



Home Office

# **Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 (‘PACE’) Codes of Practice Consultation**

Response to Home Office consultation on  
PACE Code A (Stop and Search)

# Contents

<b>1. Introduction.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2. PACE Code A .....</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1 Rationale .....	4
2.2 Responses.....	4
2.3 Table of Responses.....	5
2.4 Main Themes and Home Office Responses .....	18
2.4.1 General.....	18
2.4.2 Proposed revisions which attracted the most comments:.....	18
<b>3. Next Steps .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>ANNEX: Table of changes .....</b>	<b>20</b>

# 1. Introduction

- 1.1 Section 66 of the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 ('PACE') requires the Home Secretary to issue a number of codes of practice which set out the powers that the police have to combat crime and the associated rights and safeguards for suspects and the public in England and Wales. These must, in particular, cover the following areas:
  - 1.1.1 The exercise by police officers of statutory powers—
    - (a) to search a person without first arresting him;
    - (b) to search a vehicle without making an arrest; or
    - (c) to arrest a person;
  - 1.1.2 the detention, treatment, questioning and identification of persons by police officers;
  - 1.1.3 searches of premises by police officers; and
  - 1.1.4 the seizure of property found by police officers on persons or premises.
- 1.2 Additionally, sections 60(1)(a) and 60A(1)(a) provide for the Home Secretary to issue codes of practice on the audio-recording and visual recording respectively of interviews with individuals suspected of committing a criminal offence.
- 1.3 Section 67(4) of PACE requires that where the Home Secretary wishes to amend the codes, a statutory consultation must first be carried out. This consultation must include:
  - 1.3.1 such persons who appear to her to represent the views of Police and Crime Commissioners;
  - 1.3.2 the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime;
  - 1.3.3 the Common Council of the City of London
  - 1.3.4 the Association of Chief Police Officers of England, Wales and Northern Ireland;
  - 1.3.5 the General Council of the Bar;
  - 1.3.6 the Law Society of England and Wales;
  - 1.3.7 the Institute of Legal Executives; and
  - 1.3.8 such other persons as the Home Secretary thinks fit.
- 1.4 The Home Office has consulted over proposed revisions to PACE Code A (Stop and search). The consultation ran from 26<sup>th</sup> August 2014 to 20<sup>th</sup> October 2014. It sought views on proposed revisions to implement the Government's commitment set out in the Consultation on Stop and Search which is to; *"Revise the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 (PACE) Code of Practice A to make clear what constitutes 'reasonable grounds for suspicion' – the legal basis upon which police officers carry out the vast majority of stops. The revised code will also emphasise that where officers are not using their powers properly they will be subject to formal performance or disciplinary proceedings"* (See <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/stop-and-search>)

- 1.5 Statutory consultation is a critical element in the development of the PACE codes. It helps to ensure that the police continue to have the ability to exercise their powers effectively whilst at the same time ensuring the appropriate safeguards are in place. We are grateful to all those who took the time to consider the proposed revisions and to respond to the consultation.
- 1.6 In August 2014, in addition to the consultation, the Home Secretary launched the “Best Use of Stop and Search” scheme. This scheme will operate within the statutory framework of the revised Code and is designed to contribute to a significant reduction in the overall use of stop and search, deliver better and more intelligence-led stop and search, and improve stop-to-arrest ratios. It will also provide the public with further information on the outcome of searches. For details of the Scheme, see: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/best-use-of-stop-and-search-scheme>
- 1.7 This Government response to the consultation sets out the rationale for making the revisions to Code A, provides a summary of responses and outlines the Government’s proposed next steps.

## 2. PACE Code A

### 2.1 Rationale

2.1.1 The main changes in this draft have been made in order to implement the Government's commitment as set out on the Consultation on Stop and Search which is to *“Revise the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 (PACE) Code of Practice A to make clear what constitutes 'reasonable grounds for suspicion' – the legal basis upon which police officers carry out the vast majority of stops. The revised code will also emphasise that where officers are not using their powers properly they will be subject to formal performance or disciplinary proceedings”* Details of the consultation are published here:

- <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/stop-and-search>)

2.1.2 The existing provisions have been retained. Some have been substantially extended with a number of new provisions being added. To improve the presentation and help understanding, new subheadings have been introduced to break up the provisions and the order in which certain aspects appear has been changed. Other changes for have been made in the interests of clarity, legal accuracy and to reflect current practice.

### 2.2 Responses

2.2.1 We received responses from 21 separate individuals and organisations. These included: six police forces, the National Crime Agency, the College of Policing, the Crown Prosecution Service, legal representative bodies (London Criminal Courts Solicitor's Association and the Chartered Institute of Legal Executives), a Police and Crime Commissioner and a number of campaign and community support groups and organisations which included the African Caribbean Citizens Forum, National Children's Bureau, Network for Police Monitoring, Release, Sikh Awareness Society, Stopwatch, and Release.

2.2.2 Of the total, two indicated acceptance of the changes and made no further comments. The remaining 19 were generally supportive of the great majority of the changes and comprised over 80 comments and suggestions relating to about 25 different provisions. These included general and specific questions and suggestions about particular proposed changes, with some respondents raising the same, or more or less the same, issues. These questions, comments and suggestions and our responses are summarised in the table below. As presented, the table has been pre-sorted according to the relevant paragraph of the Code(s) to which the response relates. It also includes some general and specific observations and comments concerning stop and search which, as outlined in 2.3.3, fell outside the scope of the Code.

2.2.3 The consultation focuses on two aspects – 'reasonable grounds for suspicion' and the effective monitoring and supervision of the exercise of stop and search powers. For this reason, all bar one of the changes in the draft about which comments are invited fall within sections 2 and 5 of the Code. It also means that proposals which would require *substantial* changes to other sections and provisions of the Code or to provisions determined by primary legislation (PACE) are outside the scope of this consultation and could not be considered on this occasion. These responses have been briefly identified and marked as such in the table.

## 2.3 Table of Responses

### Code A: RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION – Summary

4 December 2014

To sort columns: Click on the table, use <Table Tools><Layout><Data> tabs then <Sort> as required.

\*NOTE: The 'From' and Reason/Comment columns includes linked cross references to other responses – to update all, 'Select columns' & press F9.

* No	From – Organisation/ individual	ID No.	Code reference(s)	Response & purpose	Accept Y/N or NR	*Reason/Comment NR= Comment/observation not requiring any general or specific revision to the draft.
1.	Chartered Institute of Legal Executives (CILEX)	16	A General	Suggest including the following: <i>A police officer must have reasonable grounds for stopping and searching someone, such as looking for drugs or a weapon.</i> <i>Reasonable grounds also include the suspect's behaviour, or they can be stopped on the basis of contextual information - such as a high number of burglaries in an area. Officers can also stop people if they match the description of someone wanted.</i>	N	Need to focus on the essential statutory test set out in A2.2
2.	Chartered Institute of Legal Executives (CILEX)	16	A General	Suggestions for some alternative/additional text to improve format &/or style in A1.03, A2.1(a), A2.2, A2.2A, A2.6A, A2.8A, A2.9, A2.11, and A2.15.	NR	
3.	Crown Prosecution Service (CPS)	04	A General	No observations or objections in respect of the intended changes. The revisions have no direct impact on the role of the CPS.	NR	
4.	London Criminal Courts Solicitors' Association (LCCSA)	12	A General	The proposed amendments are in themselves desirable, particularly those which seek to impose accountability upon those police officers, or police areas, that systematically disregard the relevant criteria when conducting stop and searches.	NR	
5.	National Children's Bureau (NCB)	10	A General	Include reference to the duty of police forces under the Children Act 2004.	Y	Reference to s.11 CA 2004 included in A1.1
6.	Police - British Transport Police	05	A General	Although the further detail in relation to reasonable grounds is welcomed, it still open to interpretation by officers. Recommended that many areas of poor practice could be eliminated with a clear definition of 'reasonable grounds to suspect'	NR	Training issue for consideration by College of Policing.
7.	Police - College of Policing	13	A General	Various observations, discussions and suggestions concerning A1.1, A1.3, A1.4, A2.2, A2.2A, A2.2B, A2.4, A2.6A, A2.8A, A2.9, A2.11, A3.1, A3.3, A3.6, A3.8, A3.11, A4.1, A4.2, A4.2A, A4.6, A5.5 and related observations on Notes 1, 16, 18, 19 and 22A. <b>Note:</b> The above either: (a) propose significant changes which go beyond the intended specified scope of the consultation or (b) are more appropriate for training & operational Guidance.	NR See <b>Note:</b> in column to the left.	To be forwarded to NPL (S & S) We will work with the CoP to address the training implications
8.	Police - Metropolitan	07	A General	No additions or comments.	NR	
9.	Police - National Crime Agency (NCA)	19	A General	Stop and search powers are used fairly infrequently by NCA officers. Changes will however be incorporated in NCA operational policy.	NR	
10.	Police and Crime Commissioner - Northumbria	20	A General	The review of Stop and Search has resulted in a detailed and welcome discussion, one which I feel can only benefit police and community relations. As Police Crime Commissioner I welcome the proposed new guidance but would like to ensure that ongoing scrutiny of the Stop and Search process, at a national and local level remains a high priority.		

* No	From – Organisation/ individual	ID No.	Code reference(s)	Response & purpose	Accept Y/N or NR	*Reason/Comment NR= Comment/observation not requiring any general or specific revision to the draft.
11.	Release	18	A General	Overall the amendments seem sensible and there is a clear effort to make these provisions clearer and more accessible to police officers.	NR	
12.	Sikh Awareness Society	11	A General	<p>Comments and suggestions concerning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The law on offensive weapons and articles carried for religious purposes, such as Kirpans.</li> <li>British Transport Police proposals to include in their Stop and Search Strategy Manual a section dealing with items being carried for religious purposes.</li> <li>Police training and inclusion of 'community engagement'.</li> </ul> <p><u>Note:</u> The above matters go beyond the intended specified scope of the consultation and the Code.</p>	NR See <u>Note:</u> in column to the left.	Code cannot amend primary legislation. BTP Operational Guidance is matter for chief officer & outside scope of Code A. Comments/suggestions to be forwarded to HO Tackling Crime Unit & CoP.
13.	STOPWATCH	17	A General	Additional Observations:		
14.	Leicester De Montfort Law School	02	A1.1 Note 1A	For clarity and completeness, include reference to section 4-12 of the Equality Act 2010 which define protected characteristics and add 'marriage and civil partnership' to make the list exhaustive. Amend cross reference to read A2.2B(a).	Y - insofar as providing clarification	Note 1A extended to include full list of 'protected characteristics' taken from section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. Cross reference amended
15.	STOPWATCH	17	A1.03	Scope of the Code should be extended to include 'stop and account' with: (a) additional cross references to A2.11, A4.12 and Note 22A; and (b) additional text which defines/describes 'stop and account'.	(a) Y  (b) N.	(a) cross references to A2.11 & 4.12 added. (b) Unnecessary duplication.
16.	STOPWATCH	17	A1.4	Amend to state that the officer <u>must</u> explain.	N	Requirement to explain established & clarified in A3.8.
17.	Chartered Institute of Legal Executives (CILEX)	16	A1.5	Request clarification as to why A1.5 states 'an officer must not search a person, even with his or her consent, where no power to search is applicable'. As long as consent or authority is adequately evidenced (in a note book or recorded on body camera) officers should not be precluded from carrying out searches by consent.	NR	Inserted in Code A in August 2004. Resolves concern that a person confronted by a constable who asks for their consent to carry out a search, is may well feel compelled to submit and so that that their consent would not be fully informed and freely given.
18.	Release	18	A2.1	Confirm that the references to s.1 of PACE & s.23 of the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971 are not an exhaustive list of powers requiring prior reasonable grounds for suspicion.	N	'Such as' makes this clear.
19.	African Caribbean Citizens Forum (ACCF)	06	A2.2	Clarify the circumstances under which the officer must be able to explain the basis of their suspicion. Explanation should be to the person to be searched.	Y - insofar as providing clarification.	Cross references to A3.8(a) & A5.5 added. Requirement to explain established & clarified in A3.8. A3.8(d) extended. See STOPWATCH (ID 17) No.23 See NETPOL (ID 15) No.41 See Release (ID 18) No.43

* No	From – Organisation/ individual	ID No.	Code reference(s)	Response & purpose	Accept Y/N or NR	*Reason/Comment NR= Comment/observation not requiring any general or specific revision to the draft.
20.	College of Policing	13	A2.2	The Code should contain a clear statement that “A stop and search must not be carried out based simply on (what the officer believes to be) the smell of cannabis, as this does not provide sufficient reasonable grounds that the person might be in possession of a controlled drug.	N	The two stage test sets the framework within which individual officers must decide whether there are reasonable ground for suspicion.
21.	Leicester De Montfort Law School	02	A2.2	Suggest an explanation along the lines used in a 1970 judgment suspicion as “a state of conjecture or surmise where proof is lacking”.	N	Need to focus on the two stage test & matters which officer must explain to the person concerned and to use terminology which understood operationally by the police.
22.	Release	18	A2.2	Amend to require the officer <u>to explain</u> to the person rather, than <u>to be able to explain</u>	Y - insofar as providing clarification.	Cross references to A3.8(a) & A5.5 added. Requirement to explain established & clarified in A3.8. A3.8(d) extended. See ACCF (ID 6) No.19 See NETPOL (ID 15) No.41 See STOPWATCH (ID 17) No.23
23.	STOPWATCH	17	A2.2	Amend to require the officer <u>to explain</u> to the person, rather than <u>to be able to explain</u> .	Y - insofar as providing clarification.	Cross references to A3.8(a) & A5.5 added. Requirement to explain established & clarified in A3.8. A3.8(d) extended. See also: ACCF (ID 6) No.19 NETPOL (ID 15) No.41 Release (ID 18) No.43
24.	London Criminal Courts Solicitors’ Association (LCCSA)	12	A2.2(ii)	For consistency, reinstate reference to ‘information &/or intelligence’	Y	Reinstated in A2.02 & elsewhere.
25.	Leicester De Montfort Law School	02	A2.2A	For clarity amend to begin “ <u>The use of</u> stop and search powers depends_ ...”	Y - insofar as providing clarification	A2.2 amended Refer to “The exercise of...”
26.	Leicester De Montfort Law School	02	A2.2A Note 1B	Note 1B, last sentence - grammar.	Y	Corrected
27.	Member of the public (JM)	03	A2.2A Note 1B	Should make it clear if “guilty knowledge” is a simplified term of mens rea.	N	Sufficiently clear from the context of <i>Note 1B</i> .



* No	From – Organisation/ individual	ID No.	Code reference(s)	Response & purpose	Accept Y/N or NR	*Reason/Comment NR= Comment/observation not requiring any general or specific revision to the draft.
28.	National Children’s Bureau (NCB)	10	A2.2A Note 1B	(a) Extend reference to safeguarding procedures for under 10s to include all under 18s; (b) Include additional requirements when under 10s are stopped and searched: (i) inform parent/guardian if their child is to be searched; (ii) forward copy of the search record to the force child protection team for referral to local children’s services where appropriate.  <b>Note:</b> (b) above proposes significant procedural changes which go beyond the intended specified scope of this consultation.	(a) Y (b) N See <b>Note:</b> in column to the left.	(a) see new Note 1BA. (b)(i) Not practicable if there was risk of injury or harm if search delayed. (b) (i) & (ii) Specific operational requirements for chief officers to consider in the context of their force ‘safeguarding’ procedures. Referred to NPL (S & S) & CoP to consider as in (b).
29.	Release	18	A2.2A Note 1B	Incorporate extract from 2006 ACPO Guidance re stopping and searching children: <i>“Stopping and searching young or vulnerable persons can be particularly intimidating for them. Officers must clearly communicate the grounds for the search using simple and easy to understand language, and check that the person has understood the grounds before continuing with the search.”</i>	NR	Outside the intended scope of the consultation. However, this will be considered with the CoP in context of APP on S & S.  See also: STOPWATCH (ID 17) No.30 & NCB (ID 10) No.82(c).
30.	STOPWATCH	17	A2.2A Note 1B	Incorporate 2006 extract from ACPO Guidance on stopping and searching children: <i>“Stopping and searching young or vulnerable persons can be particularly intimidating for them. Officers must clearly communicate the grounds for the search using simple and easy to understand language, and check that the person has understood the grounds before continuing with the search.”</i>	NR	Outside the intended scope of the consultation. However, this will be considered with the CoP in context of APP on S & S.  See also: Release (ID 18) No.29 NCB (ID 10) No.82(c).
31.	African Caribbean Citizens Forum (ACCF)	06	A2.2B	Suggest the term ‘stereotypical image’ should be replaced by more precise wording such as stereotypical preconceptions or perceptions and specific examples included.	N	Term used since 1991 reflects common use. Examples could narrow its scope, best left for training. See also ACCF (ID 6) No.68
32.	Release	18	A2.2B	Clarify that the list of personal factors is not exhaustive.	Y	Amended to provide exhaustive list.
33.	STOPWATCH	17	A2.2B A2.6	Stereotyping may conflict with A2.6.	N	A2.6 concerns more specific discrete groups. See CoP (ID 13) No.42
34.	Police - College of Policing	13	A2.2B(a)	Consider including religion.	Y	Religion included as example.
35.	Release	18	A2.4	Reiteration of the need for information that is relied upon to be current and accurate and examples of what information received from the public may constitute this, is helpful. Also need additional specific reference to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What might be considered inaccurate, outdated or irrelevant information,</li> <li>• The fact that some information may be false or malicious</li> <li>• The need to check the intelligence files for any entries regarding incorrect information.</li> </ul>	N	Following A2.8A, police must weed out what is not accurate and not current. Not necessary to duplicate this by stating the converse.

* No	From – Organisation/ individual	ID No.	Code reference(s)	Response & purpose	Accept Y/N or NR	*Reason/Comment NR= Comment/observation not requiring any general or specific revision to the draft.
36.	STOPWATCH	17	A2.4	Inclusion of examples of genuine and well founded reasonable grounds for suspicion are welcomed.	NR	
37.	STOPWATCH	17	A2.4A	Concerned that this paragraph provides for area-based searches, and as currently drafted could act as an encouragement to search anyone who is in the particular area. We recommend that the paragraph be redrafted	N	Does not override requirement for individual grounds or undermine s.60 CJPO powers. Concerns deployment and briefing of officers.
38.	STOPWATCH	17	A2.4B A2.5B	Suggest two additional paragraphs along the following lines: Officers should ensure that information on which searches are based – including suspect descriptions – is <i>accurate, reliable</i> and <i>specific</i> . Where descriptions are provided, every effort should be made to ensure that the person stopped does in fact fit the description of the suspected person.	N	Unnecessarily prescriptive –Officers must assess the information according to test in A2.2 & those responsible for the deployment of officers and the accuracy/currency of the information available as in A2.4A & 2.8A.
39.	African Caribbean Citizens Forum (ACCF)	06	A2.6	Extend reference to organised protest groups carrying articles to cause criminal damage to include groups carrying weapons.	Y	New A2.6A extended to cover groups carrying weapons. See also: CoP (ID 13) No.42 NETPOL (ID 15) No.41 STOPWATCH (ID 17) No.44 Release (ID 18) No. 43
40.	Member of the public (JM)	03	A2.6	Searching protest groups should only be authorised by a senior officer as a part of a wider operation. It should not be left to the discretion of individual constables unless seeking authorisation is unreasonable and officer has genuine reliable information or intelligence that article will be found.	N	A2.6 amended to clarify application to protest groups. Separate authorisation could have significant operational implication which would require separate consideration by the police.
41.	Network for Police Monitoring (NETPOL)	15	A2.6	Protest Groups. The additional text should be deleted to remove the extension to protest groups.	N	Code A cannot ignore current case law. New A2.6A/Note 9A clarify application to protest groups. See also: ACCF (ID 6) No.39 CoP (ID 13) No.42 See STOPWATCH (ID 17) No.15 See Release (ID 18) No. 43

* No	From – Organisation/ individual	ID No.	Code reference(s)	Response & purpose	Accept Y/N or NR	*Reason/Comment NR= Comment/observation not requiring any general or specific revision to the draft.
42.	Police - College of Policing	13	A2.6 A2.2B	Suggest deleting provisions concerning gangs and protest groups as it seems to conflict with A2.2B with regard to not relying on generalisations or stereotypical images.	N	A2.6 concerns more specific discrete groups. See STOPWATCH (ID 17) No.33 Code A cannot ignore current case law. (a) A2.6 amended to refer to purpose for which clothing etc. worn, (b) New A2.6A to deal with protest groups with more detailed provisions supported by new Note 9A. See also: ACCF (ID 6) No.39 NETPOL (ID 15) No.41 Release (ID 18) No.43
43.	Release	18	A2.6	The provisions which relate to protest groups should be limited to occasions where there is intelligence that a specific person or persons is in possession of a relevant article at a particular meeting.	Y - insofar as providing clarification.	Code A cannot ignore current case law. New A2.6A/Note 9A clarify application to groups See also: ACCF (ID 6) No.39 CoP (ID 13) No.42 NETPOL (ID 15) No.41 STOPWATCH (ID 17) No.44
44.	STOPWATCH	17	A2.6	Gangs and protest groups. Suggest additional safeguards:- (a) for gang member identification. By including: "It is important that the item of clothing or other means of identification is specific to the set of individuals in question and not one that is more widely adopted by a section of the community. Where it is more generally in use the officer must have other grounds to justify his or her suspicion that the individual to be stopped and search is a member of the set of individuals in question." (b) for protest groups; either (i) deleting new text or (ii) if it is retained, re-drafting to make clear that, apart from exceptional circumstances, individuals cannot be searched simply on the basis that they are part of a protest group about whom there is intelligence that <u>limited</u> numbers of its members may bring articles intended to be used to cause criminal damage.	(a) Y  (b) (i) N (ii) Y insofar as providing clarification.	(a) A2.6 amended to refer to purpose for which clothing etc. worn, (b) New A2.6A to deal with protest groups with more detailed provisions supported by new Note 9A. See also: ACCF (ID 6) No.39 NETPOL (ID 15) No.41 Release (ID 18) No.43
45.	African Caribbean Citizens Forum (ACCF)	6	A2.6A	Clarification required as to the circumstances under which the officer must be able to explain the basis of their suspicion. Should be to the person to be searched.	Y - insofar as providing clarification.	Add cross references to A3.8(a) & A5.5, extend A3.8(d)

* No	From – Organisation/ individual	ID No.	Code reference(s)	Response & purpose	Accept Y/N or NR	*Reason/Comment NR= Comment/observation not requiring any general or specific revision to the draft.
46.	STOPWATCH	17	A2.6A	Addition of the last two sentences welcomed. They are an essential clarification to guide the clarification of the formation of reasonable grounds for suspicion.	NR	
47.	STOPWATCH	17	A2.9 A2.11	<p>(a) A2.9 &amp; 2.11 should be re-drafted to differentiate detention under a statutory power and a non-statutory encounter ('stop and account') new sub headings.</p> <p>(b) Include requirement in A2.9 for pre-search information to include a warning that if questions to decide whether to carry out a search are answered, a search may not be necessary.</p> <p>(c) Include restriction in A2.11 that encounters should not be initiated for the sole purpose of finding grounds to search together with a prescriptive list of matters that cannot of themselves provide grounds for a search.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> The above propose significant changes which go beyond the intended specified scope of the consultation. These matters will therefore be considered separately.</p>	N See <b>Note:</b> in column to the left.	<p>(a) Cross reference to A4.12 with preceding sub heading is sufficient to distinguish the two aspects.</p> <p>(b) Unnecessary duplication of A3.8. Also implies the potentially oppressive converse i.e. if questions are not answered, they will be searched. Decision is an operational matter for the officer according to the circumstances. A 'pseudo' caution is not appropriate.</p> <p>(c) Decision is for the officer based on the test in A2.2.</p>
48.	African Caribbean Citizens Forum (ACCF)	06	A2.11	In addition to informing the person that they are being detained for the purpose of a search, they should also be informed of the grounds.	Y - insofar as providing clarification.	Reference to A3.8 to 3.11 added.
49.	Leicester De Montfort Law School	02	A2.26	Grammar	Y	
50.	Leicester De Montfort Law School	02	A2.27 heading	For clarity, insert "persons" in the sub heading.	Y	
51.	Police - Hertfordshire	09	A2.28A	Request more clarity about what is meant by 'duty' on local Senior Officers to ensure that those under their command who exercise stop and search powers have access to information and about what the consequences of failing in this 'duty' would be. Is this duty linked to the Code of Ethics and if it is, suggest re-enforcing the link between the code and stop & search.	NR	Refer to NPL(S & S) & CoP to consider need for additional guidance to assist forces.
52.	STOPWATCH	17	A3.1	Add "Officers must always explain the grounds for the search and the basis for their suspicion."	N	Duplicates A3.8 & would not apply to the s.60 CJOA power
53.	Leicester De Montfort Law School	02	A3.2	Include reference to s.117 of PACE to make it clear that the use of force is what the law allows rather than merely what the Code states.	N	The Code accurately reflects the law. S.117 PACE confined to the constable's powers under PACE where s.1 is the <u>only</u> stop and search power. A PSCO's powers (Annex C) to use force arise from the Police Reform Act 2002 not PACE.

* No	From – Organisation/ individual	ID No.	Code reference(s)	Response & purpose	Accept Y/N or NR	*Reason/Comment NR= Comment/observation not requiring any general or specific revision to the draft.
54.	STOPWATCH	17	A3.2	Proposal to substantially extend the existing provision dealing with the use of force to include detailed considerations and analysis of current law. <b>Note:</b> The above propose significant changes which go beyond the intended specified scope of the consultation. These matters will therefore be considered separately.	N See <b>Note:</b> in column to the left.	A3.2 is sufficient to cover the main points for the purposes of the Code. Referred to CoP to consider in the context of current guidance on use of force
55.	Leicester De Montfort Law School	02	A3.8 – A3.11	Code should make it clear that a failure to comply with the requirements under ‘Steps to be taken prior to a search’ will make the search unlawful.	Y - insofar as providing clarification re evidence & misuse.	New A1.6 covering evidential consequences of non-compliance. In A1.4, cross references to A5.5/5.6 added to cover misuse.
56.	National Children’s Bureau (NCB)	10	A3.8	Require all persons to be informed of complaints procedures prior to or following any stop & search. <b>Note:</b> The above proposes a significant procedural change which goes beyond the intended specified scope of the consultation. These matters will therefore be considered separately.	N See <b>Note:</b> in column to the left.	Provided for in the ‘Community complaints trigger’ element of the voluntary Best Use of Stop and Search Scheme see <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/best-use-of-stop-and-search-scheme">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/best-use-of-stop-and-search-scheme</a> .
57.	STOPWATCH	17	A3.8(d)	After A3.8(d)(i) insert (ii) the objective basis for the officer’s suspicion that the person is in possession of this article or articles by reference to intelligence or information about, or some specific behaviour by the person concerned;	Y - insofar as providing clarification.	Include similar requirement in current A3.8(d)(ii) by extending 3 <sup>rd</sup> bullet point.
58.	Police - College of Policing	13	A3.8(e)(ii) A4.2B	Since arrests are already subject to their own recording provisions they should be kept separate from stop search records. A stop search record should still be made following arrest but there should be a requirement to link the custody reference number with that search record.	N	Code reflects the statutory requirement in s.3(2)(a)PACE introduce in March 2011 which the Code cannot amend. A police operational IT issue.
59.	Police – West Yorkshire	14	A3.8(e)(ii) A4.2B	The requirement for the search record to be made as part of the custody record should be amended to avoid the need for search records to be extracted from custody records. This would reduce bureaucracy, improve accuracy of stop and search data and reduce risks to data integrity.	N	Code reflects the statutory requirement in s.3(2)(a)PACE introduce in March 2011 which the Code cannot amend. A police operational IT issue.

* No	From – Organisation/ individual	ID No.	Code reference(s)	Response & purpose	Accept Y/N or NR	*Reason/Comment NR= Comment/observation not requiring any general or specific revision to the draft.
60.	Chartered Institute of Legal Executives (CILEX)	16	A4.3A	Paragraph 4.3A of the Code indicates that 'for the purpose of completing the search record, there is no requirement to record the name, address and date of birth of the person searched...'. This does not allow an officer verify the identity of a searched person. Recording the details also protects the officer in case of complaint about police action	N	Stop & search must not be seen/used as a device to routinely carry out checks on those who are searched but not suspected of any offence. See also: Northumbria PCC (ID 20) No.65. CoP (ID13) No.62 Herts (ID 9) No.63 Northumbria Pol (ID 21) No.64
61.	National Children's Bureau (NCB)	10	A4.3A	Add a requirement to record the date of birth of a person under the age of 18. If not provided, a visual estimate should be recorded. <b>Note:</b> The above proposes a significant procedural change which goes beyond the intended specified scope of the consultation. These matters will therefore be considered separately.	N	The recording requirements in Code A have to be consistent with section 3 of PACE (as amended) which reflects the parliamentary intention to reduce the police bureaucracy surrounding the recording process.
62.	Police - College of Policing	13	A4.3A	Not requiring personal details to be recorded has resulted in less accountability by officers conducting stop searches. Officers should have to make it clear to someone subject to a stop search that they do not have to provide any personal details and that there will be no adverse consequences for not providing such details. It should also be made clear to the person searched that they will still be provided with a search record/receipt if they decline to provide personal details.	N	The recording requirements in Code A have to be consistent with section 3 of PACE (as amended) which reflects the parliamentary intention to reduce the police bureaucracy surrounding the recording process. See also: Northumbria PCC (ID 20) No.65. CILEX (ID 16) No.60 Herts (ID 9) No.63 Northumbria Pol (ID 21) No.64

* No	From – Organisation/ individual	ID No.	Code reference(s)	Response & purpose	Accept Y/N or NR	*Reason/Comment NR= Comment/observation not requiring any general or specific revision to the draft.
63.	Police - Hertfordshire	09	A4.3A	Request clarification concerning the additional line .... <i>and they should not be asked to provide it solely for the purpose of completing the record</i> ". This does nothing to clarify the situation as there are no requirements in law to give or obtain personal details. The only possible reason the details could be requested is to complete the record. It may well lead to officers feeling they can never ask for the details of the person searched. It would be better to say something like: <i>There is nothing to stop officers asking for the information but should inform the person searched there is no requirement in law for them to provide it</i>	Y - insofar as providing clarification.	A2.2B precludes the use of personal factors to establish grounds to search & the Code does not require routine requests for personal details to carry out a PNC check. Word 'solely' deleted to reflect s.3(2)(a)PACE which does not require personal details to be included in the search record. The alternative suggested would allow a person to be asked for the details without making it clear that they are not needed to complete the record.  'Intelligence gathering & recording is an operational matter for the police and guidance on it is outside the scope of Code A.  See also: Northumbria PCC (ID 20) No.65.  CILEX (ID 16) No.60  CoP (ID13) No.62  Northumbria Pol (ID 21) No.64
64.	Police - Northumbria	21	A4.3A	Concerned about the impact on intelligence gathering opportunities and the potential for confusion with regards to the seeking of personal details other than for recording purposes, in particular: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the negative impact on the ability to make use of the product of stop and search for intelligence purposes.</li> <li>• the statement, "they should not be asked to provide [this information] <i>solely</i> for the purpose of completing the record", has the potential to cause confusion for officers with regards to whether they should record a person's details. For example should a person be subject to a routine check prior to a stop and search, will the fact that personal details were obtained result in a breach of Code A? Further clarity on this point would be appreciated.</li> </ul>	NR	A2.2B precludes the use of personal factors to establish grounds to search & the Code does not require routine requests for personal details to carry out a PNC check. Word 'solely' deleted to reflect s.3(2)(a)PACE which does not require personal details to be included in the search record.  'Intelligence gathering & recording is an operational matter for the police and guidance on it is outside the scope of Code A.  See also: Northumbria PCC (ID 20) No.65.  CILEX (ID 16) No.60  CoP (ID13) No.62  Herts (ID 9) No.63

* No	From – Organisation/ individual	ID No.	Code reference(s)	Response & purpose	Accept Y/N or NR	*Reason/Comment NR= Comment/observation not requiring any general or specific revision to the draft.
65.	Police and Crime Commissioner - Northumbria	20	A4.3A	<p>Concerned that if officers cannot ask for the personal details solely for the purpose of recording the search, this:</p> <p>(a) will impact adversely on the oversight and governance of complaints and proportionality of stop and search by not being able to link a complainant to a particular stop and search if no details are shown on the record and on using records for intelligence purposes by linking a known individual subject of stop and search to a pattern of crimes which may emerge in an area they have been stopped.</p> <p>(b) might cause confusion for officers with regards to whether they should record a person's details e.g. Officers may formulate the opinion that they have reasonable grounds to stop and search a person but carry out a check of that person using information systems to support or negate the need to actually search. Would that be classed as provision solely for the purposes of the stop and search record and therefore a breach of Code A?</p> <p>(c) will create a reputational risk if we are unable to make appropriate use of the intelligence opportunities afforded by recording the details of those persons subject to stop and search.</p> <p>(d) will, given the statement, "they should not be asked to provide [this information] solely for the purpose of completing the record", creates a risk of officers breaching code A and being subject to disciplinary proceedings in understanding when they may ask for the personal details of the person concerned.</p>	NR	<p>(a) &amp; (c) maintain links via accurate recording of date time and place and descriptions plus provision of suitable record on the spot.</p> <p>(b) &amp; (d) A2.2B precludes the use of personal factors to establish grounds to search &amp; the Code does not require routine requests for personal details to carry out a PNC check. Word 'solely' deleted to reflect s.3(2)(a)PACE which does not require personal details to be included in the search record.</p> <p>'Intelligence gathering &amp; recording is an operational matter for the police and guidance on it is outside the scope of Code A.</p> <p>See also: CILEX (ID 16) No.60 CoP (ID13) No.62 Herts (ID 9) No.63 Northumbria Pol (ID 21) No.64</p>
66.	Release	18	A4.3A	<p>As a person detained for a search is under no obligation to provide their name, address and date of birth and should not be asked to provide it solely for the purpose of completing the stop-search record, it should be made clear that an officer cannot demand this information. The Code could go even further and state that officers have no right to examine or record details from any of an individual's identity documents which may be found during the search.</p>	N	<p>The restriction on not asking for personal detail to complete the record is sufficient. Supported by A2.2B which precludes use of personal factors to establish grounds to search. Misuse of powers falls under A5.1 to 5.6. Additional details not appropriate.</p>
67.	STOPWATCH	17	A4.3A	<p>The introduction of guidance on when a person is obliged to provide their name and address is welcomed. We recommend including guidance on when officers can justifiably use s.50 Police Reform Act 2002 to require a person acting in an anti-social manner to give their name and address.</p>	N	<p>A4.3A is confined to stop &amp; search records. Not necessary or appropriate to add a non-exhaustive list of other provisions which make it an offence for a person not to provide their name and address e.g. s.165 RTA 1988</p>



* No	From – Organisation/ individual	ID No.	Code reference(s)	Response & purpose	Accept Y/N or NR	*Reason/Comment NR= Comment/observation not requiring any general or specific revision to the draft.
68.	African Caribbean Citizens Forum (ACCF)	06	A5.1	Suggest the term ‘stereotypical image’ should be replaced by more precise wording such as stereotypical preconceptions or perceptions and specific examples included.	Y - insofar as providing clarification.	Existing term reflects established use. Examples could narrow its scope. See also ACCF (ID 6) No.31
69.	Police - Durham	08	A5.1, A5.5 - A5.6 General	Action to deal with misuse and abuse of powers should be distinguished from performance issues. Poor judgement, decision making and genuine mistakes should not be classed as abuse and should be dealt with by less rigid methods such as advice, guidance, training, etc.	N	Matter for training /guidance. Refer to PIPU Police Misconduct & Complaints Team & CoP to consider guidance/training for police.
70.	Police - College of Policing	13	A5.1	Code A could state that supervisors would be expected to take action where they are not satisfied.	N	Excessively prescriptive for the Code. Refer to PIPU Police Misconduct & Complaints Team & CoP to consider guidance for police.
71.	Police - College of Policing	13	A5.3 A5.4	Consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Placing a requirement on forces to make data available publically; and</li> <li>• Requiring forces to take action to address community concerns (when appropriate).</li> </ul>	N	Provided for in the ‘Community complaints trigger’ element of the voluntary Best Use of Stop and Search Scheme. Evaluation of Scheme necessary before such changes are made to the Code.
72.	National Children’s Bureau (NCB)	10	A5.4 Note 19	In Note 19, include children and young people in those who should be consulted for the purposes of any public scrutiny.	Y	Note 19 extended.
73.	Chartered Institute of Legal Executives (CILEX)	16	A5.5 A5.6	Disciplinary action should only occur if there was no genuine belief that an object/item will be found. The Code must not restrain officers from taking action from fear of complaint or disciplinary action if they make an honest mistake.	NR	Matter for training /guidance. Refer to PIPU Police Misconduct & Complaints Team & CoP to consider guidance/training for police.
74.	Police – Derbyshire (Individual officer)	01	A5.5 - A5.6 General	Concern expressed that the new provisions on performance monitoring and misconduct might deter officers from the proper exercise of stop and search powers.	NR	Refer to PIPU Police Misconduct & Complaints Team & CoP for guidance.
75.	STOPWATCH	17	A5.5 A5.6	Concerned that sanctions are left to the supervising officer’s discretion and that there is a lack of clarity on what sanctions are available. Recommend much clearer guidance on the sanctions available for officers who consistently to misuse the power of stop and search and that officers who persistently fail to record their reasonable grounds to search or exercise their powers unlawfully or in discriminatory manner should have their powers to stop and search suspended until they have undergone thorough retraining.	N	A requirement that the police officer’s use of a statutory power of stop and search would be unlawful until further training was received would require an amendment to primary legislation. This cannot be achieved by changing the Code. Refer to PIPU Police Misconduct & Complaints Team & CoP to consider guidance for police.
76.	Police - College of Policing	13	A5.6	There is scope for Code A to reiterate the emphasis in the Code of Ethics about officers and staff needing to raise concerns about the practices of colleagues.	N	Link to Code added to A5.6 See LDMLS (ID 02) No. 78

* No	From – Organisation/ individual	ID No.	Code reference(s)	Response & purpose	Accept Y/N or NR	*Reason/Comment NR= Comment/observation not requiring any general or specific revision to the draft.
77.	African Caribbean Citizens Forum (ACCF)	06	A5.6	Recommend that the Home Office and College of Policing consider how officers who do not fulfil their obligations lawfully should be deal with.	NR	Refer to PIPU Police Misconduct & Complaints Team & CoP for guidance.
78.	Leicester De Montfort Law School	02	A5.6	Add link to the “Code of Ethics” to assist public understanding	Y	Link added
79.	Police - Hertfordshire	09	A5.6	Concerned that that formal action is required even for minor breaches which would be best dealt with by supervisory support. Supervising officers appear to have no discretion and there is a risk that the supervisor may not address the issue for fear of invoking a disproportionate response.	NR	Refer to PIPU Police Misconduct & Complaints Team & CoP for guidance.
80.	Police - College of Policing	13	Annex A	Consider reordering this list so that PACE Sec. 1 is first on the list, followed by powers relating to weapons, firearms and drugs so that the most commonly used search powers appear first.	N	Annex follows convention of listing statutes chronologically avoid any need to prioritise.
81.	Police - Metropolitan	07	Annex A5	Amend following the repeal of section 27(1) Aviation Security Act 1982.	Y	Superseded by s.24B Aviation Security Act 1982
82.	National Children’s Bureau (NCB)	10	Other matters	<p><i>(a) HM Inspectorate of Constabulary’s thematic inspection on crime data integrity.</i> Recommend that HMIC reviews the effectiveness of recording mechanisms for stop and search and the feasibility of recording a visual estimation of a child’s age where date of birth is not given or is unknown.</p> <p><i>(b) Home Office and the College of Policing Best Use of Stop and Search Scheme:</i> For under 18s, the ‘<i>requirement on forces to record and publish a broader range of outcomes which could follow on from a stop and search encounter</i>’ should focus on ensuring that forces are able to present accurate statistics on the number of under 18s stopped and searched, including the result in an arrest, summons, requirement to attend a voluntary interview, or confiscation of drugs or a weapon.</p> <p><i>(c) The College of Policing should be commissioned to publish Authorised Professional Practice (APP) to provide more detailed guidance on the use of stop and search on children and young people.</i></p>	NR	<p>(a) Refer for HMIC/P to consider</p> <p>(b)/(c) Refer to NPL(S &amp; S) &amp; CoP to consider need for additional guidance to assist forces.</p> <p>See also: STOPWATCH (ID 17) No.30 Release (ID 18) No.29</p>

## 2.4 Main Themes and Home Office Responses

### 2.4.1 General

Several responses proposed fairly straight forward changes to help clarify the provisions. These were either accepted as presented or implemented by adding cross-references as shown in the table. Some particular responses are outlined below.

### 2.4.2 Proposed revisions which attracted the most comments:

2.4.2.1 The changes to *paragraph 2.6* which extend the provisions concerning searching groups to reflect case law with regard to articles for causing criminal damage were commented on by 6 respondents as follows:

- 1 suggested the provisions should be extended to include groups suspected of carrying weapons;
- 2 argued that they should be deleted;
- 2 recommended that the scope should be restricted; and
- 1 argued that if not deleted, the scope should be restricted.

**Home Office response:** The draft was substantially revised to ensure it accurately reflected current case law and extended to include groups carrying weapons. A new paragraph 2.6A and new *Note Guidance 9A* have been added.

2.4.2.2 The change to *paragraph 4.3A* which made it clear that a person must not be asked to give their personal details for the purposes of completing the search record was commented on by 8 respondents, as follows:

- 5 believed that this would have a negative impact with regard to police accountability, monitoring of stop and search, dealing with complaints and gathering intelligence and should be removed.
- 2 supported the statement and that the restriction on obtaining personal details should be extended.

**Home Office response:** The revision concerns the completion of the record and sets out the position for police and the public - that since section 3(6) of PACE 1984 does not require personal details to be included in the search record, they should not be sought in order to complete the record. The items required by PACE are as follows:

- Ethnicity
- Object of search
- Grounds for search
- Identity of the officer carrying out the search
- Date
- Time
- Place

*Paragraph 2.2B* also precludes personal factors from being used to establish grounds to search and the Code does not require routine pre-search requests for personal details to carry out a PNC check. Alternatives suggested by some respondents would allow a person to be asked for their details without making it clear that they are not needed to complete the record. For monitoring searches which do not result in an arrest, details of the date, time and place of the search and a description of the person should be sufficient to distinguish individual cases for which the person's name is not known.

2.4.2.3 New *paragraphs 5.5* and *5.6* which introduced provisions whereby officers who do not use their power properly will be subject to formal performance or disciplinary proceedings were commented on by 7 respondents as follows:

- 1 wanted more clarity as to the sanctions available and expressed concern about the discretion given to supervising officer;
- 1 recommended that consideration should be given as to how officers should be dealt with.
- 1 expressed concerns about the impact of the apparent lack of discretion given to supervising officers to adopt less formal methods.
- 2 expressed concerns that the formal approach might deter officers from exercising their powers.
- 2 suggested linking the provisions to the College of Policing Code of Ethics;

**Home Office response:** The intention of the new wording is to make it unambiguous that appropriate action will be taken as a result of misuse – irrespective of the nature of its cause. The new wording also makes clear that the facts of the case would determine the appropriate action to take, which makes action both case specific and down to the discretion of the supervisor.

It is not necessary to detail the various outcomes that can result from formal proceedings – these are dealt with separately in legislation and College of Policing guidance. The Home Office has referred the consultation responses to the College of Policing for consideration.

A link to the College of Police website and the Code of Ethics was added to the text.

## 3. Next Steps

3.1 Following careful consideration of the consultation responses, the Home Office has finalised the revision of Code A. The revised Code was laid before Parliament on Friday 5<sup>th</sup> December 2014 along with the Order (statutory instrument) which, after it has been approved by both Houses of Parliament, will bring the revised Code into operation twenty-one days after the Order is made. This is expected to be before the end of March 2015. The revised Code as laid before Parliament, is available online at:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/pace-code-a-2014>

3.2 The table in the Annex outlines the changes and the provisions which have been amended.

3.3 A Home Office Circular will be published to inform police and practitioners of the revised Code and the date they come into operation.

# ANNEX: Table of changes

The main changes in the revised Code have been made in order to implement the Government's commitment as set out on the Consultation on Stop and Search which is to "Revise the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 (PACE) Code of Practice A to make clear what constitutes 'reasonable grounds for suspicion' – the legal basis upon which police officers carry out the vast majority of stops. The revised code will also emphasise that where officers are not using their powers properly they will be subject to formal performance or disciplinary proceedings"

(See <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/stop-and-search>)

The table below identifies the paragraphs and Notes for Guidance which have been revised and briefly outlines the changes (excluding minor grammar and typographical corrections).

**Key:** 'RGS' = reasonable grounds for suspicion.  
's & s' = stop and search (powers)

No.	Paragraph	Summary of changes, reason/purpose
1.	Commencement	The revised Code will come into force as specified.
2.	A1.03	To assist understanding, references to A2.11 and 4.12 ('stop and account') added
3.	A1.1 Note 1A	Reference to the Children Act 2004 added. Note 1A provides full list of 'protected characteristics' taken from section 149 of the Equality Act 2010.
4.	A1.4	Cross-reference to A5.5 and 5.6 added
5.	A1.6 new	New A1.6 to point out that non-compliance with the provisions of the Codes might undermine the evidential value of any item found in the search.
6.	A2 Heading	Section heading amended for clarity.
7.	A2.1(a) A2.1(d) and (e)	Examples added to (a) for clarity. Sub paragraphs (d) and (e) swapped for consistency to correspond with amended subheadings (d) and (e) which precede A2.18A and 2.27.
8.	Subheading (a) before A2.2	Current subheading numbered and amended
9.	New subheading. A2.2 New 2.2A and Note 1B - new Note 1BA - new	'General' subheading added. A2.2 revises and extends the first 2 sentences of current A2.2. Reference to 'information and/or intelligence' reinstated and cross references to A3.8(d), A4.6 and A5.5 added. A2.2A and new Note 1B revise and extend current A2.7 which is <i>not used</i> . These point out the key features of RGS and how it applies to s & s and clarify that RGS depends on the likelihood of finding an item, not the commission of an offence by the person searched. Note 1BA outlines the need for action to safeguard under 18s who are stopped and searched.
10.	New subheading New A2.2B	Subheading - RGS and personal factors added. New A2.2B replaces and extends current A2.2 with regard to personal factors to emphasise that they can never support RGS. Includes full list of 'protected characteristics' taken from section 149 of the Equality Act 2010.
11.	New subheading A2.4 New A2.4A	Subheading – 'RGS and information and/or intelligence' added. A2.4 extends and clarifies the first 2 sentences of the current A2.4 with regard to basing RGS on information and intelligence. A2.4A retains the rest of the current A2.4 with added emphasis on the importance and benefits of accurate and current information and intelligence.
12.	A2.5	<i>Not used</i> – provisions retained and extended in new A2.8A.

No.	Paragraph	Summary of changes, reason/purpose
13.	New subheading A2.6 A2.6A Note 9A - new	Subheading – RGS and searching groups added. A2.6 extended to clarify group identification by clothing etc. New A2.6A supported by new <i>Note 9A</i> to reflect <i>Howarth v Commissioner of the Met Police (2011)</i> <a href="http://www.bailii.org/ew/cases/EWHC/QB/2011/2818.html">http://www.bailii.org/ew/cases/EWHC/QB/2011/2818.html</a> and clarify how RGS may be applied to groups of individuals.
14.	New subheading A2.6B	Subheading – RGS and behaviour. Extends and replaces the current A2.3 which is <i>not used</i> to emphasise that RGS must have an objective basis. Cross references to A3.8(d) and A5.5.
15.	A2.7	<i>Not used</i> – provisions revised and extended in new A2.2A and <i>Note 1B</i>
16.	New subheading A2.8A	Subheading – community relations RGS and searching groups added. Repeats and extends current A2.5 (see no.12) which is <i>not used</i> . It places a duty on local senior officers to ensure relevant information is available to their officers and a duty on those officers to acquaint themselves with that information.
17.	New subheading A2.9, A2.10 and A2.11	Subheading – questioning and decision to search. A2.9, A2.10 and A2.11 amended to clarify and distinguish between questioning when RGS have been established to decide whether to search and other encounters not subject to any statutory power.
18.	Subheading (b) before A2.12 Subheading (c) and subheading (d) before A2.18A Subheading (e) before A2.27	Subheadings which precede A2.18A and A2.27 re-numbered as (c), (d) and (e) to correspond with sub-paragraphs (a) to (e) in A2.1.  In sub-heading (e), ‘persons’ inserted for clarity.
19.	A3.8(d)(ii)	Extended to clarify the information to be given when informing the person of the grounds for search and cross reference to A2.2 added.
20.	A4.3A	Extended to point out that a person should not be asked to provide their name and date of birth for the purpose of completing a search record.
21.	A4.12	Reference to A2.11 (see 17) added.
22.	A4.6	For consistency with A2.2 and A3.8(d)(ii) (see 9 and 19) extended to clarify the information required when recording the grounds for the search record and cross reference to A2.2 (see 9) added.
23.	New subheading A5.1	Subheading ‘General’ added with regard to the requirement for ‘force-wide’ monitoring of s & s as set out in A5.1 to 5.4. A5.1 new first sentence repeats current third sentence in A1.4 to emphasise the need for effective monitoring and supervision.
24.	New subheading A5.5 and A5.6	New subheading and new provisions in paragraphs A5.5 and 5.6 make it clear that the use of s & s by <i>individual</i> officers must be monitored and that appropriate action must be taken to deal with misuse. Link to the Code of Ethics on College of Policing website added in A5.6.
25.	<i>Note 13</i>	Locality within which powers may be exercised amended for accuracy to reflect the provisions of section 60.
26.	<i>Note 23</i>	Amended for accuracy to reflect section 1(9)(b) of PACE.
27.	Annex A para.5	Revised, section 27(1) Aviation Security Act 1982 repealed and replaced by section 24B.
28.	Annex A para.6	Paragraph formatting updated for clarity to reflect statutory provisions.
29.	Annex A para.18	<i>Not used</i> - Schedule 7 Terrorism Act deleted as it has its own Code of Practice and is not subject to Code A, see A1.03(b).
30.	Annex C para.2	Reference to paragraph 7 of Schedule 4 to the Police Reform Act 2002 added for accuracy with regard to the search power under the Children and Young Persons Act 1933.

4 December 2014

*Blank Page*