

	HOME OFFICE FULL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT
	Office for Security and Counter-Terrorism
	Pursue Policy and Strategy Unit
	March 2011

Name of Policy/Guidance/Operational activity

Introduction of stop and search powers to replace sections 44-47 of the Terrorism Act 2000 pending the coming into force of the provisions on stop and search in the Protection of Freedoms Bill.

What are the aims, objectives & projected outcomes?

The policy objectives are to repeal sections 44 to 47 of the Terrorism Act 2000 which have been found by the European Court of Human Rights to be incompatible with a Convention right (*Gillan and Quinton v United Kingdom*) and to introduce new counter-terrorism stop and search powers which are necessary, proportionate and effective and have sufficient safeguards to prevent misuse of the power. The terrorism stop and search powers must be lawful (including compliance with the *Gillan* ECtHR judgment) whilst also ensuring that the police have the necessary powers to protect the public from the risk of terrorism.

The intended effects are (a) to implement the *Gillan* judgment, (b) to ensure that the police are able to protect the public effectively from the threat of terrorism; (c) to make these powers available to the police as soon as possible because of the urgent operational need for them; (d) to ensure the powers are lawful (including in compliance with the ECtHR judgment); and (e) to ensure that civil liberties are protected, including through robust safeguards in the legislation and the statutory code of practice.

The aim of the remedial order is to effectively and swiftly implement the recommendations contained in the review of counter-terrorism and security powers, announced by the Home Secretary on January 26th 2011. The order will be temporary however, and will be superseded by the similar provisions in the Protection of Freedoms Bill, to ensure that Parliament has the opportunity to carry out the usual scrutiny of proposed changes to primary legislation.

1 SCOPE OF THE EIA

1.1 Scope of the EIA work

The Equality Impact Assessment has been developed by the terrorism legislation team in the Office for Security and Counter-Terrorism in the Home Office. It relates to the review of Section 44 powers and the provisions of the Terrorism Act 2000 (Remedial) Order 2011 (SI 2011/631) which repeal and replace Section 44.

1.2 Will there be a procurement exercise?

No.

2 COLLECTING DATA

2.1 Relevant quantitative and qualitative data

<p>Race</p>	<p>Quantitative data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Home Office statistical bulletin published on 28 October 2010 covers the operation of police counter-terrorism powers in Great Britain during 2009/10. This records that of the 101,248 stops and searches carried out under section 44 of the Terrorism Act 2000 during the period, 59% were against people who defined themselves as white, 17% against people who defined themselves as of Asian or Asian British origin and 10% against people who defined themselves as of black or black British origin. These percentages are in line with section 44 stops and searches in earlier years. (In 2008/09, of those stopped and searched under section 44 in Great Britain the majority defined themselves as White (61%)). A further 15% defined themselves as being Asian or Asian British, 10% Black or Black British and 4% self-classified as being Chinese or other.• These statistics reflect the way that section 44 was used before the Home Secretary's statement in July 2010. This statement announced that the use of section 44 without any suspicion was to cease and that the stop and search powers in Part V of the Terrorism Act 2000 were only to be used on the basis of reasonable suspicion on an interim basis whilst powers were considered as part of a wider review of counter-terrorism and security powers. More recent statistics were published on 24 February 2011 for the quarter July to September 2010, which show an almost complete cessation of the use of the powers since the Home Secretary's statement.• Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Branch Northern Ireland Statistics on the Operation of the Terrorism Act 2000: Annual Statistics Research and Statistical Bulletin. The published statistics show that the vast majority of individuals stopped and searched under Section 44 in Northern Ireland are white (for example, between 1 January 2010 and 31 March 2010, nearly 99% of individuals stopped and search under these powers were white).
--------------------	--

	<p>Qualitative Data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a perception in Asian communities that section 44 stop and search powers have been used disproportionately against people of Asian origin. • Previous reports by the independent reviewer of terrorism legislation (Lord Carlile of Berriew QC). • Reports by civil liberty organisations (such as Liberty and Amnesty) and academics on the use of section 44. These reflect concerns about the necessity and proportionality of Section 44 powers. • Parliamentary committee reports, in particular by the Joint Committee on Human Rights. • Whilst such polling is self-selecting (i.e. it does not reflect a random cross section of the population and therefore does not necessarily indicate the public's view), on the 'Your Freedom' website set up by the Deputy Prime Minister, repealing section 44 was in the top six most popular ideas on the civil liberties section. • Dstl report entitled '<i>What perceptions do the UK public have concerning the impact of counter-terrorism legislation implemented since 2000?</i>' was published in March 2010. • Significant consultation with internal and external stakeholders (see below).
<p>Religion/ belief & non belief</p>	<p>Quantitative data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No statistics are available on the religious or other beliefs on those stopped and searched under section 44, as this data is not requested of or collected from individuals subject to stop and search. <p>Qualitative data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Muslim communities have expressed concerns that Muslims generally (rather than individual suspects) are being targeted by counter-terrorism laws. • It is likely that there is a perception in Northern Ireland that counter-terrorism powers are used disproportionately against Catholic people. Most searches in Northern Ireland take place in areas where there are high levels of terrorist activity. It is a fact that republican terrorists (who represent the most significant current risk in Northern Ireland) have tended to come from the Catholic community almost

	exclusively (albeit a very small minority of the population). It is therefore understandable that a Catholic person may feel more likely to be searched than a Protestant person.
Disability	No issues arise from the change to the legislation in relation to disability.
Gender	Data on the gender of individuals stopped and searched under Section 44 by the police is not collected in Great Britain. It has been in Northern Ireland for some quarters (for example, between 1 Jan 2010 to 31 March 2010, 92% of those stopped and search under Section 44 were male. The difference in Great Britain is likely to be much less stark given the power was used, before July 2010, at a much greater volume and in a less targeted way. It is likely that the majority of those stopped and searched would be male on the basis that the majority of those arrested under counter-terrorism legislation are male. The proposed changes to the power to stop and search individuals and vehicles without suspicion contained in the remedial order are not assessed to have an impact on the proportion of men/women searched.
Gender Identity	No issues arise from the change to the legislation in relation to gender identity.
Sexual Orientation	No issues arise from the change to the legislation in relation to sexual orientation.
Age	No issues arise from the change to the legislation in relation to age.
Welfare of Children [UKBA ONLY]	N/A
Socio-economic	The replacement of the powers in section 44 of the Terrorism Act 2000 with the provisions in the remedial order is not assessed to have a socio-economic impact.

Human Rights

The replacement of the powers in section 44 of the Terrorism Act 2000 with the provisions in the remedial order responds to the European Court of Human Rights' judgment in the case of *Gillan and Quinton* (as well as reflecting the Government's concerns about the power). The new stop and search powers in the remedial order are considered to be in compliance with our domestic and international human rights obligations, including in the light of the European Court judgment. See also the ECHR Memorandum for the Protection of Freedoms Bill (as the replacement powers provided for in that Bill are identical to those in the remedial order).

2.2 What are the overall trends/patterns in this data?

The overall pattern in this data (which reflects the position prior to the Home Secretary's guidelines on 8 July 2010) are that:

- (a) The use of Section 44 had been declining (over 250,000 in 08/09 before falling to just over 100,000 in 09/10).
- (b) Whilst the number of individuals from ethnic minorities stopped and searched under this legislation had fallen, the proportion of those stopped and searched who are from ethnic minorities remained broadly the same and is still disproportionately high in Great Britain.
- (c) There was significant regional variation in the use of the power. Between April 2009 and March 2010, 79% of the Section 44 stops and searches in Great Britain were carried out by the Metropolitan Police Service. 17% were made by British Transport Police. This principally reflects the different levels of threat in the UK (in particular, London and the transport network face a particularly high threat of terrorism).

The replacement of the powers in section 44 of the Terrorism Act 2000 with the provisions in the remedial order should have a positive equality impact as the total volume of terrorism stop and searches conducted without reasonable suspicion should fall considerably (from the pre-July 2010 position) and the police will only be able to use the power in a much more limited and proportionate way.

2.3 Please list the specific equality issues and data gaps that may need to be addressed through consultation and/or further research?

Due to the significant concerns about the use of Section 44 and its impact on ethnic minorities and civil liberties more generally, there is a significant amount of qualitative information about stakeholders' views. In respect of quantitative data, the statistics for the police's use of stop and search powers provides a good data base (the Home Office and Northern Ireland Office produce regular statistical bulletins). Looking ahead, it will be important to maintain the monitoring of use and data collecting / reporting requirements on the police. This is reflected in the Code of Practice issued under the provisions introduced by the remedial order, which requires chief officers to

monitor the use of the powers, including identifying and addressing any potentially discriminatory trends, and requires the compilation and publication of statistics on the use of the powers. The Home Office will publish data on the use of the new powers on a quarterly basis.

The fact that the powers introduced by the remedial order will replace section 44 with a significantly circumscribed stop and search regime means that the volume of stops and searches using the new powers is likely to be substantially lower than the use of section 44 prior to the Home Secretary's guidelines on 8 July 2010. There is evidence that where such powers are used in a much more focused way, the proportion of individuals affected from particular groups can increase, even though the volumes will be much smaller. The use of the powers will be closely monitored to ensure the powers are used proportionately in response to available intelligence.

3 INVOLVING AND CONSULTING STAKEHOLDERS

3.1 Internal consultation and Involvement: e.g. with Other Government Departments, Staff (including support groups), Agencies & NDPBs

The review of counter-terrorism and security powers which lead to the formulation of the provisions in the remedial order was led by the Home Office and involved significant internal and external consultation and involvement. Stakeholders across Government (including within the Home Office and other Government Departments such as the Ministry of Justice) were engaged and consulted. Similarly stakeholders across the security and intelligence agencies were consulted. The key method for this engagement and consultation was the establishment of a Section 44 working group that comprised representatives of:

- Office for Security and Counter Terrorism, Home Office
- Crime and Policing Group, Home Office
- Olympics Security Directorate, Home Office
- Home Office Legal Advisors Branch
- Ministry of Justice
- National Policing Improvement Agency
- Security Service
- Association of Chief Police Officers
- Metropolitan Police Service
- Northern Ireland Office
- Police Service of Northern Ireland
- British Transport Police

In addition, the Crown Prosecution Service, Attorney General's Office and counterparts in the Devolved Administrations were consulted. The former statutory Independent Reviewer of terrorism legislation, Lord Carlile, was also consulted and the independent reviewer of the review of counter terrorism and security measures, Lord MacDonald, provided oversight of the review.

3.2 External consultation and involvement: strand specific organisations e.g. charities, local community groups, third sector

As part of the review of counter-terrorism and security powers, the Home Office consulted a wide range of external organisations including civil liberty and human rights organisations, community groups, local councils, organisations representing the legal profession, victims support groups and organisations which had a special interest in particular aspects of the review (such as photography organisations). The Home Office also consulted key individuals with an interest in counter-terrorism and security powers.

The Home Office sought to ensure that different external stakeholder and community groups had access to the consultation by making different groups

and the public in general aware of the review (in particular the Parliamentary statement by the Home Secretary announcing the review resulted in significant media coverage of the review) and by providing a variety of avenues for external groups / individuals to provide their views.

Consultation meetings on the review were held in Manchester, Birmingham, Edinburgh, London and Belfast. These meetings involved police, community representatives (the Research, Information and Communications Unit (RICU) based in the Home Office provided advice on local faith and community groups that were likely to have an interest) and local authorities. The Home Office also provided an e-mail and postal address for members of the public and organisations to contribute to the review. As a result of the consultation, the Home Office has received over 50 written contributions to the review.

Independent oversight of the review was provided by Lord Macdonald of River Glaven QC who also met interested organisations and individuals. Lord Macdonald concluded that the review's conclusions achieve the sensitive balance between the need for stop and search powers to be conducted without reasonable suspicion, and the decision in *Gillan*.

As part of their contribution to the review, the Equality and Human Rights Commission included interim findings from research they had undertaken (by Tufyal Choudhury from the University of Durham) into the impact of counter-terrorism measures on Muslim communities. This suggested that:

- The impact of counter-terrorism law and policies are experienced and felt more acutely and directly amongst Muslims than non-Muslims. Non-Muslims were less likely to have direct or indirect experiences of any measures and were generally more supportive of the measures that were being taken as necessary.
- Amongst Muslims concern focused on those measures that it was felt were targeted against or applied to Muslims as a group or community compared to measures that were seen as targeted against individual suspects. In relation to the measures covered by the review, this concern was focused on the use of section 44 stop and search powers.
- Most Muslims had direct experience of being stopped and searched, had close friends or family who had been stopped and searched or had witnessed stops in their local area. This covered all stop and search powers (including non-terrorism powers and ports and border powers), not just section 44 powers.

The Your Freedom website provided the public with an opportunity to suggest changes in laws and Government policies. Repealing section 44 was in the top six most popular ideas on the civil liberties section. Whilst such polling is self-selecting (i.e. it does not reflect a random cross section of the population and therefore does not necessarily indicate the public's view), the fact that repealing section 44 was in the top six most popular ideas on the civil liberties section shows that it is a significant civil liberty concern.

The fact that people of South Asian origin were more likely to be stopped under section 44 was made by a number of contributors to the review (*'Many young Muslim men in particular feel that they are stopped and searched simply because they fit a general stereotype held by the police'* – Liberty).

The Equality and Human Rights Commission raised concerns about the use of racial profiling and the adverse impact this could have on race relations to the extent that it was considering enforcement action against particular police forces under the race equality duty. At least one contribution to review argued that even if use of the power was limited, it may not entirely address the possibility of ethnic profiling when deciding who should be stopped.

The Home Office has provided feedback to participants who engaged in the review, and will continue to do so, by:

- (a) Publishing the findings from the review
- (b) Publishing a summary of the consultation
- (c) Continuing to engage with internal and external stakeholders in the development and implementation of the policy (see Action Plan).

4 ASSESSING IMPACT

4.1 Assessment of the impact

The review of counter-terrorism and security powers was welcomed by everyone who contributed to the review. The replacement of section 44 powers with a severely circumscribed regime was seen as a positive move which would have a favourable impact on Muslim and Asian community perceptions that the powers had been used disproportionately against them.

The results of this Equality Impact Assessment suggests that:

- (a) Replacing section 44 and replacing it with the powers set out in the remedial order should have a positive equality impact (in relation to race and human rights) by significantly reducing the total volume of stops and searches conducted without reasonable suspicion and limiting officers' discretion in the use of the power when available. The total number of individuals whose human rights (in particular Article 8) are engaged will reduce.
- (b) The replacement of Section 44 is likely to promote good community relations as it was a widely discredited power, especially amongst Asian communities.
- (c) The curtailment of, and increased safeguards in, the new powers will mean that the power may only be used in far more limited circumstances and will be proportionate.

The introduction of a statutory Code of Practice will ensure best practice is followed and lead to greater transparency about how the powers are to be authorised and used. The Code of Practice will govern the way in which the powers are authorised and used. It will include guidance on:

- a) the threshold for an authorisation
- b) the geographical and temporal extent of an authorisation
- c) information to be provided to the Secretary of State in support of an authorisation, clarification that continual renewal of authorisations on the basis of a similar intelligence case cannot be justified
- d) briefing and tasking for officers using the powers
- e) avoiding discrimination
- f) the general conduct of stop and searches
- g) community engagement

The concerns expressed about the disproportionate and/or unnecessary use of Section 44 has been the key driver (alongside the need to implement the European Court of Human Rights judgment) in making the proposed changes to the legislation.

The powers in the remedial order are considered to be compatible with our domestic and international human rights obligations, including in the light of the *Gillan and Quinton* judgment.

The order will also be temporary and will sunset on the coming into force of the relevant provisions of the Protection of Freedoms Bill, to ensure that Parliament has the opportunity to scrutinise the powers as part of the normal legislative process.

Further safeguards will be implemented. We will:

- (a) Issue a robust statutory Code of Practice at the same time as the order comes into force and keep it under review.
- (b) Increase the level of scrutiny provided by the Home Office in considering authorisations.
- (c) Continue to keep the powers under review once they come into force and publish statistics on a quarterly basis.

5 REPORT, ACTION PLANNING AND SIGN OFF

5.1 Sign-off

Date of completion of EIA	10 March 2011
Compiled by	Ben Hale, OSCT Pursue Policy and Strategy Unit
SCS sign-off	Peter Hill, OSCT PPSU
<i>I have read the Equality Impact Assessment and I am satisfied that all available evidence has been accurately assessed for its impact on equality strands. Mitigations, where appropriate, have been identified and actioned accordingly.</i>	
Date of publication of EIA Report	17 March 2011
Review date	TBC

5.2 Publication and Review

Equality Impact Assessment Report

TITLE

Introduction of stop and search powers to replace sections 44-47 of the Terrorism Act 2000 pending the coming into force of the stop and search provisions in the Protection of Freedoms Bill.

BACKGROUND

On 28 June 2010, the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) made final its decision in the case *Gillan and Quinton v United Kingdom* which found sections 44 to 46 of the Terrorism Act 2000 to be in breach of Article 8 (the right to privacy and family life) of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) because they are not “in accordance with the law”. The ECtHR found the legislation was too broadly expressed and the safeguards in place were not sufficient. The Home Secretary took immediate steps to bring the use of the powers into line with the judgment whilst the issue was considered by the government’s review of various counter-terrorism powers and measures.

The policy objectives of the review in relation to stop and search were to ensure that the powers were necessary, proportionate and effective and that there are sufficient safeguards to prevent their misuse and that the powers would be ECHR-compatible in the light of the *Gillan* judgment. The terrorism stop and search powers must be lawful (including compliance with the ECtHR judgment) whilst also ensuring that the police have the necessary powers to protect the public from the threat of terrorism. The review also looked at whether the powers should be repealed and not replaced.

The remedial order constructs a new terrorism stop and search regime to replace the provisions of sections 44-47 of the Terrorism Act 2000. The order replaces the previous threshold for making an authorisation of “expedient” for the prevention of acts of terrorism, to where the senior officer making the authorisation “reasonably suspects that an act of terrorism will take place” and considers that the powers are necessary to prevent such an act. The provisions also specify that the geographic and temporal extent of an authorisation can be no greater or longer than is considered necessary for that purpose. The grounds for the exercise of the powers is to search for evidence that a person is a terrorist (as defined by section 40(1)(b) of the 2000 Act) or for evidence that a vehicle is being used for the purposes of terrorism (rather than the grounds under section 45 of the 2000 Act, which was to search for articles of a kind which could be used in connection with terrorism). An officer may conduct a search whether or not he reasonably suspects the presence of such evidence.

The intended effects are:

- (a) to implement the *Gillan* judgment,
- (b) to ensure that the police are able to protect the public effectively from the threat of terrorism;
- (c) to make these powers available to the police as soon as possible because of the urgent operational need for them;

- (d) to ensure the powers are lawful (including in compliance with the ECtHR judgment); and
- (e) to ensure that civil liberties are protected, including through robust safeguards in the legislation and the statutory code of practice.

The remedial order effectively implements the recommendations contained in the review of counter-terrorism and security powers. It implements those recommendations as swiftly as possible in light of the urgent operational need to have ECHR-compatible powers of this nature on the statute book. The substantive powers introduced by this Order will cease to have effect on the coming into force of the relevant provisions in the Protection of Freedoms Bill (after those provisions have received the full Parliamentary scrutiny that accompanies the passing of primary legislation).

SCOPING THE EIA

The Equality Impact Assessment has been developed by the terrorism legislation team in the Office for Security and Counter-Terrorism in the Home Office. It relates to the review of Section 44 powers and the provisions of the Terrorism Act 2000 (Remedial) Order 2011 which repeal and replace Section 44.

COLLECTING DATA

The Home Office review of Section 44 (as part of the wider review of counter-terrorism and security powers) had a wide range of quantitative and qualitative data to consider. This included:

- The Home Office statistical bulletin published on 28 October 2010 covers the operation of police counter-terrorism powers in Great Britain during 2009/10. This records that of the 101,248 stops and searches carried out under section 44 of the Terrorism Act 2000 during the period, 59% were against people who defined themselves as white, 17% against people who defined themselves as of Asian or Asian British origin and 10% against people who defined themselves as of black or black British origin. These percentages are in line with section 44 stops and searches in earlier years. (In 2008/09, of those stopped and searched under section 44 in Great Britain the majority defined themselves as White (61%)). These statistics reflect the way that section 44 was used before the Home Secretary's statement in July 2010. This statement announced that the use of section 44 without any suspicion was to cease and that the stop and search powers in Part V of the Terrorism Act 2000 were only to be used on the basis of reasonable suspicion on an interim basis whilst the review considered the power.
- Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Branch Northern Ireland Statistics on the Operation of the Terrorism Act 2000: Annual Statistics Research and Statistical Bulletin
- Previous reports by the independent reviewer of terrorism legislation (Lord Carlile of Berriew QC).

- Reports by civil liberty organisations (such as Liberty and Amnesty) and academics on the use of section 44. These reflect concerns about the necessity and proportionality of Section 44 powers.
- Parliamentary committee reports, in particular by the Joint Committee on Human Rights.
- Whilst such polling is self-selecting (i.e. it does not reflect a random cross section of the population and therefore does not necessarily indicate the public's view), on the 'Your Freedom' website set up by the Deputy Prime Minister, repealing section 44 was in the top six most popular ideas on the civil liberties section.
- Dstl report entitled '*What perceptions do the UK public have concerning the impact of counter-terrorism legislation implemented since 2000?*' was published in March 2010.
- Significant consultation with internal and external stakeholders (see below).

INVOLVING AND CONSULTING STAKEHOLDERS

The review which led to the recommendations to be implemented by the remedial order (and subsequently by the Protection of Freedoms Bill), was conducted by the Home Office with the full involvement of other government departments, the police, prosecutors and the intelligence and security agencies.

The terms of reference for the review, published by the Home Secretary in July 2010, made it clear that the review should consider a wide range of views, including those of civil liberty organisations and community groups. To meet this commitment, the Home Office wrote to key organisations including civil liberty and human rights organisations, organisations and those representing the legal profession to make them aware of the review and offering to provide further advice on how they could contribute. The Home Office met with a number of these organisations, including the main human rights organisations to discuss the review.

Consultation meetings were also held in Edinburgh, Belfast, Manchester, Birmingham and London. Over 190 organisations were invited to the consultation meetings. This included community groups (including representatives of all the major religions and beliefs), local police forces, probation and prosecutors, local councils, academics, youth organisations, equality groups and representatives of the legal profession.

A dedicated Home Office e-mail and postal address was also provided for those who wanted further information on the review or who wanted to submit contributions to the review.

The Home Office sought to ensure that different external stakeholder and community groups had access to the consultation by making different groups and the public in general aware of the review (in particular the Parliamentary statement by the Home Secretary announcing the review resulted in significant media coverage of the review) and by providing a variety of avenues for external groups / individuals to provide their views.

Independent oversight of the review was provided by Lord Macdonald of River Glaven QC who also met interested organisations and individuals.

The Home Office provided feedback to participants who engaged in the review by:

- (d) Publishing the findings from the review
- (e) Publishing a list of those who contributed to the review and summary of the contributions received
- (f) Continuing to engage with internal and external stakeholders in the development and implementation of the policy (see Action Plan).

The views expressed as part of the review consultation and which helped to inform the review's recommendations, have been carried forward into the drafting of the provisions of the remedial order.

ASSESSING IMPACT

There has been significant public, NGO and parliamentary concern over the breadth of section 44 and its alleged misuse by the police. The former independent reviewer of terrorism legislation, Lord Carlile, has repeatedly highlighted inconsistencies in the use of section 44 across police forces and concluded that the power was overused and that the authorised areas were too large and not directly related to threat intelligence (although forces – particularly the Metropolitan Police Service – made significant changes to reduce the geographic extent of their authorisations and their use of the powers in 2009 and early 2010 until the Home Secretary's guidelines in July 2010).

Critics often note that there is no evidence of a single individual being convicted with a terrorist offence after being stopped and searched under section 44 or even being arrested on terrorism grounds in Great Britain. While it may be the case that a high visibility section 44 operation around for instance, an Underground station, made it a less attractive target for terrorists, the lack of an outcome of that kind in Great Britain from those types of operation is a stark statistic. In addition, the increase in use (from around 42,000 in 06/07 to just over 250,000 in 08/09 before falling to just over 100,000 in 09/10)¹ led to accusations of abuse and concern that there were effective constraints on the police's use of the powers.

¹ Home Office Statistical Bulletin, '*Operation of police powers under the Terrorism Act 2000 and subsequent legislation: Arrests, outcomes and stop & searches*'.

The perception of disproportionate use of the section 44 powers against people from Asian Communities may adversely impact on *Prevent* work by fuelling the perception that the police employ racial profiling techniques and that terrorism legislation is not being applied equally across all sections of society. The Home Office statistical bulletin published on 28 October 2010 covers the operation of police counter-terrorism powers in Great Britain during 2009/10. This records that of the 101,248 stops and searches carried out under section 44 of the Terrorism Act 2000 during the period, 59% were against people who defined themselves as white, 17% against people who defined themselves as of Asian or Asian British origin and 10% against people who defined themselves as of black or black British origin.²

Conversely, operations which were based on entirely random stops and searches attracted criticism that the powers were not being used in an “intelligence-led” way, and that individuals from a wide variety of backgrounds were stopped and searched in an attempt to “even out” the figures. Lord Carlile has also criticised the use of the powers against individuals who he said were clearly not suspected terrorists. This has created confusion about the way in which the powers were meant to be applied. Attempts to address this have been made in a number of guidance documents, including the Police and Criminal Evidence (PACE) Codes of Practice, and comprehensive, dedicated terrorism stop and search guidance issued by the National Policing Improvement Agency (NPIA)³.

The production of a dedicated statutory Code of Practice to accompany the new powers seeks to address any potential confusion around how the new powers are to be used. It provides guidance on:

- a) the threshold for an authorisation
- b) the geographical and temporal extent of an authorisation
- c) information to be provided to the Secretary of State in support of an authorisation, clarification that continual renewal of authorisations on the basis of a similar intelligence case cannot be justified
- d) briefing and tasking for officers using the powers
- e) avoiding discrimination
- f) the general conduct of stop and searches
- g) community engagement

It also requires authorising officers to consider whether the powers should be used on the basis of “objective factors” (i.e. indicators that will officers help

² Statistics on Race and the Criminal Justice System 2007/08, Ministry of Justice, 2009

³ Practice Advice on Stop & Search in Relation to Terrorism, NPIA, 2008.

select individuals or vehicles to be stopped and searched but which would not meet a threshold of reasonable suspicion) or, where intelligence provides insufficient information about the potential perpetrators of an attack, whether the powers should be used on a “random” basis, and to set out how the powers will be so used, as part of an authorisation.

The increasing use of section 44 powers since their implementation and criticism of the consistency, effectiveness and proportionality of their use contributed to a sense, that counter-terrorism powers were being misused. During the “42 days” pre-charge detention debates during the passage of the Counter-Terrorism Act 2008, a commitment was made to review the impact of all counter-terrorism legislation on our communities. The report *‘What perceptions do the UK public have concerning the impact of counter-terrorism legislation implemented since 2000?’* was published in March 2010.⁴ This considered existing research on public perceptions and found that:

- Although it was acknowledged that stop and searches conducted without reasonable suspicion are a necessary procedure to ensure public safety⁵ there are perceptions that the process is discriminatory, based on stereotypes and racial profiling.⁶
- Most objections to section 44 stem from acknowledgements of disproportionality in the demographics of those subject to search procedures. (See ETHNOS Research).
- However, there is also evidence that shows acceptance of the need for measures to take account of the intelligence about the demographics of potential terrorists. An opinion poll, carried out by ICM Research for the BBC in April 2004, indicated 69 per cent of the respondents, representative of the UK population, supported police powers to stop and search anyone at anytime. It appears that the contention with section 44 was not necessarily linked to the measure itself, but with the way it was implemented.⁷

Concerns voiced in the evidence assessed by the rapid evidence assessment of existing research suggested two key perceptions towards the implementation of section 44 that fuelled negative perceptions:

- (a) Lack of justification by the authorities, or valid logic as to why the procedures are carried out. (See CML Market Research footnote)

⁴ The Dstl report entitled ‘What perceptions do the UK public have concerning the impact of counter-terrorism legislation implemented since 2000?’ was published in March 2010. It is available at <http://rds.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs10/occ88.pdf>

⁵ ETHNOS Research & Consultancy for Communities and Local Government. *The Drivers of Black and Asian people’s perceptions of racial discrimination by Public Services*. 2008

⁶ El-Wafi, L. (2006). *British Arab Muslims and the ‘War on Terror’: Perceptions of Citizenship, Identity and Human Rights*. Unpublished manuscript. http://www.naba.org.uk/content/articles/2006/BrArabs/61010_BrArMus_AIWafiL.pdf. 19 Nov 2009.

⁷ CML Market Research for Communications Strategy and Insight Unit; Home Office. Communications Directorate, UK 2008

- (b) The manner in which searches are conducted: disrespectful; intimidating; impolite; brusque; and rude. (See CML Market Research footnote)

As part of their contribution to the review, the Equality and Human Rights Commission included interim findings from research they had undertaken (by Tufyal Choudhury from the University of Durham) into the impact of counter-terrorism measures on Muslim communities. This suggested that:

- The impact of counter-terrorism law and policies are experienced and felt more acutely and directly amongst Muslims than non-Muslims. Non-Muslims were less likely to have direct or indirect experiences of any measures and were generally more supportive of the measures that were being taken as necessary.
- Amongst Muslims concern focused on those measures that it was felt were targeted against or applied to Muslims as a group or community compared to measures that were seen as targeted against individual suspects. In relation to the measures covered by the review, this concern was focused on the use of section 44 stop and search powers.
- Most Muslims had direct experience of being stopped and searched, had close friends or family who had been stopped and searched or had witnessed stops in their local area. This covered all stop and search powers (including non-terrorism powers and ports and border powers), not just section 44 powers.

The review of counter-terrorism and security powers was welcomed by everyone who contributed to the review. The possibility of repealing the section 44 powers or severely limiting their usage was seen as a positive move which would have a favourable impact on Muslim and Asian community perceptions that the powers had been used disproportionately against them. The fact that people of South Asian origin are more likely to be stopped under section 44 was noted by a number of contributors to the review (*‘Many young Muslim men in particular feel that they are stopped and searched simply because they fit a general stereotype held by the police’* – Liberty).

The Equality and Human Rights Commission raised concerns about the use of racial profiling and the adverse impact this could have on race relations to the extent that it was considering enforcement action against particular police forces under the race equality duty. At least one contribution to review argued that even if use of the power was limited, it may not entirely address the possibility of ethnic profiling when deciding who should be stopped.

The fact that the powers introduced by the remedial order will replace section 44 with a significantly circumscribed stop and search regime means that the volume of stops and searches using the new powers is likely to be substantially lower. There is evidence that where such powers are used in a much more focused way, the proportion of individuals affected from particular groups can increase, even though the volumes will be much smaller. The use of the powers will be closely monitored to ensure the powers are used proportionately

in response to available intelligence. In general however, the reduction in the overall volume of stops and searches will represent a significant reduction in the potential infringement of the rights of all sections of the community.

The repeal of section 44 and replacement with the provisions contained in the remedial order responds to the ECtHR judgment in the case of *Gillan and Quinton* and reflects the Government's concerns about the power. The proposed new powers are considered to be compatible with our domestic and international human rights obligations, including in the light of the European judgment.

ACTION PLAN

Repealing section 44 and replacing it with the provisions of the remedial order should have a positive equality impact by:

- (a) Significantly reducing the total volume of stops and searches conducted without reasonable suspicion. The total number of individuals whose human rights (in particular, in relation to Article 8) are engaged will reduce.
- (d) The repeal of section 44 is likely to promote good community relations as it was a widely discredited power, especially amongst Asian communities.
- (e) The curtailment of, and increased safeguards in, the new powers will mean that the power is available in far more limited circumstances and is proportionate.

The concerns expressed about the disproportionate and/or unnecessary use of section 44 has been the key driver (alongside the need to implement the ECtHR judgment) in making the proposed changes to the legislation.

The replacement of Section 44 with the new powers contained in the remedial order is considered to be in compliance with our domestic and international human rights obligations, including in the light of the *Gillan and Quinton* judgment.

Further safeguards will be introduced. We will:

- (d) Issue a robust statutory Code of Practice at the same time as the order comes into force and keep it under review.
- (e) Increase the level of scrutiny provided by the Home Office in considering authorisations.
- (f) Continue to keep the powers under review once they come into force and publish statistics on a quarterly basis.

An action plan is attached. The Home Office and the police will continue to assess the equality impact of the new powers and consult with internal and external stakeholders to inform that assessment. The independent reviewer of terrorism legislation will have an important role in continuing to report on the

operation of terrorism powers – including the new terrorism stop and search powers contained in the remedial order.

ANNEX B - Action Plan for use with Home Office Equality Impact Assessments

Terrorism stop and search powers

ACTION / ACTIVITY	OWNER AND INTERESTED STAKEHOLDERS	DEPENDENCIES / RISKS / CONSTRAINTS	COMPLETION DATE	PROGRESS UPDATE
<p>Ensure that the police continue to collect and report data of their usage of terrorism stop and search powers, including the new proposed powers to be conducted without reasonable suspicion contained in the remedial order</p>	<p>Home Office (owner) Parliament Northern Ireland Office Scottish Government Independent Reviewer of Terrorism legislation National Policing Improvement Agency Association of Chief Police Officers Association of Police Officers in Scotland Individual Police Forces</p>	<p>The Government is committed to reducing the bureaucratic burden on the police. There may, therefore, be pressure to reduce the reporting requirements on the police.</p>	<p>The statutory Code of Practice will include a requirement for the police to collect and report data on their usage of terrorism stop and search powers.</p> <p>The Code will also require the police to monitor the use of the power.</p> <p>The ability to collect data will be in place before the powers are exercised</p>	<p>Monitoring will be provided by the Terrorism legislation team in the Home Office.</p>
<p>Publish a statutory Code of Practice governing the authorisation and use of the new powers</p>	<p>Home Office (owner) Parliament Northern Ireland Office Scottish Government Independent Reviewer of Terrorism legislation</p>	<p>The Code will need to be kept under review to ensure police forces can and do comply with its provisions, but also that it does not create unjustifiable burdens on the police which</p>	<p>Code to be issued and laid before Parliament at the same time the remedial order comes into force</p>	<p>The Code of Practice will be published at the same time as the remedial order</p>

	<p>National Policing Improvement Agency Association of Chief Police Officers Individual Police Forces Civil liberty organisations Faith organisations</p>	<p>disproportionately diminish the usefulness of the powers.</p>		
<p>Continue to engage with internal and external stakeholders in the development and implementation of the new terrorism stop and search powers.</p>	<p>Home Office (owner) Parliament Northern Ireland Office Scottish Government Independent Reviewer of Terrorism legislation National Policing Improvement Agency Association of Chief Police Officers Individual Police Forces Crown Prosecution Service Civil liberty organisations Victims groups Faith organisations Local authorities Academics</p>	<p>The passage of the Protection of Freedoms Bill, which will include the new stop and search terrorism powers (to be placed on the statute book on a permanent basis), should provide significant opportunity to engage with internal and external stakeholders. This will include consultation on the draft Statutory Code of Practice accompanying the provisions in the Bill (which will be wider than the Code accompanying the remedial order as the Bill introduces new stop and search powers exercisable on reasonable suspicion as well as powers identical to the ones in the remedial order, which will also be covered in that Code).</p> <p>The risk to this action is the</p>	<p>Ongoing.</p>	<p>The Protection of Freedoms Bill, containing similar provisions to the remedial order, was introduced to Parliament on 11 February. A Code of Practice will be introduced for committee stage.</p>

		<p>capacity of the Home Office team responsible for the new powers to engage with the broad range of stakeholders. We will seek to mitigate this by seeking to consult in a resource-efficient manner (i.e. consult stakeholders at the same time on any changes to the Codes of Practice required during the passage of the Protection of Freedoms Bill).</p>		
--	--	--	--	--