

Title: Counter-Terrorism and Security Bill - Support for people vulnerable to being drawn into terrorism IA No: HO0143 Lead department or agency: Home Office Other departments or agencies:	Impact Assessment (IA)		
	Date: 25/11/2014		
	Stage: Final		
	Source of intervention: Domestic		
	Type of measure: Primary legislation		
Contact for enquiries: CTSBill@homeoffice.x.gsi.gov.uk			
Summary: Intervention and Options			RPC Opinion: N/A

Cost of Preferred (or more likely) Option				
Total Net Present Value	Business Net Present Value	Net cost to business per year (EANCB on 2009 prices)	In scope of One-In, Two-Out?	Measure qualifies as
N/A	£0m	£0m	No	N/A

What is the problem under consideration? Why is government intervention necessary?

On 29 August the Joint Terrorism Analysis Centre raised the UK threat level from ~~SUBSTANTIAL~~ to ~~SEVERE~~ meaning that a terrorist attack is 'highly likely'. There is a need to legislate to deal with the increased terrorist threat.

The programme, known as Channel in England and Wales, part of the wider Prevent strand of the UK's Counter-Terrorism Strategy (CONTEST), is a multi-agency programme which provides tailored support to people who have been identified as at risk from radicalisation. Each local authority area currently has a panel made up of experts which assess the suitability of referred individuals for support under the programme. Attendance can vary between areas and when there is not full or consistent attendance referred individuals might not have access to the full range of support available. Consistency in delivery increases the opportunity to identify good practice that can be shared and effectively applied between areas.

What are the policy objectives and the intended effects?

- To reduce the likelihood of individuals becoming radicalised;
- To ensure full cooperation with the programme to support vulnerable people being drawn into terrorism, including full attendance at panel meetings; and
- To ensure the continued effective implementation of the support programme.

What policy options have been considered, including any alternatives to regulation? Please justify preferred option (further details in Evidence Base)

Option 1: do not legislate

Option 2: legislate to put the programme on a statutory footing. This will include a requirement for local authorities to establish multi-agency panels, identify the support provider and place a duty for each agency (e.g. police, NOMS) to cooperate with each other in relation to the whole process (including information sharing). This is the preferred option as it will ensure full and continued cooperation with Programme.

Will the policy be reviewed? It will be reviewed. If applicable, set review date: January 2016

Does implementation go beyond minimum EU requirements?			N/A		
Are any of these organisations in scope? If Micros not exempted set out reason in Evidence Base.	Micro No	< 20 No	Small No	Medium No	Large No
What is the CO ₂ equivalent change in greenhouse gas emissions? (Million tonnes CO ₂ equivalent)			Traded: 0		Non-traded: 0

I have read the Impact Assessment and I am satisfied that, given the available evidence, it represents a reasonable view of the likely costs, benefits and impact of the leading options.

Signed by the responsible Minister: _____ Date: _____

Summary: Analysis & Evidence

Policy Option 1

Description: Do not put Channel on a statutory footing

FULL ECONOMIC ASSESSMENT

Price Base Year	PV Base Year	Time Period Years	Net Benefit (Present Value (PV)) (£m)		
			Low: Optional	High: Optional	Best Estimate: £0

COSTS (£m)	Total Transition (Constant Price) Years		Average Annual (excl. Transition) (Constant Price)	Total Cost (Present Value)
Low	N/A		N/A	N/A
High	N/A		N/A	N/A
Best Estimate	£0			

Description and scale of key monetised costs by 'main affected groups'

Option 1 is the baseline, so there are no additional costs.

Other key non-monetised costs by 'main affected groups'

N/A

BENEFITS (£m)	Total Transition (Constant Price) Years		Average Annual (excl. Transition) (Constant Price)	Total Benefit (Present Value)
Low	N/A		N/A	N/A
High	N/A		N/A	N/A
Best Estimate				

Description and scale of key monetised benefits by 'main affected groups'

Option 1 is the baseline, so there are no additional benefits.

Other key non-monetised benefits by 'main affected groups'

N/A

Key assumptions/sensitivities/risks	Discount rate (%)
N/A	

BUSINESS ASSESSMENT (Option 1)

Direct impact on business (Equivalent Annual) £m:			In scope of OITO?	Measure qualifies as
Costs: 0	Benefits: 0	Net: 0	No	N/A

Summary: Analysis & Evidence

Policy Option 2

Description: Put Channel on a statutory footing

FULL ECONOMIC ASSESSMENT

Price Base Year	PV Base Year	Time Period Years	Net Benefit (Present Value (PV)) (£m)		
			Low: Optional	High: Optional	Best Estimate: N/A

COSTS (£m)	Total Transition (Constant Price) Years		Average Annual (excl. Transition) (Constant Price)	Total Cost (Present Value)
Low	Optional		Optional	Optional
High	Optional		Optional	Optional
Best Estimate	N/A		N/A	N/A

Description and scale of key monetised costs by 'main affected groups'

N/A

Other key non-monetised costs by 'main affected groups'

There are no significant implementation costs associated with this policy because all the local authorities who would be required to establish panels have already done so.

There may be an opportunity cost to panel members who were previously not participating, who would now attend panel meetings.

BENEFITS (£m)	Total Transition (Constant Price) Years		Average Annual (excl. Transition) (Constant Price)	Total Benefit (Present Value)
Low	Optional		Optional	Optional
High	Optional		Optional	Optional
Best Estimate				

Description and scale of key monetised benefits by 'main affected groups'

N/A

Other key non-monetised benefits by 'main affected groups'

This policy will safeguard the impact of the programme to support vulnerable people being drawn into terrorism by ensuring full participation by all panel members, and continued future participation in the programme by all partners. Panel attendance is likely to reduce the risk of referred individuals becoming radicalised, because the full range of support will be available. This should reduce the risk of those individuals carrying out an attack.

Key assumptions/sensitivities/risks

Discount rate (%)

Risk that legislating will give greater prominence to criticism that the programme is there to spy on individuals receiving support, or that it targets Muslims.

Partners whom we are intending to make subject to a statutory co-operation duty may not want to have any additional statutory responsibilities, even if in practice they are already carrying them out in most places.

BUSINESS ASSESSMENT (Option 2)

Direct impact on business (Equivalent Annual) £m:			In scope of OITO?	Measure qualifies as
Costs: 0	Benefits: 0	Net: 0	No	N/A

Evidence Base (for summary sheets)

Problem under consideration

On 29 August the Independent Joint Terrorism Analysis Centre raised the UK national terrorist threat level from SUBSTANTIAL to SEVERE meaning that a terrorist attack is 'highly likely'. Approximately 500 individuals of interest to the police and security services have travelled from the UK to Syria and Iraq since the start of the conflicts; a number of these individuals have joined terrorist organisations including the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL). On 1 September the Prime Minister announced that legislation would be brought forward in a number of areas to stop people travelling overseas to fight for terrorist organisations, or conduct terrorist related activity, and subsequently returning the UK, and to deal with individuals already in the UK who pose a risk to the public.

The Channel Programme is part of the Prevent strand of the UK's Counter-Terrorism Strategy (CONTEST). Channel is a multi-agency programme which provides tailored support to people who have been identified as at risk from radicalisation. The programme is available in every local authority area in England and Wales.

Each local authority area currently has a panel, made up of experts including social workers and mental health professionals, which assesses the suitability of referred individuals for support. The consistent delivery of Channel across areas and full attendance on the panel would improve the effectiveness of the programme. With a statutory requirement to participate in the programme, the full range of support available to individuals can be considered. It will ensure good practice can be recognised, shared, and applied between areas using common practices, to further improve the implementation of the programme.

The impacts of this could include radicalisation not being properly addressed, which could in turn lead to engagement in terrorist activities. This will result in greater costs to the police and security and intelligence agencies, and for the criminal justice system. It could also potentially lead to attacks being carried out. Furthermore, radicalisation of additional individuals could take place (in turn potentially leading to even more engagement in terrorism), and increasing extremism leading to segregation within communities increased public anxiety, and increased marginalisation of minorities.

Rationale for intervention

Protecting the UK against terrorism is a fundamental role of Government. Counter-terrorism measures require judgments on the need to balance protecting the public with safeguarding civil liberties and dealing with sensitive issues of national security. Such judgments should not be left to the private sector. The private sector does not have the access to intelligence to understand the scale/nature of the threat.

It is the Government that manages sensitive information and intelligence on individuals that pose a terrorist threat and is responsible for the safety and security of UK citizens. Given the necessity of counter-terrorism measures, and the role of the Government to protect the public, the Government is uniquely placed to fulfil this role.

Policy objective

- To reduce the likelihood of individuals becoming radicalised;
- To ensure full cooperation with the programme, including full attendance at panel meetings; and
- To ensure the continued effective implementation of the programme.

Description of options considered (including do nothing)

Option 1 is to make no changes

Option 2 is to legislate. This should:

- a) require local authorities to establish multi-agency panels, or as currently, to co-opt existing multi agency arrangements to support people identified as being vulnerable to being drawn into terrorism , and/or join up with other local authorities to create a single panel;
- b) set out the purposes of the panel as: to decide whether a person is vulnerable to being drawn into terrorism and should be offered support; to develop a support plan for any person who accepts an offer of support; to monitor the person's progress whilst receiving support and amend the plan as appropriate; to decide if and when support is no longer appropriate; and to undertake periodic reviews after the person has ceased to receive support.
- c) require the panel to identify the support provider who will first contact the referred individual to offer support and seek their consent to participate in the programme;
- d) place a duty to cooperate with each other in relation to the (whole) process on: local authorities, police, education, health and NOMS, and take the power to add to this list in Regulations; and
- e) take a power to create statutory guidance.

Monetised and non-monetised costs and benefits of each option (including administrative burden)

Option 1:

This is the baseline, so there are no costs and benefits.

Option 2:

There would be a cost to local authorities if they had intended to stop participating in the programme, were it not a statutory requirement. However, it is not known how many local authorities may have chosen to do this, so the costs cannot be estimated.

There may be an opportunity cost to panel members who were previously not participating, who would now have a statutory duty to attend. Additionally, the attendance requirement differs between areas, so it is not possible to estimate the additional cost to one member who would be required to start participating.

Rationale and evidence that justify the level of analysis used in the IA (proportionality approach)

As the costs of this policy are negligible, and the benefits are not quantifiable, the level of analysis is low. This policy is to safeguard or make marginal improvements to current practices, not to introduce new practices.

Risks and assumptions

Option 1:

- Risk that some local authorities that were previously participating or participating to the required level will cease doing so. This could potentially be mitigated by emphasising the positive impacts associated with the programme to incentivise local authorities to remain participants, despite it not being a statutory requirement.

Option 2:

- Risk that partners whom we are intending to make subject to a statutory co-operation duty may not want to have any additional statutory responsibilities, even if in practice they are already carrying them out in most places. They will want to understand exactly why this legislation is needed and what impact it will have on them. They may call for the Home Office to fund them to implement the programme. The central mitigations to this are the facts that in most areas the programme is working well, and that the scale of the programme overall is very small. The proposed “duty to cooperate” would also be framed broadly, with expectations for partners set out in statutory guidance (for example that they would be expected to understand their role in identifying emerging risks, sharing information; attending panel meetings, providing support, etc.).

Assumptions

Every authority has an established board which carries out the duties outlined in the legislation, implying there will be no costs associated with authorities starting to participate.

Authorities that may not have continued to participate in the programme will do so because it is a statutory requirement.

It will not be possible to quantify the benefits associated with this policy. This is because:

- It will not be possible to prove that authorities who do continue participating in the programme would not have done so without the legislation to make participation a statutory requirement.
- The benefits associated with participation in general are not quantifiable, because it is not possible to say whether attacks would have been carried out without the programme, or what types of attacks.

Direct costs and benefits to business calculations (following OITO methodology)

N/A

Wider impacts

N/A

Summary and preferred option with description of implementation plan

Option 2 is the preferred option. The Government plans to implement these changes following Royal Assent.

There are currently procedures in place to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of of the programme, which will continue to be used when it is placed on a statutory footing. Any concerns from affected parties will be monitored.

The Home Office will use evaluation results to identify areas for improvement in the policy in England and Wales.