Economic Note	Number: HO EN 1044
Title of regulatory proposal	Cuckooing
Lead Department/Agency	Home Office
Expected date of implementation	Autumn 2026
Origin	Domestic
Date	28/04/2026
Lead Departmental Contact	CrimeandPolicingBillTeam@homeoffice.gov.uk
Departmental Assessment	GREEN

Rationale for intervention, objectives and intended effects

Cuckooing harms victims by violating the safety of their homes and exposing them to criminality and tactics including deception, coercion, fear, and violence. This new offence of cuckooing will criminalise the non-consensual control of another person's dwelling in connection with the commission of certain criminal offence/s. This will improve the criminal justice system response to cuckooing and outcomes for victims and society.

Policy options (including alternatives to regulation)

Option 0: 'Do nothing'. Police continue to use existing tools and powers to address cuckooing, however these are not commensurate with the harm caused nor are they considered to support the best possible outcomes for victims.

Option 1: Introduce a new offence of cuckooing to criminalise the specific act of cuckooing, to drive a consistent national police response and improve outcomes for victims, supported by accompanying non-statutory guidance. **This is the government's preferred option.**

Costs and benefit summary

Total costs are estimated to be £2.5 million (PV), ranging between £2.2 million and £3.0 million. Benefits have not been monetised due to insufficient data and evidence.

Risks

Data informing the current prevalence of cuckooing cases underpinning the cost estimates is limited. Victims may refuse to give evidence for fear of self-incrimination of other offences and/or incrimination of victims of Child Criminal Exploitation. The Home Office will draft guidance alongside this offence to mitigate these risks.

Total Cost (£m PV)	Transition Cost (£m Constant)	Cost to Business (£m PV)	
£2.5	**£0.1**	**N/A**	
Total Benefit (£m PV)	**NPSV (£m PV)**	**BNPV (£m PV)**	**EANDCB (£m PV)**
N/A	-£2.5	N/A	N/A
Price Base Year	**PV Base Year**	**Appraisal period (Years)**	**Transition period (Years)**
2026/27	**2026/27**	**10 Years**	**1 Year**

Departmental sign-off (*SCS*):	Caroline Hart	Date: 28/04/26
Chief Economist sign-off:	Tim Laken	Date: 01/04/26
Better Regulation Unit sign-off:	Emma Kirk	Date: 01/04/26

Evidence Base

A. Policy objectives and intended effects

1. Cuckooing is an exploitative practice whereby criminals target and take over the homes of vulnerable people for the purpose of criminal activity. The activity is commonly related to the storage, preparation, and sale of illegal drugs but police have also reported cases of cuckooing where sexual, weapon and fraud offences take place.

2. While there are a range of applicable offences and orders that can currently be used in cuckooing cases, consultation with police and other stakeholders has identified that existing legislation does not reflect the exploitative nature of cuckooing or the harm to victims.

3. The objective of this policy is to create a cuckooing offence which will specifically target the legislative gap around the non-consensual control of another person's dwelling for the purpose of enabling it to be used in connection with the commission of criminal activity.

4. The intended effects of the policy are to reduce the harm to victims and to wider communities by reducing incidence of associated anti-social behaviour and criminality. Additionally, making cuckooing an offence will also allow for consistent national reporting and a more informed prevalence estimate of cuckooing than is currently available.

5. The introduction of a cuckooing offence and relevant non statutory guidance should reduce victim harm and promote safeguarding by enhancing the ability of the police and other services to respond to cases. Increased identification and investigation of cuckooing incidents as a result of this legislation should increase the associated risks to perpetrators, which may act as a deterrent, potentially reducing the prevalence of cuckooing

B. Policy options considered, including alternatives to regulation

6. **Option 0: 'Do-nothing'.** Police and partners would continue to use existing tools and powers but there would be no specific offence to target the harm caused by cuckooing and no associated improvement in the response to victims and perpetrators.

7. **Option 1:** Introduce a new offence of cuckooing, to drive a consistent national police response and improve outcomes for victims, supported by accompanying non-statutory guidance. This would support the government's Safer Streets Mission[1] by tackling criminal behaviour linked to violence, drug dealing and anti-social behaviour. **Option 1 is the government's preferred option as it meets the strategic objectives.**

8. This offence would address the gap in legislation which means that, while action can currently be taken in relation to criminal activity associated with cuckooing, there is no specific criminal offence to respond to the highly harmful and exploitative act of taking over a person's home for criminal purposes without their consent.

9. **Non-regulatory options:** The government considered the non-regulatory option of producing guidance alone. While guidance could result in improved awareness of cuckooing and a more consistent policing response, it would not lead to the benefits anticipated to arise as a result of introducing an offence. Additionally, guidance alone would not be a satisfactory response to the harm that is caused by criminal perpetrators of cuckooing.

---

[1] Safer Streets - GOV.UK: https://www.gov.uk/missions/safer-streets

C. Past evaluations and rationale for government intervention

10. The economic and social rationale for government intervention is that, while local police forces currently attempt to address cuckooing with various approaches, a national framework is needed for a more consistent response. The government has the power to introduce primary legislation to create a cuckooing offence and develop guidance for operational stakeholders working to protect victims and target perpetrators. The new offence will improve the consistency of the response to victims and perpetrators across England and Wales. Additionally, the offence will provide more reliable national prevalence estimates through Criminal Justice System (CJS) statistics that will allow for a better understanding of the scale of the issue.

11. Although data on the prevalence of cuckooing is limited as it is not yet classified as an offence, recent reports indicate that cuckooing cases in England and Wales are increasing. A 2023 Centre for Social Justice report[2] found that one in eight of people surveyed had noticed signs of cuckooing in their local communities, while the 2023 London Labour report[3] documented a 300 per cent increase in cuckooing in London between 2018 and 2022. The narrative of an increasing prevalence in cuckooing cases has been supported by individual police forces who were consulted in relation to this legislation.

12. Cuckooing causes significant harm to victims by violating the safety and security of their homes, exposing them to, and sometimes involving them in, criminality and subjecting them to tactics including deception, manipulation, coercion, fear, and violence. Cuckooing also has a wider impact on communities by enabling criminal activity, in particular drug dealing, which can lead to anti-social behaviour.

13. Police and partners have existing tools and powers to deal with the criminal activity associated with cuckooing and can take action to evict cuckooing perpetrators from premises through the use of Closure Orders[4]. However, there is no legislation which specifically holds offenders to account for the harm caused by taking over another person's home for the purposes of criminality.

14. As a result, victims of cuckooing are often not recognised as such by professionals or wider society. This impacts victims' ability to receive protection and support and to get redress for the harm caused to them. Similarly, there is no clear message to perpetrators of cuckooing that this specific practice is not tolerated by society.

15. Introducing a new offence of cuckooing would complement the new offence of Child Criminal Exploitation (CCE) given that anecdotal evidence from police and partners suggests that children exploited by county lines gangs are sent to cuckooed properties where they are likely to be subjected to violence and intimidation. Increased enforcement against cuckooing would help to safeguard victims of CCE, supporting the government's Safer Streets Mission[5].

---

2 Centre for Social Justice Report– Slavery at Home. Available here: https://justiceandcare.org/app/uploads/2023/02/Slavery-at-Home-a-new-bill-to-tackle-slavery-in-Britain.pdf

3 London Labour Report - Protecting the Vulnerable: Addressing "Cuckooing" in London. Available here: https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2023-05/Cuckooing%20Report%20Embargoed.pdf

4 A legal tool used by UK police or local councils, authorised by a magistrates' court, to temporarily shut down premises.

5 Safer Streets - GOV.UK: https://www.gov.uk/missions/safer-streets

D. Appraisal

General assumptions and data

16. The following general assumptions are used in this Economic Note (EN) which is in line with the guidance set out in HM Treasury (2026) Green Book[6]:

    a. The appraisal period used is 10 years, 2026/27 to 2035/36.
    b. The price base year used is FY 2026/27.
    c. The present value base year is FY 2026/27.
    d. The HM Treasury GDP deflator, December 2025[7]

17. The impacts of the Option 1 are relative to the counterfactual baseline Option 0.

18. Evidence gaps exist regarding the prevalence of cuckooing. Since cuckooing is not yet a classified offence and there is neither a national database nor a standardised approach to recording. The methods used by law enforcement and intelligence partners to record current cases are not comprehensively understood.

19. The County Lines Strategic Threat Risk Assessment[8] details that the prevalence of drug-related cuckooing can be partially inferred from the number of drug lines that use cuckooing as part of their business model, quoting 728 instances of this in 2023/24. It is acknowledged that one drug line could be linked to multiple cuckooed addresses, meaning prevalence may be higher.

20. Given the absence of publicly available data to inform the prevalence of non-drug related cuckooing and the uncertainty in the data to inform drug-related cuckooing, internal management information from the National County Lines Coordination Centre (NCLCC) and Crimestoppers has been used to estimate a potential annual number of offences, though this estimate remains highly uncertain.

21. Controlling and coercive behaviour (CCB) has been selected as an appropriate proxy offence for cuckooing through consultation with the Ministry of Justice (MoJ) due to similarities in the complex nature of the offence. This has shaped several modelling assumptions, for example, it uses data on CCB[9] to proxy the charge, prosecution, and conviction rates, as well as the sentencing rates and custodial sentence length for cuckooing. Applying these proxy rates to the internal management data for the annual number of cuckooing offences, the Home Office estimates that between 8 and 10 offenders will be sentenced to immediate custody for cuckooing per year. A small range has been deemed appropriate given the low charge rate of the proxy offence and the complexity of the crime which often relies on victim statements from vulnerable and exploited individuals.

22. The Average Custodial Sentence Length (ACSL) for a cuckooing offence is expected to be two years. The Home Office assumes that 34 per cent of the ACSL will be served in custody, which means the sentence length served in custody is reduced to eight months. The Home Office assumes that the remaining 66 per cent of the sentence will be served on probation.

---

6 HM Treasury Green Book, 2022. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/Government/publications/the-green-book-appraisal-and-evaluation-in-central-Government/the-green-book-2020

7 GDP deflators at market prices, and money GDP December 2025- GOV.UK (www.gov.uk): https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/gdp-deflators-at-market-prices-and-money-gdp-december-2025-quarterly-national-accounts

8 County Lines Strategic Threat Risk Assessment 2023/24. Available here: https://www.npcc.police.uk/SysSiteAssets/media/downloads/publications/publications-log/national-crime-coordination-committee/2024/county-lines-strategic-threat-risk-assessment.pdf

9 CJS quarterly statistics – controlling and coercive behaviour proxy data. Available here: https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/criminal-justice-system-statistics-quarterly-june-2024

23. The Home Office assumes that all offenders charged with cuckooing would have been charged with another offence (for example, drug supply offences) in absence of the new legislation, and that no offender will be charged with cuckooing alone. This assumption has been agreed by the MoJ, NCLCC and police forces. MoJ have also advised that a cuckooing offence is likely to be served consecutively[10], meaning the cuckooing sentence will be served after the original offence in the absence of this legislation.

24. The main impact to the CJS is expected to arise from an increased custodial sentencing length following a cuckooing conviction. There is an expected increase in associated probation costs as a result of this legislation. The Home Office has assumed that probation costs arise at the end of the sentence served in custody. There is no additional impact expected to His Majesty's Courts and Tribunal Services (HMCTS) or legal aid as a result of this legislation.

25. These modelling assumptions mean that there are delayed impacts of this legislation. These have been set out below:

Table 1: Demonstration of delayed impact and costs

Year 1	Cuckooing is implemented halfway through the year. Stakeholders incur familiarisation costs (only exist in year 1). There are no prison costs.
Year 2 & 3	Simplifying assumption that there will be a one year CJS delay[11]. Assuming no offender will be charged for cuckooing alone and the most likely baseline offence is a drug supply offence, a two year average delay based on the ACSL served for a drug supply offence[12] has been modelled. No costs incurred in years 2 or 3.
Year 4	Due to the implementation halfway through Year 1 and a total delay of three years, prison costs are zero for the first half of Year 4. Ongoing prison place and probation costs begin the second half of year 4 and continue to year 10 of the appraisal period.

26. The transition costs (familiarisation costs) are excluded from the average cost per year figure. The average cost per year figure is calculated by dividing the ongoing costs (prison costs and probation costs) by 10, to show the average annual cost over the 10-year appraisal period.

Costs

Monetised costs

Set up costs:

Cost 1: Familiarisation Costs

27. The familiarisation cost estimates the opportunity cost to the public sector of time spent reading and comprehending new legislation issued. Familiarisation costs are incurred in year 1 of implementation and no further familiarisation costs are calculated over the 10-year appraisal period. Proxied off existing legislation, a reading length of 5,000 words is assumed. At a central reading speed of 300 words per minute, with a range of 200 to 700 words per minute, it is

[10] A consecutive sentence means you will serve one offence after another. More information can be found here: https://www.gov.uk/types-of-prison-sentence

[11] Criminal Justice System data delivery dashboard. Available here: https://criminal-justice-delivery-data-dashboards.justice.gov.uk/overview

[12] Criminal Justice System quarterly statistics. Available here: https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/criminal-justice-system-statistics-quarterly-june-2024

estimated that it will take between 7 and 36 minutes to read the legislation, with a central estimate of 21 minutes[13]. Familiarisation costs are calculated as follows:

Time taken to read the guidance x wage rate x volume of people reading

28. The main stakeholders who will be required to familiarise themselves with the new legislation include the police, and solicitors and barristers engaged in criminal legal aid[14]. Median gross hourly wage data by occupation published by the ONS[15] is selected for each profession – senior police officers, solicitors and lawyers, and barristers and judges – and uplifted by 22 per cent for public sector workers to account for non-wage costs[16]. This equates to an estimated wage rate of £41, £38, and £37 per hour for each respective profession.

29. A range for the volume of people reading is taken for each profession. In the absence of more specific data, between 3 and 10 police officers per force, with a central estimate of 5, are assumed to read the legislation. Applied to 43 police forces in England and Wales this equates to between 130 and 430 police officers, with a central estimate of 215. Estimated police familiarisation costs range between £600 and £10,500, with a central estimate of £3,100. Based on figures published in the Independent Review of Criminal Legal Aid, the number of solicitors engaged in criminal legal aid is estimated to be 11,800 and the number of barristers engaged in criminal legal aid is estimated to be 2,700[17]. For both solicitors and barristers, it is assumed that between 25 per cent and 75 per cent will read the guidance, with a central estimate of 50 per cent, resulting in between 3,000 and 8,800, with a central estimate of 5,900, solicitors and between 700 and 2,000, with a central estimate of 1,300, barristers, assumed to read the guidance. Estimated solicitor familiarisation costs range between £13,000 and £201,900, with a central estimate of £78,500. Estimated barrister familiarisation costs range between £2,900 and £45,200, with a central estimate of £17,600.

30. The Home Office assumes that support sector organisations will not be required to read the legislation. Given their existing experience with cuckooing cases and victim support, these organisations are assumed to already be familiar with the nature of the offence and their associated operational responsibilities which are not expected to change because of the legislation.

31. Total familiarisation costs associated with this legislative change are estimated to be between **£0.0 and £0.3 million, with a central estimate of £0.1 million**. These costs are only incurred in year 1 of the appraisal period. This cost is excluded in the average cost per year calculation.

---

13 Words per minute estimates for paper and screen reading, Readingsoft. Available here: http://www.readingsoft.com/. This is using words per minute estimates of 200, 400 and 700.

14 Volumes have been estimated based on the Independent Review of Criminal Legal Aid. Available here: https://www.gov.uk/government/groups/independent-review-of-criminal-legal-aid

15 Earnings and hours worked, occupation by four-digit SOC: ASHE Table 14.5a - Office for National Statistics (ons.gov.uk), https://www.ons.gov.uk/file?uri=/employmentandlabourmarket/peopleinwork/earningsandworkinghours/datasets/occupation4digitsoc2010ashetable14/2024provisional/ashetable142024provisional.zip

16 Index of Labour Costs per Hour, non-seasonally adjusted - Office for National Statistics (ons.gov.uk), https://www.ons.gov.uk/file?uri=/employmentandlabourmarket/peopleinwork/earningsandworkinghours/datasets/indexoflabourcostsperhourilchseasonallyadjusted/current/ilchtablestemplatesa1.xls

17 This is the number of solicitors who held practicing certificates and worked for a Criminal Legal Aid firm in 2018/19 as reported in the Independent Review of Criminal Legal Aid. Available here: https://www.gov.uk/government/groups/independent-review-of-criminal-legal-aid

Ongoing costs

Cost 2: Prison costs

32. It is estimated that between 8 to 10 offenders will be sentenced to immediate custody per year. MoJ outcome tools[18] are used to estimate the ACSL of the proxy offence - CCB – 2 years, taking a three-year average. It is assumed that 34 per cent of the sentence, equivalent to 0.69 years, will be served in custody.

33. The annual cost per prisoner place is £56,000[19] as provided by MoJ (2025/26 prices). In the analysis, the cost per year has been inflated to 2026/27 prices using the GDP deflator[20] to give an approximate cost of £68,700 per prisoner annually. This is multiplied by the volume of prisoners, accounting for their time served in custody, to estimate ongoing prison place costs.

34. Prison place costs are assumed to take effect from year four of the appraisal period based on timings outlined in Table 1. Ongoing prison costs are estimated to range between **£2.0 million and £2.5 million, with a central estimate of £2.2 million (PV)** across the 10-year appraisal period**.** These costs are incurred from year four of the appraisal period onwards. This cost is included in the average cost per year calculation.

Cost 3: Probation costs

35. The additional probation time for offenders is estimated based on the ACSL of the new cuckooing offence, assuming that 34 per cent of the sentence will be served in custody, with the entirety of the remaining 66 per cent served on probation, which assumes that there will be no re-offending and no breach of probation. Time served on probation is therefore estimated to be 1.34 years.

36. The annual cost per person on probation has been provided by MoJ and inflated to 2026/27 prices. This is multiplied by the number of offenders sentenced to custody for a cuckooing offence, accounting for time spent on probation, to estimate probation costs.

37. Similarly to the time lag applied to prison costs, probation costs are assumed to take effect from year five of the appraisal period, additionally accounting for the 0.69 years offenders will serve in custody for the cuckooing offence. Ongoing probation costs are estimated to range between **£0.2 million and £0.3 million, with a central estimate of £0.3 million (PV)** across the 10-year appraisal period. These costs are incurred from year five of the appraisal period onwards. This cost is included in the average cost per year calculation.

Non-monetised costs: Safeguarding and support services

38. The policy aims to strengthen the police and support services response to cuckooing through increased identification and investigation of cuckooing incidents. This could lead to an increase in the number of victims who are referred for safeguarding and other support services. It is unknown to what extent the legislation will create an additional demand for safeguarding and support services, so this is not monetised.

Total costs:

39. Total costs of this policy are estimated to be between **£2.2 million and £3.0 million, with a central estimate of £2.5 million (PV).** This translates to an estimated annual cost of £0.22 million to £0.30 million per year, with a central estimate of £0.25 million (PV).

---

[18] Ministry of Justice (2024), Criminal Justice System Statistics Quarterly: June 2024. Available here: https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/criminal-justice-system-statistics-quarterly-june-2024

[19] Ministry of Justice (2025), internal estimates provided by MoJ.

[20] GDP Deflator – October 2024. Available here: https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/gdp-deflators-at-market-prices-and-money-gdp-october-2024-autumn-budget-2024

BENEFITS

Monetised Benefits

40. No benefits for Option 1 have been quantified and monetised due to data and evidence gaps.

Non-Monetised Benefits

41. If this policy were to deter perpetrators from cuckooing, there would be a benefit on an individual level to those targeted and selected as victims. As well as the individual benefit, in each instance of a deterrence of a cuckooing case, there will be cost savings to the police, local authorities and support sector organisations, as well as the CJS.

42. These benefits cannot be monetised due to an absence of evidence on the deterrence effect of this policy, and the specific costs to each stakeholder, given there is no standardised response plan in instances of cuckooing currently.

NPSV, BNPV and EANDCB

43. The Net Present Social Value (NPSV) of this policy is estimated to be between **-£2.2 million and -£3.0 million, with a central estimate of -£2.5 million (PV).** This is a partial NPSV, made up only of the costs of this policy due to the absence of monetised benefits.

44. There is no expected cost to businesses, so BNPV and EANDCB are likely to be 0.

45. It is expected that there will be minimal costs of this intervention to the police and support sector organisations, who already work to deal with cases of cuckooing. The largest costs of this intervention are likely to arise from the increased custodial sentence that offenders will receive for a cuckooing offence. This impact is expected to be low but remains uncertain and subject to the prevalence of cuckooing cases as well as the way in which courts will apply sentence.

Table 2: Option 1 - Summary costs, benefits, NPSV, BNPV and EANDCB £ million (PV), 10 years, 2026/2027 prices.

Summary of Costs and Benefits	Low	Central	High
Total Set up costs	**0.0**	**0.1**	**0.3**
Private sector set-up costs	0.0	0.0	0.0
Public Sector set-up costs	0.0	0.1	0.3
Total Ongoing costs	**2.2**	**2.4**	**2.8**
Private sector ongoing costs	0.0	0.0	0.0
Public sector ongoing costs	2.2	2.4	2.8
Total Costs	**2.2**	**2.5**	**3.0**
Private sector benefits	N/A	N/A	N/A
Public sector benefits	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total benefits	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**
NPSV	**-2.2**	**-2.5**	**-3.0**
BNPV	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Net Cost to Business (EANDCB)	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

Source: Home Office estimates, 2026. £ million estimates rounded to one decimal place.

E. Wider impacts

46. Cuckooing has a wider impact on communities by enabling criminal activity, particularly drug dealing, and contributing to anti-social behaviour. Enhancing the response of police and support services to instances of cuckooing could reduce these impacts, creating benefits at both an individual, community, and societal level.

F. Sensitivity

47. This measure does not require a full impact assessment as the equivalent annual direct cost to the public sector are less than +/-£20 million per year and there are no impacts to businesses or households expected to result from the proposed changes.

G. Risks

48. **Cuckooing Analytical Risk 1: Absence of well evidenced national prevalence estimates**. National data on the prevalence of cuckooing cases are limited, resulting in uncertainty in the cost estimate, particularly to the CJS. However, this analysis likely overestimates the impact to the prison system by modelling all cuckooing sentences consecutively, whereas in practise sentences could be applied concurrently. If sentencing for this offence is applied concurrently, which is at the discretion of the court on a case-by-case basis, then the cost impact may be minimal or negligible, depending on the underlying offence (for example, drugs supply).

49. **Analytical Risk 2: Unable to monetise all costs and benefits of this policy.** The absence of a standardised national approach to cuckooing has prevented analysts from monetising potential benefits that may arise from a reduction in prevalence due to this policy. The extent to which the policy may reduce prevalence is also unknown and unsupported by evidence. Additionally, the potential increase in demand for support and safeguarding services remains uncertain, and inconsistencies in national costs and approaches have prevented these from being costed in the analysis.

50. **Policy Risk 1: Risk of CCE victims being criminalised**. A cuckooing offence could risk incriminating victims of CCE who are involved in cuckooing activity. As part of the county lines model, young people are often sent to take over properties to deal drugs and ‘run’ the property and could be captured by an offence that criminalises control of a dwelling for criminal purposes. To mitigate this risk, the Home Office will provide clear guidance to police and engage closely with the Crown Prosecution Service, on how to use the offence to target those ultimately directing the cuckooing, rather than those who are found in the properties who could also be victims of CCE.

51. **Policy Risk 2: Victims may refuse to give evidence for fear of self-incrimination.** The cuckooing offence targets the non-consensual control of a dwelling (the victim’s home) for a criminal purpose/s. This may mean victims of cuckooing could be unwilling to give evidence for fear of self-incrimination. To mitigate this risk, the Home Office will provide clear guidance to police on how they can achieve victim engagement.

H. Annex

Mandatory specific impact test - Statutory Equalities Duties	**Complete**
The new offence would have a direct impact in relation to age. The definition of 'consent' within the legislation sets out that a victim can never be deemed to have consented to the control of their property if they are under 18 years old. This means that people aged under 18 years old may be more likely to receive legal redress for the harm caused to them as it may be easier to prosecute such cases. The government considers that this is a proportionate means of achieving the legitimate aim of protecting children aged under 18 years who are living independently as occupants of a property and, as such, are particularly vulnerable. Overall, the government considers that the benefits of the measure outweigh any potential risks. People with all protected characteristics are affected by cuckooing, so improving the response to victims of cuckooing will have a positive impact on all communities, demographics, and protected characteristics. **The SRO has agreed these findings**	**Yes**