>Management of Asylum Applications</b>	
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Update</b>
PAC Conclusion (ii): The Department still has some way to go to meet its aims of reaching initial decisions in 80% of cases within two months of an application and of concluding all cases within six months. The average time taken to reach an initial decision in Asylum cases had fallen from 22 months in 1997 to seven months in 2007. Whilst the Department's focus is on concluding cases, the Department should continue to reduce the time taken to reach a decision and consequently reduce the cost of managing asylum applications. For example, the Department needs to reach a decision on entitlement to accommodation and	<p>We have developed and implemented a new set of performance indicators designed to show the overall health of the asylum system. One of the indicators is the percentage of adult initial decisions taken within 30 days. But, we know that speed is not everything which is why we will also have a stretching quality indicator to ensure that we have good quality speedy decisions.</p> <p>The 2004 NAO report revealed that on average the department was interviewing applicants for asylum 48 days after their applications had been made. We are now making decisions on 60% of applications within 30 days.</p> <p>The link provided below is for the Asylum Improvement</p>

<p>support more quickly to reduce the cost of initial accommodation.</p>	<p>Projects progress report and details what the agency has been doing to speed up the asylum system. Also provided are statistics which show:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) the speed of decision making</li> <li>b) conclusion rate at 6 months (no longer adjusted for GLB)</li> <li>c) removals within 12 months.</li> </ul> <p><a href="http://www.ukba.homeoffice.gov.uk/sitecontent/documents/aboutus/reports/asylum-improvement-project/">http://www.ukba.homeoffice.gov.uk/sitecontent/documents/aboutus/reports/asylum-improvement-project/</a></p>
<p>PAC Conclusion (v): Detention is important in ensuring that failed asylum applicants can be removed from the UK expeditiously once their case is decided. The Department has fewer detention spaces than it needs to meet its operational and business needs. This shortfall is due both to a lack of physical capacity and also to the large number of spaces occupied by foreign national prisoners awaiting deportation. Despite the previous recommendations of this Committee, it will be 2013 before the Department has the number of spaces it thinks it needs. To make best use of the available spaces, the Department should:</p> <p>Review how it uses its estate and whether this meets current and future needs and press on with implementing our predecessors' recommendation to review all foreign national prisoner cases at the beginning of their custodial sentence to prepare for immediate removal of offenders recommended for deportation on their release from custody.</p>	<p>The UK Border Agency is developing its detention estate to remove more of those with no legal basis to be in the UK, but it takes time to do so.</p> <p>We delivered a number of expansion projects in existing centres at Lindholme, Oakington and Dungavel House in 2008; opened Brook House, a new Centre near Gatwick in March 2009; and opened new wings at Harmondsworth in July 2010, providing another 364 bed spaces. Although we had to close Oakington in November, with the loss of 408 bed spaces, HMP Morton Hall has become an immigration removal centre providing 393 new bed spaces for men. Morton Hall started taking its first detainees on 16 May but will not be fully occupied until September this year.</p> <p>We have planning consent for two new immigration removal centres and are currently applying for consent to expand significantly the number of bed spaces at Lindholme. However, not all options will be affordable and so following the Comprehensive Spending Review we are now considering the best way to develop the estate further.</p> <p>Building work has commenced at Larne in Northern Ireland to create a new residential short-term holding facility which will open in the summer.</p> <p>The UK Border Agency has an agreement with NOMS to ensure that foreign national prisoners who meet deportation criteria are referred to UK Border Agency within five days of sentencing and cases are considered at the earliest opportunity. In addition, nine prisons have embedded teams of UK Border Agency officers and other prisons are visited on a regular basis to undertake actions to resolve issues at the earliest opportunity, where possible, e.g. confirming identity and explaining voluntary return options to improve compliance.</p> <p>However, delays remain and although action can be taken to mitigate these delays they cannot be completely prevented, for example if a foreign national prisoner does not fully co-operate with the documentation process, e.g. by failing to answer questions or providing false information, this will prevent or delay UK Border Agency obtaining a travel document to facilitate their removal. Other delays include the use of judicial challenges being used as a means to frustrate removal. This is being addressed by improved legal and case working within the UK Border Agency and closer co-operation with the judiciary to reduce the impact of abusive judicial reviews.</p> <p>In addition where sentence length allows, consideration of an individual's case will be commenced 18 months prior to the earliest removal scheme date.</p>



<p>PAC Conclusion (vi): Removals of failed asylum seekers have fallen over the period 2006-08, and the majority of removals have been achieved primarily from legacy cases, and cases held in detention, with few successful removals being achieved by the New Asylum Model teams in the regions. The Department should monitor regional variations in removal rates closely to identify best practice, as well as any local issues which may be holding back removals.</p>	<p>The UK Border Agency is committed to increasing removals.</p> <p>The Agency has strengthened its performance governance arrangements and approach to planning and monitoring regional performance. This includes close monitoring of regional effectiveness and efficiency on a weekly and monthly basis and spreading of best practice. A number of key actions have also been taken to ensure we are getting the operational fundamentals right, breaking down silo working and removing policy and country-specific barriers to removal. Increased volume of removals of unfounded cases from a particular country of origin tend to drive down intake from that country - e.g. China and Afghanistan - meaning that FAS removals performance is always vulnerable to changes in the precise country of origin case mix. The UK Border Agency and Foreign and Commonwealth Office focuses significant attention on ensuring we act quickly to respond to such changes but our leverage over some of our highest intake countries is limited by the political situation in those countries in many cases, making rapid progress challenging to achieve.</p>
<p>PAC Conclusion (vii): Making a successful enforced removal of a failed asylum applicant is challenging as it requires the Department to coordinate documentation, transport and escorts against the backdrop of legal challenges and international relations. To improve the chances of a successful removal, the Department should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• improve coordination of flights, escorts and detention;</li> <li>• press on with its work with the Ministry of Justice, Scottish Executive and courts in the UK to speed up the Judicial Review process and to reduce the number of applications for Judicial Reviews applied for on the same grounds that are allowed, and</li> <li>• work with the Foreign and Commonwealth Office to increase the number of countries from which it can obtain Emergency Travel Documents and use more of those documents to effect removals.</li> </ul>	<p>The UK Border Agency have agreed a number of policy changes on judicial review challenges; including ceasing to automatically suspend a removal where there has been a previous Judicial Review on the same grounds within the three months preceding the current challenge and where a judicial review is requested on a case that has exhausted all appeal rights and had removals directions set within three months of becoming appeal rights exhausted and the judicial review does not raise any ground not covered in the appeal. Where new grounds are raised and if these cannot be dealt with in time then the removal is suspended but these are a minority of cases where the new policy applies.</p> <p>If implemented successfully, the proposed transfer of fresh claim related JR litigation from the Administrative Court to the Upper Tribunal will free up judicial resources in the Administrative Court to hear more judicial reviews. The planned 'go live' date is October 2011. To enable improved performance UK Border Agency have been working closely with MoJ and we will not agree to implementation of the transfer unless we are satisfied that the new 'fresh claim JR process' in the Upper Tribunal is as fast or faster than the current expedited JR process in the Administrative Court.</p> <p>Work has been ongoing since December 2009 with the Scottish judiciary to introduce a new policy on judicial review in Scotland. That new policy should implement as far as possible, given the different legal systems, the various policy changes which had previously been introduced in England and Wales. Discussions have since been widened to include proposals for changing the procedure for managing immigration judicial reviews in Scotland to improve efficiency. Further discussions are likely to take place in June or July.</p> <p>The UK Border Agency continues to work with the Foreign and Commonwealth Office to procure more Emergency Travel Documents (ETDs). Some ETDs are time limited and expire before legal proceedings are concluded or before an applicant who has absconded is found again. The Agency has focused attention on improving re-documentation processes. Specifically we have focused on improving the quality of applications for documents; working with other</p>

	<p>Governments to reduce the amount of time before documents are issued; utilising a larger proportion of documents received and reducing the time taken between receipt of a document and removal. Significant progress has been made on each of these aspects and further improvements are anticipated over the next year.</p> <p>The development of Country Plans detailing our priorities and objectives for key UK Border Agency countries is part of this work. The plans cover the remit of the whole Agency and identify all the levers available to influence our key objectives, primarily returns.</p>
<p>PAC Conclusion (viii): Around 20-25% of appeals against a refusal decision are upheld. Reasons include changes in circumstance in the country of origin, insufficient evidence presented by the Department and poor decisions. The Department is reliant on appeals to overturn poor initial decisions where Asylum is refused. The Department's decision making process would be more effective if it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>collected and analysed data nationally on why appeal cases are being upheld and fed the results back to Case Owners;</li> <li>used the findings of its Quality Assurance Team, and systematic checks by line managers to disseminate good practice to Case Owners and to identify and reverse incorrect decisions;</li> <li>set and published targets to increase the quality, as well as the speed, of initial decisions to help increase public confidence in its decision-making process, and</li> <li>collected and disseminated nationally information on the number of decisions reversed as a result of discussions between its quality auditors and local senior caseworkers.</li> </ul>	<p>The Agency is committed to improving further the quality of decision making and building on the work it is already doing with UNHCR. A dedicated team conducts regular quality assessments and shares their findings with regional teams. This team has now taken on responsibility for auditing appeals work and the same quality auditing mechanisms are used to feed back to case owners on the quality of appeals casework.</p> <p>The Agency reviews asylum decisions when appeals are lodged and does reconsider decisions before the appeal is heard. It has taken further measures to address performance at the appeal stage including creating country-specific working groups to provide expert advice to staff in court and training on specific technical and legal issues, focusing on improving performance.</p> <p>The Agency has established a process in the Midlands and East Region in which legal representation is made available at the asylum decision stage. This process is being monitored to establish the extent to which less appeals result from higher quality decision making and to establish the impact on whole life cycle costs within the asylum system.</p> <p>We are committed to reviewing the asylum system to ensure that <u>better</u> and <u>faster</u> decisions are made.</p>
<p>PAC Conclusion (xi): The Department acknowledged the legacy of underinvestment in IT and new technology. Case Owners use fax machines, paper files, hand-written interview notes and outdated computer systems and will not get a better IT system until 2013. This wastes Case Owner time and carries a risk that personal information could be lost. The Department should continue to develop and expand its use of new technology, for example, digital recording of interviews and electronic information exchange, and prioritise the introduction of those systems which reduce the risk of losing sensitive personal information and increase the productivity of Case Owners.</p>	<p>Modernising the UK Border Agency's case work system is a priority. A new, user friendly and flexible case working and IT system called INTEGRITY is under development by the Immigration Case Work Programme (ICW). INTEGRITY will replace the Agency's current casework systems, including the Case Information Database, with an integrated system that will give case owners access to data from around 20 other related systems via a single screen, and improve the accuracy and speed of decisions. The rollout is being phased over the next two years with the initial release focusing on temporary migration: study visas. A key function will be drawing together all case working interactions between the UK Border Agency and an individual, enabling the caseworker to gain a single accurate view of the customer. INTEGRITY is currently due to be rolled out to asylum from February 2013. We have identified high level requirements which include routing cases electronically; e-bundling, online support applications and utilising rules based technologies. We are currently exploring the benefit of digital transcription coupled with our work on structured decision making. We anticipate that INTEGRITY will facilitate fast accurate decision making through the introduction of automated triggers and tasking.</p>

	We will also establish a document management capability that will enable the UK Border Agency to transition to paperless casework.
PAC Conclusion (xiii): The Department's assurance that it will meet the target to conclude all legacy cases by 2011 is welcome, as some of these old cases may prove challenging. The Department should provide the Committee with a report in 2011, confirming that all legacy cases have been cleared and identifying the lessons learned.	Jonathan Sedgwick, acting Chief Executive, informed the Home Affairs Committee on 5 April that we have now reviewed all of the legacy cases and are due to provide a further update to the Public Accounts Committee in the next few months.
PAC Conclusion (xiv): Backlogs have built up in other areas of the Department's core immigration work. The Department acknowledged that it had pockets of immigration cases awaiting resolution, for example, applications for leave to remain on the basis of marriage to a UK spouse, where decisions have been outstanding over a period of three or four years or more. We look to the Department to conclude these cases and eradicate the backlogs with the same degree of effort and in the same timescales as the legacy asylum cases.	The UK Border Agency has identified a cohort of 40,000 non-asylum cases where the application was made before December 2008 and the cases were held in a Work in Progress store. These are cases where we have dealt with the application, but where we have no formal record that the individual has left the country. Lin Homer, former Chief Executive of the UK Border Agency, reported in her letter to the Home Affairs Select Committee in October 2009 that sampling suggests that the majority of these cases have already been concluded, the nature of these cases, where discrepancies exist between the paper records and our computer systems, mean that each case needs to be individually reviewed to establish its status and whether any further action is required. The Case Resolution Directorate will use the expertise they have developed in making such progress with the older asylum cohort, to effectively review, conclude and, in the cases where individuals cannot be traced, control archive these cases. Other areas of the business are also reviewing their files to ensure any cases of this type are treated consistently. All of these files will be reviewed by Summer 2011.

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT IN THE HOME OFFICE	
Recommendation	Update
<p>PAC Conclusion (ii):</p> <p>The Department is confident that sound financial management is now routine but recognises the need for further improvement. The next step should be to refresh the Department's strategy for finance improvement, focusing particularly on driving greater financial awareness to staff at all levels and in all aspects of the business, and to report its progress to them in its Departmental Annual Report.</p>	<p>Owing to a number of factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the previous success of its courses (with over 60% attending at least three resource management workshops);</li> <li>• the provision of similar courses by NSG (funded by top-slicing Departments); and</li> <li>• the tighter fiscal position,</li> </ul> <p>the Department has continued to offer SCS resource management workshops but at a reduced level.</p> <p>The finance courses for junior staff, developed after a comprehensive Training Needs Analysis, were rolled out during 2010/11 and have proved a great success.</p> <p>A standard finance objective has been provided for all staff together with a checklist for managers to assess performance against.</p> <p>The importance of Financial Management has been at the heart of events designed to prepare people for, and inform people about, the outcome of the Comprehensive Spending Review throughout the year.</p> <p>The Department has monitored the effectiveness of the Financial Improvement Strategy by a self-assessment against the standards of the Chartered Institute of Public</p>

	Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) Model and is now developing a further self assessment tool based on the NAO's Maturity Model.
<p><b>PAC Conclusion (iii):</b></p> <p>The Department faces increasing demands on limited resources and needs a greater understanding of the value gained from expenditure in every area of its business. Operating Reviews have the potential to be an effective mechanism to hold all areas of the business, including arm's length bodies, to account for their use of resources, management of risk and the outcomes achieved. The Department should continue to refine and strengthen the Operational Review process, including by developing enhanced profiling and modelling tools.</p>	<p>The Department has accepted the Committee's recommendation and continued to utilise Operating Reviews as a key tool. All areas of the business continue to be held to account on the delivery of objectives and the effective use of resources.</p> <p>We continue to extend our strong focus on efficiency and value for money, challenging all areas of the business to build on efficiency gains to date and to develop structured cost reduction plans that enable them to reduce costs while maintaining delivery. The Department is undertaking a systematic programme to assure cross-organisational business and savings plans, based on the NAO's Structured Cost Reduction framework. That will help ensure savings are delivered and key services are safeguarded, whilst providing assurance and indicators of areas on which to focus</p> <p>The police QUEST and UK Border Agency/ Home Office Front Runner Continuous Improvement programmes have yielded substantial savings through focussing on operational workforce productivity. Improved efficiency and value for money has also been achieved through greater use of shared services for support functions, commercial and procurement initiatives such as 'Extend and Blend', and reshaping the Home Office workforce to significantly reduce headcount while continuing to deliver key services well.</p>
<p><b>PAC Conclusion (vii):</b></p> <p>The Home Office has only limited mechanisms available to it to hold police forces and police authorities to account for the £5 billion funding it provides for policing, its largest single area of activity. We note the newly enhanced role being developed for HM Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) and look to the Department to use the inspection regimes of HMIC and the Audit Commission to strengthen the accountability exercised by local police authorities, whilst identifying poor performing forces, and to encourage them to improve.</p>	<p>With the introduction of <b>Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs)</b>, the responsibility for performance managing community safety will pass to local areas. Local communities will have the powers, information and tools they need to reconnect with policing and to address the local issues that matter. PCCs will be responsible for challenging performance at a local level, ensuring the Chief Constable is delivering the priorities of the local community and obtaining good value for money. PCCs will work closely with local partners to reduce crime.</p> <p>Performance on crime is being made transparent to support local accountability. All forces are required to publish monthly street level <b>crime and anti-social behaviour data</b>. This information is available at <a href="http://www.police.uk">www.police.uk</a> through street level crime maps, which is helping local communities to engage productively with local forces and to drive up standards.</p> <p>A <b>Police and Crime Panel</b> within each force area will maintain a regular check and balance on the performance of the PCC. The Panel will scrutinise the exercise of the PCC's statutory functions and will be able to ask the PCC to provide information. It has several key powers including the power of veto over the Commissioner's proposed precept and over the Commissioner's proposed candidate for Chief Constable.</p> <p><b>Chief Constables, their officers and local partners</b> will be free to focus on local concerns and those strategic issues which require a collaborative approach. Whitehall</p>

	<p>will not interfere in operational matters; this responsibility sits with Chief Constables who will be held to account by their PCC. Working in partnership the PCC will commission the services they need, to cut crime and improve community safety. The responsibility for performance managing policing within the force will now sit with the Chief Constables, the force as a whole will be held to account through the Chief Constable by the PCC on behalf of the communities that they both serve. Chief Constables and PCCs will be supported in balancing local and national demands through the Strategic Policing Requirement.</p> <p>Beyond these local scrutiny arrangements, expert scrutiny continues from a strengthened Inspectorate (<b>HMIC</b>), which has responsibility for monitoring police performance. They will make performance data transparent to the public and partners. HMIC will take a risk-based approach to inspection and focus its inspection resources on strategic policing issues such as efficiency and value for money, protection from serious harm and crime data integrity.</p> <p>We will be updating the current Financial Management Code of Practice for Police Forces and Authorities ahead of the election of PCCs. This will set out local roles and responsibilities, as well as arrangements for external audit.</p> <p>Following the announcement last Autumn that the audit commission will be disbanded, CLG are currently consulting on proposals for a new audit framework. Police Authority Chairs have been encouraged to feed into that process and we will be working closely with CLG to ensure that the new framework offers an appropriate and robust audit process for Police and Crime Commissioners.</p> <p>The Home Office will not micro manage forces or partnerships from the centre, but will take a more strategic role. The <b>Home Secretary</b> will continue to monitor the national crime risk and will only act where local mechanisms have failed to solve serious or sustained problems. This will be as a last resort in order to protect the public, and we will be open and transparent in doing this. Simultaneously, the Home Office will strip away bureaucracy and information sharing burdens, and will continue to offer partnerships support, through effective practice and encouraging peer support.</p>
<p>PAC Conclusion (x):</p> <p>Newly established bodies did not have the appropriate financial resources, processes or procedures in place at start up to enable them to function effectively. This is a recurring theme and we look to the Treasury to remind Departments to resource new organisations and business areas from start up to carry out their functions effectively.</p>	<p>The Department agreed with the Committee's recommendation. A project was established as part of the finance improvement strategy to examine lessons learned from the Department's experience of newly established bodies. As a result, a support package has been designed, and is in use, to help new organisations with their financial management at inception. The Department also now supports operational and policy business managers apply robust financial management when new business areas are being established, and also as an integral part of the on-going lifecycle management of the bodies.</p>

<b>Tackling Problem Drug Use</b>	
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Update</b>
<p>PAC Conclusion (i): The Government spends £1.2 billion a year on measures aimed at tackling problem drug use, yet does not know what overall effect this spending is having. The Committee welcomes the Department's commitment to evaluating this spending. From 2011, the Department should publish annual reports on progress against the strategy's action plan. These should set out expenditure on each measure, the outputs and outcomes delivered, and progress towards targets.</p>	<p><b>Treasury Minute Response</b></p> <p>The Department agrees with the Committee's conclusion. The drug strategy was not subject to a formal overall evaluation, as a single evaluation of a wide-ranging strategy is not deemed the most suitable form of measurement. This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the strands of the policy, which include drug supply, drug harms, drug markets, young people and treatment are too disparate to be treated as a single piece. It will be very hard to be clear, in an overarching evaluation, exactly what is driving outcomes;</li> <li>• the available data to perform such an evaluation are limited; and</li> <li>• establishing what would have happened without the drug strategy – a necessary component of a robust evaluation - would be very difficult given the variety of policy strands.</li> </ul> <p>A bottom-up approach has therefore been adopted allowing detailed consideration of individual strands of the strategy and monitoring of performance and achievements. An evaluation of the Drug Interventions Programme (DIP)<sup>1</sup>, showed that overall offending fell by 26% amongst the studied cohort, and the <i>Drug Treatment Outcomes Research Study</i><sup>2</sup> (DTORS) which estimated that drug treatment was cost-beneficial in 80% of cases and for every £1 spent on drug treatment, an estimated £2.50 of benefits was obtained.</p> <p>The new Coalition Programme for Government provides an opportunity to review current drug policy and the Department is working with other Government Departments to consider the Government's future approach to drugs, building on the measures specified in the Coalition Agreement. The Government is committed to ensuring that we obtain value for money, and future drug strategy will include options to put in place an evaluative framework, upon which to make a robust assessment of value for money.</p> <p><b>Update – (5/4/11)</b></p> <p>Since the publication of the 2010 Drug Strategy in December, the Department, reporting through the cross-Government Drug Strategy Research Group and the senior officials Drug Strategy Group, has continued to work with other departments with responsibility for delivering key elements of the 2010 strategy. Initial baseline information has been collected on funding arrangements, the existing evidence base and how departments intend to assess the value for money of their spend. The Department is also producing guidance for new research to promote a consistent approach to measurement and evaluation so that</p>

<sup>1</sup> (Skodbo S et al. 2007; *The Drug Interventions Programme: addressing drug use & offending through Tough Choices*; Home Office)

<sup>2</sup> (Source: Jones et al. 2009; Barnard et al. 2009; Davies et al. 2009)

	<p>results from individual evaluations can be combined where possible into a series of meta-evaluations to provide an improved overall value for money figure. This will be an ongoing process throughout the life of the Strategy, as it will take a significant amount of time to evaluate the outcomes of new interventions and approaches to delivery, though new evidence will be incorporated as and when available. Officials have been liaising with the National Audit Office and will meet to discuss progress with them in the next quarter.</p>
<p>PAC Conclusion (ii): Around one-quarter of problem drug users are hard-core offenders who resist measures to reduce their offending or 'drop out' of drug treatment. The Department's action plan should set out specific measures directly aimed at driving down offending by hard-core problem drug users for whom the Drug Interventions Programme and drug treatment does not work.</p>	<p><b>Treasury Minute response</b></p> <p>The Department partially agrees with the Committee's conclusion. The 28% whose offending increased following contact with the Drug Interventions Programme (DIP) may never have gone into treatment following their positive drug test. Hard core offenders do go into treatment and substantially reduce their offending behaviour. Other hard core offenders enter treatment at a later stage. Additionally the 28% of individuals, who tested positive and subsequently increased their offending may be more chaotic offenders, offenders with particularly entrenched criminal behaviours or offenders whose primary motive for offending is not their drug use. The research that produced this figure did not explore the causes for the increase in offending behaviour. Further research has been commissioned to explore this group in more detail.</p> <p>Local Drug Interventions Programmes continue to engage with drug misusers on each occasion that they come into contact with the criminal justice system. The new DIP operating model, which will be implemented by December 2010, re-emphasises DIP as a crime reduction programme focusing on effective, consistent case management to ensure a better grip on individuals to reduce offending. The recently published <i>Continuity of Care</i> guidance sets out arrangements to ensure continuity of care of drug misusing offenders between the Criminal Justice Integrated Teams (CJITs), who deliver DIP in the community, Counselling, Assessment, Referral, Advice and Throughcare teams (CARATs) based in prisons, offender managers and treatment providers. Strengthening these links will lead to offenders being better managed at crucial times, such as on discharge from prison, when the risks of relapse and re-offending are high. Following implementation of the new DIP operating model, a review will be undertaken to establish the impact that it has had and identify good practice to support local schemes.</p> <p>The Department will explore alternative forms of secure, treatment-based accommodation for drugs offenders. Additionally, a review is currently being carried out of the research literature on the effectiveness of programmes that rehabilitate and reintegrate drug-misusing offenders. The review includes interventions aimed at factors relating to housing, education and training, employment, financial support and mental health and will be completed in summer 2010. This will inform wider work on the 'rehabilitation revolution' announced in the Coalition Agreement, whereby independent providers will be paid by results to reduce re-offending.</p> <p>Local areas are adopting Integrated Offender Management approaches, providing a framework that brings together</p>

	<p>their agencies to tackle crime and re-offending focused on the most damaging offenders, identified locally. It builds on offender-focused approaches such as DIP and the Prolific and other Priority Offenders (PPO) scheme, to target and manage offenders of concern; using pooled local resources to turn them away from crime. Additionally, a review of sentencing policy announced in the Coalition Agreement will ensure sentences are effective in cutting re-offending and ensure that drug-misusing offenders are helped to come off drugs.</p> <p><b>Update – (1/4/11)</b></p> <p>We are working with the Department of Health and other government departments to support the design and implementation of innovative pilots to pay providers by results to help offenders to recover from their drug dependence. This will introduce the Local Area Single Assessment and Referral System (LASAR) – a community-based system providing a robust assessment and challenging outcomes for all drug users that providers must achieve before receiving payment. Local areas not involved in the pilots will be encouraged to move towards setting up similar LASARs.</p>
<p>PAC Conclusion (iii): Problem drug users typically relapse several times into further drug use and offending during and after drug treatment. The Department should introduce evidence-based measures to reduce the risk of relapse into drug use and offending. It should identify and implement support measures to enable people to reintegrate into their home environments while resisting temptations and pressures to return to drug use and offending.</p>	<p><b>Treasury Minute response</b></p> <p>The Department partially agrees with the Committee's conclusion. The ultimate goal of all drug treatment is for drug misusers to achieve abstinence. The National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE) has undertaken a full review of the evidence base for treatment and the current UK Clinical Guidelines distil this into a summary of the best current available evidence for effective drug treatment. In addition, a programme of work is in place to improve local clinical governance systems to support the provision of evidence based interventions and in 2010, the National Treatment Agency for Substance Misuse (NTA) launched '<i>Commissioning for Recovery</i>', a guide for local commissioners to ensure that NICE and Orange Book recommendations were procured locally.</p> <p>A number of improvements have been made to the drug treatment system over the last decade such as in access to treatment, with the average waiting time reduced to a week, and a reduction in the number of individuals dropping out of treatment early, building on the expert evidence that drug misusers should spend at least 12 weeks in treatment to derive some benefit. However, the Department of Health accepts that it can do more and will review the current approach.</p> <p>Problematic drug users often form a highly marginalised group that are the furthest from society and therefore face a number of barriers. <i>The 2008 Drug Strategy</i> brought a new focus to the reintegration – or in many cases integration – of drug misusers, specifically focusing on the issues of housing, employment and piloting new ways of working. The Government has identified that addiction is one of the five pathways to poverty and this will create the opportunities to develop this work further to provide the help and support people need to overcome their use of drugs and so get back to work.</p> <p>On housing, Central Government provides Supporting</p>



	<p>People funding. On employment, problematic drug users in the benefits system who self admit are encouraged to access treatment. Those with drug and alcohol problems often face other difficulties in finding work, and the Government will now focus on addressing substance misuse in the wider context of other barriers to employment such as housing and mental health issues. On new ways of working, the System Change Pilots began in April 2009, with the key principle that all partners should combine and integrate their efforts to maximise the outcomes for drug misusers. Whilst these steps are making progress, the Department acknowledges that more progress is required.</p> <p><b>Update – (15/4/11)</b></p> <p>Analysis has shown that individuals who have a successful completion of treatment – leaving free of dependency – have a significantly better chance of not re-presenting back to treatment following a relapse. They are also less likely to be subsequently arrested on a drug related offence. The National Treatment Agency has therefore embarked on a major piece of work to support local partnerships in improving their successful completion rates. From a baseline of 09-10, there has been a 20% increase in the number of successful completions, meaning that around 28,000 people are projected to leave drug treatment having overcome their dependency during 2010-11. In terms of supporting recovery even further by ensuring people in drug treatment have their housing and employment needs met (which the evidence consistently shows is one of the best ways to improve long term outcomes) the DWP took on this challenge following the publication of the 2010 drug strategy and are currently exploring options.</p>
<p>PAC Conclusion (iv): Despite local authorities spending £30 million on housing support for problem drug users in 2008–09, up to 100,000 drug users in England continue to have a housing problem. While accommodating drug users is concerning to those living nearby, evidence shows that by providing them with stable accommodation as part of their rehabilitation programme they are more likely to stop offending. However, there is currently no evidence on the effectiveness of the different measures being used to accommodate problem drug users. It is important that evidence is obtained quickly to establish which housing measures are most effective.</p>	<p><b>Treasury Minute response</b></p> <p>The Department partially agrees with the Committee's conclusion. Central Government provides Supporting People funding to top tier local authorities to enable them to provide housing related support services to a wide range of client groups, which may include people with drug related problems. Supporting People funding is allocated to local authorities as a single budget and does not specify how much should be spent or allocated for specific client groups. The Supporting People programme is a locally delivered and managed programme and strategic decisions about how the funding is used and services to be commissioned are made by the local authority, in conjunction with their partners, in order to meet local needs and priorities.</p> <p>The Department for Communities and Local Government (CLG) commissioned Capgemini in 2008, to undertake a study to assess the financial benefits of the Supporting People programme. Capgemini found that investment in packages of support that include housing support services avoids costs elsewhere, and therefore produces a net financial benefit. Their research estimated that for a £1.61 billion investment in Supporting People, there is a net financial benefit of £3.41 billion. For people with drug problems specifically, a £30.1 million investment was estimated to have a net financial benefit of £157.8 million. This is mainly due to avoiding potential downstream costs relating to residential care (hospitals and residential rehab services).</p> <p><b>Update – (4/4/11)</b></p>

	<p>Housing related support funding is now allocated to local authorities as part of the Local Government Formula Grant. This enables local authorities and their partners to decide how much is spent on housing support services and also which client groups receive the funding based on local needs and priorities.</p> <p>The Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) has also announced £10m funding for Crisis between 2010/11 and 2012/13 to fund voluntary sector-led schemes to improve access to the private rented sector for single homeless people. DCLG is working with the National Treatment Agency to include drug users as a particular client group.</p>
<p>PAC Conclusion (v): Some problem drug users quickly relapse into drug use and reoffending when released from prison. In some intensive Drug Interventions Programme areas, drug key workers meet up to 80% of those prisoners who have received drug treatment in prison at the prison gate to escort them directly to community and treatment services. The strategy should evaluate the impact of this approach in reducing relapse and reoffending rates and the costs and benefits of applying this more widely.</p>	<p><b>Treasury Minute Response</b></p> <p>The Department agrees with the Committee's conclusion. Following on from the review of DIP, the DIP Operational Handbook was published in February 2010. This sets out clear expectations of how DIP services are delivered including the circumstances in which offenders are met at the prison gate, to facilitate their successful engagement in drug treatment on release. This activity was specifically factored into the new funding model for DIP from April 2010, and the expectation is that all CJITs will be delivering against this new model by the end of December 2010.</p> <p>The Government is taking a fresh look at rehabilitation that will seek to ensure that sentencing for drug use helps offenders come off drugs and explore alternative forms of secure, treatment-based accommodation for drug offenders. New approaches will be informed by the prison drug treatment strategy review led by Lord Patel which explores commissioning models for prison drug clinical and psychosocial treatment with the aim to secure better value for money, improved care continuity and a greater impact on re-offending. Similarly, the System Change Pilot programme is evaluating end-to-end case management models of drug misusing offenders. The Lambeth and Essex partnerships are probably the best examples of pilots with a focus on criminal justice outcomes and the National Centre for Social Research (NATCEN) is involved in a full evaluation of all seven pilots.</p> <p>On a national scale, the NTA, Department of Health, National Offender Management Service and the Department are working together on the <i>Data Warehouse</i> project to track relapse and recovery rates of drug misusers as they move through the criminal justice and drug treatment systems. This innovative project will anonymously match clients in different data sets and enable identification of areas delivering high levels of recovery and low rates of recidivism to enable identification of good practice as well as challenge and support for under-performing areas. This longitudinal and comprehensive data set will also allow the generation of cost benefit analysis when cross-tabulated with spend data from local commissioning treatment plans.</p> <p>These initiatives, along with the Integrated Offender Management programme, will contribute to identifying more effective programmes to support drug misusers leaving prison to help further reduce post release re-offending rates.</p>

	<p><b>Update – (1/4/11)</b></p> <p>The Department is currently considering with the Ministry of Justice responses to the <i>Breaking the Link</i> Green Paper which sets out proposals to move towards a position where drug users fully recover from their dependency, and they have fewer opportunities to take drugs while they are in prison. To achieve this, the Green Paper proposes to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• further reduce the availability of illicit drugs in prison and increase the number of drug free environments;</li> <li>• introduce pilots for drug recovery wings in prisons;</li> <li>• explore options to relax the level of detail with which a drug or alcohol treatment requirement must be specified by a court and thereby give providers the flexibility to tailor and deliver the intervention to the offender;</li> <li>• test options for intensive community-based treatment for offenders.</li> </ul> <p>We are also working with the Department of Health and other government departments to support the design and implementation of pilots to pay providers by results to help offenders to recover from their drug dependence.</p>
--	--

## 2011-12

<b>Immigration: the Points Based System - Work Routes</b>	
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Update</b>
1. The Points Based System (the System) is an improvement on the visa system which preceded it but has yet to fully meet its objectives. The System is more transparent to those applying and more adaptable to changing migration needs. It provides an objective basis for decisions, which are reached more quickly than under the previous system. It therefore provides a useful base on which to build. However, the Agency needs to make significant improvements, particularly to encourage greater compliance and improve management information, so that the System works more effectively to meet its objectives. The following recommendations are designed to help meet this end.	<b>N/A</b>
2. The Agency has not done enough to ensure that migrant workers leave the UK when they no longer have a right to remain. It estimates that 181,000 people may have stayed on in the UK after their permission to remain has expired, but it does not have the right information to know if this is an accurate estimate. The Agency should not use the lack of exit controls as an excuse to ignore thousands of people who overstay in this country illegally. It should develop a strategy to identify and deal with those overstaying, including students, workers and others who are in the UK illegally, and report publicly at least once a year on progress in reducing their numbers. We will return to this topic in due course to evaluate progress.	<b>N/A</b>
3. The Agency does not have enough control over whether sponsoring employers comply with	<b>N/A</b>

<p>their duties and does not appear to know where the main risks lie. The Agency does not check regularly through visits to ensure proper compliance with the rules by employers. Until October 2010, the Agency was unable to say how many employers had been visited or the outcomes of these visits. This has undermined its ability to develop a sufficiently robust risk-based approach to monitoring employers. The Agency should improve its ability to assess and address the risk of employers failing to comply with immigration rules by developing better systems and placing greater priority on compliance. It should also review its system of incentives and penalties to encourage better compliance, and consider what incentives it could offer to employers to guarantee their employees' adherence to immigration rules, in particular leaving the country when the visa has expired.</p>	
<p>4. Multi-national organisations are able to send workers from outside the European Economic Area to UK branches through the Intra-Company Transfer route, but we are concerned that the Agency does not have enough control over this route. Up to September 2010, employers have brought in 42,000 IT workers using this route at a time when UK residents with IT skills cannot find work. Unlike other work routes, there is no limit on the number of workers able to use the route. The Department believes that the interests of resident workers are protected through a minimum salary requirement. Since April 2011, this route is available only to workers earning a minimum of £24,000 a year to remain in the UK for 12 months and to workers earning over £40,000 a year to remain in the UK for up to five years. However, employers are able to pay up to 40% of the salary as allowances, which are more difficult to verify. The Agency must ensure that it can verify all salaries accurately and should consider excluding allowances from salaries. Furthermore, we expect the Home Office to monitor this scheme and whether controls are operating adequately, to provide the assurance that it does protect the interests of resident workers.</p>	<p><b>N/A</b></p>
<p>5. There are wide variations in productivity between the Agency's UK-based and overseas operations, and between different regions, which the Agency cannot fully explain. The Agency's visiting officers are not as productive as they should be. The numbers of applications decided per day varies widely between caseworkers working in the UK and overseas offices, and between different offices overseas. In addition, the Agency's visiting officers carry out an average of only 4.5 employer visits a month, compared to the 16 visits the Agency calculates should be possible. The Agency should investigate known areas of difference in productivity and focus greater effort on ensuring that staff in all locations work as productively as possible.</p>	<p><b>N/A</b></p>

<p>6. The number of errors made by applicants creates unnecessary burdens on both applicants and the Agency. Currently, half of migrant applicants seek help through calls to the Agency's helplines, and applications are often rejected for easily correctable errors. Sponsoring employers frequently seek advice from the Agency's enquiry lines or from specialist immigration lawyers. We welcome the Agency's commitment to address these problems by improving its guidance and forms. 'Evidential flexibility', which was introduced to help with this issue, is not applied consistently and is not in place for sponsor licence applications. We also heard that some employers would like to have named immigration caseworkers who could be directly contacted about applications for sponsored workers. The Agency should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. ensure that its staff take a consistent and proactive approach to correcting minor errors and omissions;</li> <li>ii. extend the principle of evidential flexibility to applications from employers; and</li> <li>iii. explore options for improving the service provided to sponsors who are willing to pay for it, for example by providing a single caseworker contact.</li> </ul>	<p><b>N/A</b></p>
<p>7. The Agency does not have the necessary management information on migrant applications to address compliance problems. We welcome the Agency's assurance that its new integrated casework system will provide the information needed to deal with these issues. We note, however, that it will not address weaknesses in the management information available on sponsoring employers or improve the service offered to them. We are also concerned that the changes will not be fully operational until 2013. Over the next two years, while it rolls out the new integrated immigration casework system, the Agency should establish performance measures and determine what management information it needs to manage compliance better across both migrant and sponsor management and ensure that the new systems are able to support these.</p>	<p><b>N/A</b></p>