

Summary: Intervention & Options

Department /Agency:
Ministry of Justice

Title: Engaging Communities in Criminal Justice – Green Paper
Impact Assessment of Chapter 1: Prosecution and the
Courts – responding to community concerns about
crime

Stage: Options Stage

Version: First

Date: April 2009

Related Publications:

Available to view or download at:

<http://www.cjsonline.gsi.gov.uk>

Contact for enquiries:

EngagingCommunities@cjs.gsi.gov.uk

Telephone:

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

To deliver the CJS core aims of punishment and reform set out in the new criminal justice Public Service Agreement targets (PSAs) by facilitating ways in which Criminal Justice services and local partners can work effectively with each other and with (and for) the public, To do this, we need to:

- Improve the quality and consistency of the services we provide;
- Improve the experience of all those who use and work in – or with - the CJS;
- Respond effectively and proportionately to the concerns of the communities we serve; and
- Improve criminal justice outcomes for all

What are the policy objectives and the intended effects?

To ensure that all the agencies in the criminal justice services engage with the public in a way that is joined up, better co-ordinated and more productive by better understanding their needs. To ensure that the service delivered to local communities is based on the needs of, and issues faced, by those communities, and contributes towards solving local problems. To better inform and involve local people, in particular to encourage more people to become involved through various types of community engagement including volunteering. The intended effects are to improve confidence.

What policy options have been considered? Please justify any preferred option.

0) Do nothing

1) Implement all of proposals 1 - 10

2) Introduce some of proposals 1 - 10

A mixture of all options in the preferred approach, according to local need, including more intense interventions in areas where communities have the most issues caused by crime. The Government is consulting on a package of proposals set out in the Green Paper. This impact assessment relates to those proposals relating to understanding and addressing community concerns through the prosecution and the courts.

When will the policy be reviewed to establish the actual costs and benefits and the achievement of the desired effects?

No firm implementation date has yet been set for the proposals. However, the Ministry is committed to post implementation reviews, further development of the proposals and Impact Assessments will enable us to set a specific date

Ministerial Sign-off For consultation stage Impact Assessments:

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: Understanding & Addressing Community Concerns through the Prosecution & the Courts	Description: Community Prosecutors, Community Impact Statements, problem-solving in the magistrates' courts, judicial continuity and reviews of community orders, further use of community justice, refocusing the roles of the judiciary on community engagement and problem-solving, a system of hallmarks for magistrates' courts
---	---

COSTS	ANNUAL COSTS	Description and scale of key monetised costs by 'main affected groups' Implementing ALL proposals 1 - 10 will have an annual running cost of between £8.407M and £9.185M with start-up costs of £9.851M (based on introducing 1 new co-located community justice court and 1 new community justice virtual team, increasing by between £440k - £1.2M for each additional co-located community justice court, and between £45k and 62k for each additional virtual community justice team). This cost would fall across different parts of the CJS. However, the proposed approach is to implement a mixture of options, depending on local need, so the cost is not accurate.
	One-off (Transition) Yrs	
	£ 9.851M 1	
	Average Annual Cost (excluding one-off)	
	£ 7.868M - 8.645M	Total Cost (PV) £ 17.719 - 18.496M
Other key non-monetised costs by 'main affected groups'		

BENEFITS	ANNUAL BENEFITS	Description and scale of key monetised benefits by 'main affected groups' It is not possible at this stage to cost the benefits of this policy option, although anticipated benefits of the problem-solving approach and community justice approach are reduced re-offending which will mean savings to the CJS agencies and to society.
	One-off Yrs	
	£	
	Average Annual Benefit (excluding one-off)	
	£	Total Benefit (PV) £
Other key non-monetised benefits by 'main affected groups' Increased confidence in the CJS and less fear of crime		

Key Assumptions/Sensitivities/Risks

Risk that consultation does not manage to reach agreement on the way forward

Price Base Year	Time Period Years	Net Benefit Range (NPV) £	NET BENEFIT (NPV Best estimate) £
--------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------------	---

What is the geographic coverage of the policy/option?		England and Wales	
On what date will the policy be implemented?		N/A	
Which organisation(s) will enforce the policy?		CJS agencies	
What is the total annual cost of enforcement for these organisations?		£	
Does enforcement comply with Hampton principles?		Yes	
Will implementation go beyond minimum EU requirements?		No	
What is the value of the proposed offsetting measure per year?		£ 0	
What is the value of changes in greenhouse gas emissions?		£ 0	
Will the proposal have a significant impact on competition?		No	
Annual cost (£-£) per organisation (excluding one-off)	Micro	Small	Medium Large
Are any of these organisations exempt?	Yes/No	Yes/No	N/A N/A

Impact on Admin Burdens Baseline (2005 Prices)			(Increase - Decrease)
Increase of £ 0	Decrease of £ 0	Net Impact	£ 0

Key: Annual costs and benefits: Constant Prices (Net) Present Value

Evidence Base (for summary sheets)

We have a shared agenda to increase public confidence, set out in the new criminal justice Public Service Agreement targets (PSAs), which can only be achieved if Criminal Justice services and local partners work effectively with each other and with (and for) the public. The PSAs are: 23 (Make Communities Safer), 24 (Deliver a more effective, transparent and responsive CJS for victims and the public), and 25 (Reduce the harm caused by alcohol and drugs). We need to build on achievements of the last ten years and be more ambitious in our efforts to:

- Improve the quality and consistency of the services we provide;
- Improve the experience of all those who use and work in – or with - the CJS;
- Respond effectively and proportionately to the concerns of the communities we serve; and
- Improve criminal justice outcomes for all and provide assurance to communities that the CJS is delivering on its core aims of punishment and reform.

The Green Paper and consultation are built around three primary aims which are at the heart of the debate. A summary: Interventions and Options sheet has been completed to assess the impacts for each of these three primary aims:

- **A: Strengthening the connections between communities and their prosecution and court services** - building on the success of Community Justice and the problem-solving approach to help the community and enable offenders to reform and to make amends.
- **B: Ensuring that justice outcomes are more responsive and more visible** - Increase visibility and responsiveness of Community Payback and other forms of reparation and compensation so that justice is delivered and seen to be delivered, and promoting the use of Restorative Justice to increase victim satisfaction; and
- **C: Keeping communities informed, getting people involved, empowering communities** - empower communities by improving information the public receives about case outcomes: ensuring the public can see a real connection between the crime and the punishment (and reform) meted out in response.

It also provides an opportunity for the Ministry of Justice to set out its thinking in response to the proposals in the Cabinet Office Review of Crime and Communities (the Casey Review). The proposals outlined in this Green Paper are consistent with the approach taken by the Review, and the recent Policing Green Paper – ‘From the Neighbourhood to the National: Policing Our Communities,’ published in July 2008

Evidence is presented to support the first primary aim

Evidence Base for Aim A: Strengthening the connections between communities and their prosecution and court services, building on the success of Community Justice and the problem-solving approach

We need to achieve a step-change in the efficiency, effectiveness and responsiveness of criminal justice services, including making some of the less visible parts of the criminal justice system more accessible and better understood. Chapter One of the Green Paper looks at ways in which the Crown Prosecution Service and the magistrates' courts can achieve this cultural shift.

Despite the CPS' involvement as a core member of every Local Criminal Justice Board, its work with Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships and innovative work with communities, the CPS has been less well-recognised among the public as a part of the criminal justice system

than the police or the courts. In a recent study¹, just 24% of those asked identified the CPS as one of the agencies making up the end-to-end criminal justice service. This apparent lack of visibility of the prosecution team locally and poor public awareness of the role of the CPS may be factors in the level of confidence communities have in the prosecution. In 2006/7 approximately one third of respondents to the British Crime Survey² thought that the CPS was doing a good or excellent job. This figure is improving as people become more aware of the CPS's successes but we want to build on this.

Models of 'problem-solving courts' in the US³ prompted our decision to see how this approach could be applied in the UK. In 2005 we established the North Liverpool Community Justice Centre, and the Salford Initiative, and since then 11 further community justice projects across England and Wales, to test and develop the problem-solving for low-level offending. Alongside these 13 community justice courts, we have been developing specialist courts to deal with specific problems, focusing on drug addiction, domestic violence and mental health issues. We now have 122 courts specialising in cases of Domestic Violence, a recently widened pilot of 6 courts dedicated to tackling drug-related offending and are developing a new Mental Health courts project which aims to pilot new processes, at Brighton and Stratford Magistrates' Courts.

The evaluation of North Liverpool Community Justice Centre in 2007⁴ showed that its distinctive community focus has enabled local people to influence the working of the Centre and to increase involvement in the criminal justice system. It also showed that community engagement work at the centre has focused on ensuring that the local community: is aware of and uses the services at the centre; is kept informed about the court's operations and successes; is able to influence the centre to ensure that it is responsive and reacts to local concerns; and is actively involved in the development and operation of the centre.

Anecdotal evidence from staff indicates and case studies forming part of the evaluation of the North Liverpool project suggest that the problem solving approach enhances offenders' engagement with the court and compliance with their sentence, and ultimately helps them – through finding solutions for contributory problems – to change their offending behaviour. Specific problem-solving meetings were a new mechanism adopted at the Community Justice Centre, which provide the opportunity to identify underlying issues that impact on offending behaviour such as drug use, housing, debt. The meetings include offenders, their families if appropriate, and encourages joint responsibility for outcomes. From the survey of offenders interviewed as part of the evaluation, 79% indicated that the problem-solving meeting had helped them to address their problems, 76% thought that the support they got from the problem-solving meeting was better than they had previously received in a traditional court and 86% believed that the problem-solving meeting would help to deter them from offending again in the future. Qualitative case-study evidence from interviews offenders suggests that this 'holistic, problem-solving, multi-agency approach can have a transformative impact'. Any reduction in re-offending rates will mean a saving in cost to the Criminal Justice System and to the local community.

Evidence from North Liverpool also showed that the role of the judge and judicial continuity was crucial. The evaluation cited strong judicial leadership and authority as a result of continuity of single judge model, and stated that offenders are more accountable to the court and to the judge in particular, as a result of the consistency and quality of the court process. This was

¹ Confidence in the Criminal Justice System: What lies beneath? <http://www.justice.gov.uk/docs/criminal-justice-system-report.pdf>

² Attitudes, perceptions and risks of crime: Krista Jansson, Sarah Budd, Jorgen Lovbakke, Sian Morley and Katharine Thorpe, (2007), supplementary volume 1 to the Crime in England and Wales 2006/07, Home Office. <http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs07/hosb1907.pdf>

³ Applying the problem-solving model outside of problem-solving courts. Donald Farole Jr., Nora Puffett, Michael Rempel and Francine Byrne (2005). Subsequent international models of community justice, based on both the US and the UK, are being or have been developed in Australia, Canada, Ireland, Scotland, and South Africa

⁴ Katherine McKenna, (2007), Evaluation of the North Liverpool Community Justice Centre, Ministry of Justice Research Series 12/07,

supported by offenders being more likely to attend hearings. Dedicated Drug Court pilots have shown how judicial continuity in reviews of community orders with drug rehabilitation requirements can act as a motivating factor in an offender's compliance with their sentence. The evaluation of the first two dedicated drug courts, published in April 2008⁵ gave positive indications that increased continuity of magistrates led to offenders being less likely to be re-convicted, less likely to miss a court hearing and more likely to complete their community order⁶.

From the evaluation of North Liverpool, co-location of the criminal justice agencies with advice and support services was seen as a strong advantage. Solid collaborative working, as a result of co-location, the strong personal and working relationships among staff across agencies, and the pre-court meetings, was seen to be helping to achieve effective case management and efficient information exchange. The evaluation also noted a robust approach to dealing with non-compliance at court and breaches of sentence, contributing to its objective to increase compliance with community orders. Co-locations of core services allowed swift action to be taken in issuing warrants; 100% of warrants were issued within 24 hours, which is above the national target of 90%. Clear qualitative evidence from interviews with staff, supported by the more limited quantitative management information data suggested that in terms of speed and robustness of the court the performance of the Community Justice Centre is strong. Staff perceived that the increase in ongoing support and the offender's enhanced sense of accountability have improved compliance.

The Green Paper also seeks to build on the magistracy as the link between the courts and the communities they serve, across all magistrates' courts. Nationally, 47% of 30,000 volunteers are over 60, 81% are over 50, and 96% are over 40. The Green Paper looks at ways of increasing the representativeness of the magistracy, including encouraging younger volunteers to apply.

We now seek to widen the problem-solving approach to all magistrates' courts. We have already taken learning from the community justice courts to improve community engagement across the magistrates' courts. The roll out of the problem-solving approach will compliment this work, through improving local quality of life by tackling problems identified as of particular local concern. Community views contribute to more informed sentencing solutions whilst community sentences are served in the community where the offence was committed, in a way that seeks to repair the damage done. The magistrates' court also engages directly with offenders to identify any issues that may be contributing to the offending, such as debt or alcohol abuse. Through informed and appropriate sentencing, the court is able to direct an offender to problem-solving services. The aim is to reduce re-offending by tackling its root causes and to reduce further harm to the community.

The 13 existing Community Justice Projects across England and Wales share the two key aims: of increasing confidence in the Criminal Justice System; and reducing re-offending. Community Justice brings the courts and other criminal justice agencies together to engage with the local community, identifying local issues, working together to drive down crime and reduce re-offending through a problem-solving approach to tackle the causes of crime, such as providing access to help with alcohol addiction or unemployment.

So far there have been independent evaluations of the Community Justice Centre in North Liverpool, and the Community Justice Initiative in Salford Magistrates' Court, published in October 2007. The findings indicated that the qualitative evaluations were undertaken at a relatively early stage in the life of the projects, and the full impact of community justice may take years to assess; in particular in relation to the impact on re-offending and local people's attitudes and perceptions.

⁵ Dedicated Drug Courts Pilots, a Process Report, Matrix Knowledge Group, April 2008

⁶ compared to other offenders at these courts not subject to the Dedicated Drug Court process

The consultation document sets out a number of propositions, each of which contributes to one or more of these aims. Collectively, the propositions offer opportunities to improve the offer from criminal justice services to communities and to bring about real and positive change in the public's relationship with the CJS. Only then will we achieve our ambition of transforming criminal justice from a system that "does to" to a true service that "does for".

The Proposals, Options Costs and Benefits for Aim A

Do Nothing: although much has been done to reduce crime and improve confidence, the British Crime Survey shows that there is still much to do to ensure the criminal justice agencies are visible, approachable and responsive to community needs. The Government therefore believes that to do nothing and maintain the current status quo is not an option.

Benefits and Costs:

To do nothing will not generate additional costs or savings to the public sector and taxpayer. However it will not provide further benefits or build on the success of the steps already taken.

Options: Below we have discussed the individual propositions in the green paper. We are considering each individual proposition whether to implement them and how to do so. Each of the propositions is discussed below including the benefits and costs.

Options A: Implement all the propositions 1 to 10

Option B: Implement some of the propositions 1 to 10

We would be grateful for stakeholder comments and views on each of the individual propositions 1 to 10 and also on the way we are considering packaging the measures together for implementation.

PROPOSITION 1: The Community Prosecutor Approach

A visible, proactive and community-facing District/Borough Crown Prosecutor, who will be supported by teams of area-based prosecutors who will ensure local priorities inform casework decision making and local CPS business priorities.

Benefits

The Community Prosecutor approach will enable the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) to provide a much more locally responsive prosecution service than it can at present. It will improve links between the CPS and local CJS and other local partners, and in particular, support neighbourhood policing. The CPS will have better links with the community it serves at a local level, and it will achieve demonstrable outcomes through addressing the offences of most concern to the community.

A more effective flow of “real time” information about issues of local concern will enable better informed casework decision making by prosecutors and provide a mechanism for the communities’ priorities to have an impact upon decision making, especially when considering the public interest stage of the Code for Crown Prosecutors. For example, such public interest consideration can include where the offence, although not serious in itself, is widespread in the area where it is committed, and similarly whether a prosecution would have a significant positive impact on maintaining community confidence.

Cost

Illustrative early estimates indicate the costs for piloting the proposal in at least 30 pioneer areas over a 12 month period will rise from £0.8 million in 2009-10 to £5.5 million for full roll-out in 2010-11. However, the costs will be properly identified and evaluated over a 12 month pathfinder period.

PROPOSITION 2: Introduce Community Impact Statements (CISs) as a problem-solving and engagement tool

Benefits

To enable the court to be aware of the impact of certain crimes on community life. A vehicle to enable the community’s voice to be heard in the courtroom, helping to improve confidence in the work of the courts and the judiciary.

Cost

Nil

PROPOSITION 3: Introducing problem-solving principles to all magistrates' courts

Implementation of 4 elements of problem-solving, developed from the community justice courts:

- A multi-agency pre-court meeting
- Direct judicial engagement with offenders
- Problem solving intervention to advice and support provider;
- Review hearings for community orders

Benefits

This builds on the community justice and specialist courts approach whilst aiming to make problem-solving available to all magistrates' courts, helping offenders to address the underlying causes of their offending, and hopefully leading to a reduction in re-offending.

Cost

Annual costs of £1.98M. This is the cost of CJS staff attending pre-court meetings, based on one day a week (if problem-solving sessions are held one day a week). This is based on one Legal Advisor from the court, one CPS lawyer and one probation officer attending one pre-court meeting a week. If pre-court meetings were to take place each day this cost would increase significantly.

PROPOSITION 4: Improving judicial continuity and roll out of review powers under Section 178 of the Criminal Justice Act 2003

Section 178 is the power to attach a requirement for an offender to return to court for reviews of their community order. This legislation is currently only enacted for the 13 community justice projects at the following magistrates' courts: Birmingham, Bradford, Hull, Haringey, Leicester, Merthyr Tydfil, North Liverpool, Nottingham, Plymouth, Salford, South Western, Stratford and Teesside.

Benefits

This builds on the community justice approach whilst aiming to make problem-solving available to all magistrates' courts, helping offenders to address the underlying causes of their offending, and hopefully leading to a reduction in re-offending. During 2009 we will be evaluating the use of S178 at the community justice courts. This has not so far been possible, because the power has not been in place long enough yet to produce a large enough number of offenders to evaluate.

Cost

Annual costs of £5.4M (£2.9M for the courts and £2.5M for probation)

PROPOSITION 5: Creating one or more co-located Community Justice project(s) in a suitable existing magistrates' court building

Benefits

The anticipated benefits of the community justice approach are increasing confidence in the CJS (through engagement and involvement, and matching delivery to community needs), and reduced re-offending (through taking a problem-solving approach to offenders' underlying causes of crime, for example addiction, unemployment, housing or debt issues, relationship issues). This 'magistrates court based' approach would be cheaper than a new Community Justice Centre. The court may also be potentially able to deal with a larger number of cases if required. A benefit of consulting through the Green Paper would be to seek views on feasibility from CJS delivery partners, including their views on cost and possible locations. In particular

we would like stakeholders to consider: what is the feasibility of creating co-located community justice projects within existing magistrates' court buildings; which courts may be suitable; how might this be done; which agencies, CJS, local authority and third sector, should be involved; what other ways could co-location be achieved; what might the benefits be?

We also considered an option to create one or more co-located, purpose built or renovated Community Justice Centres. The benefits of the Community Justice Centre model, as in North Liverpool, which are a visible, community focused and full-time on site problem-solving for offenders and the community. Could be led by a visible single judge. A second centre would also provide a comparator to North Liverpool to draw out the evidence. However, costs are prohibitive, at a one off cost of around £4.2M for the building (dependant on local land and rental costs), and between £790k and £1.55M annual running costs for staff and utilities.

Cost of co-locating with an existing magistrates' court

Annual costs of between £440k and £1.2M for additional CJS staff and other agencies at each co-located court.

PROPOSITION 6: Creating dedicated, multi-agency Community Justice teams (not co-located) to handle suitable cases

Teams which include members from each of the CJS agencies, whose role is dedicated to dealing with community justice cases, alongside team liaison with representatives from the local authority and CDRPs, and third sector advice and support providers.

Benefits

The anticipated benefits of the community justice approach are increasing confidence in the CJS (through engagement and involvement, and matching delivery to community needs), and reduced re-offending (through taking a problem-solving approach to offenders' underlying causes of crime, for example addiction, unemployment, housing or debt issues, relationship issues). Benefits of the virtual team are that it is more replicable than creating co-located teams and it would be cheaper and easier to establish than co-location, with staffing resources where possible drawn from existing staff within local agencies, although there will be a need for some additional resources. A benefit of consulting through the Green Paper would be to seek views on feasibility from CJS delivery partners, including their views on cost and possible locations. In particular we would like stakeholders to consider what benefits might be seen through creating virtual teams, and which agencies should be involved?

Cost

Annual costs of £45k - £62k for 1 co-ordinator, 1 community engagement officer and 1 additional problem-solving officer.

PROPOSITION 7: Re-focusing the role of District Judges (Magistrates' Courts) and volunteer magistrates explicitly to include adoption of the problem-solving approach and a requirement to engage with local communities

Benefits

Aiming to increase confidence and reduce re-offending by ensuring the judiciary are at the forefront of community engagement, and leading the approach to solving offender's underlying issues that lead to crime. This may also encourage lawyers to apply who are attracted to 'making a difference' through problem-solving, or who are skilled at community engagement, and the same for members of the community who may wish to become magistrates. The benefit of consultation would be to see to what extent stakeholders feel this would make a difference

Cost

One off cost of £34k training materials

PROPOSITION 8: Involving community representatives in the appointments and deployments process for District Judges (Magistrates' Courts)

Benefits

This may encourage lawyers to apply who are attracted to community engagement and serving local people. It should create a sense of accountability to the community, and contribute to increasing confidence within the community. The benefit of consultation would be to see to what extent stakeholders (including the public) feel this would make a difference.

Cost

One off cost of £575 to develop training materials plus £3,450 each year for training of community members

PROPOSITION 9: Developing further strategies for ensuring that magistrates are reflective of the diverse communities they serve

Benefits

We are keen to encourage applicants from a wide range of society, and in particular younger people. The aim is to make the magistracy more representative of local communities, to challenge possible perceptions that the magistracy are remote from the communities in which the most crime occurs.

Cost

Unknown

PROPOSITION 10: Introducing a system of Hallmarking for magistrates' courts to work towards "Justice in the Community" status

Benefits

Aim to increase confidence in the courts through visibly demonstrating that they serve their local communities. Community surveys carried out but community justice projects show that residents support the concept of 'community justice' (but it is not known whether there is support for 'community courts'). In addition this may encourage members of the public to become involved with their local court, either as volunteers (magistrates) or through community engagement

Cost

Cost of £12k for badging per court – this would be a total of £4.35M if all magistrates' courts reach the hallmark

Use the table below to demonstrate how broadly you have considered the potential impacts of your policy options.

Ensure that the results of any tests that impact on the cost-benefit analysis are contained within the main evidence base; other results may be annexed.

Type of testing undertaken	<i>Results in Evidence Base?</i>	<i>Results annexed?</i>
Competition Assessment	Yes	No
Small Firms Impact Test	Yes	No
Legal Aid	Yes	No
Sustainable Development	Yes	No
Carbon Assessment	Yes	No
Other Environment	Yes	No
Health Impact Assessment	Yes	No
Race Equality	No - see evidence base. Will be published at a later date	No
Disability Equality	No - see evidence base. Will be published at a later date	No
Gender Equality	No - see evidence base. Will be published at a later date	No
Human Rights	No - see evidence base. Will be published at a later date No	No
Rural Proofing	Yes	No

Specific Impact Tests

Competition Assessment – We have completed the checklist, and none of the proposals contained in the Green Paper: directly limit the number or range of suppliers; indirectly limit the number or range of suppliers; limit the ability of suppliers to compete; or reduce suppliers' incentives to compete vigorously. Therefore, we have concluded that these proposals will not have any impact on competition.

Small Firms Impact Test – This has been completed and none of the proposals contained in the Green Paper impose or reduce costs for small businesses.

Legal Aid Impact Assessment – We have completed the Legal Aid Impact test and concluded from the results none of the proposals contained in the Green Paper indicate a downstream legal aid cost, or an impact on the workload of the courts, as the proposals do not bring in any new offences.

Sustainable Development – The Green Paper considers the benefits to society and quality of life through the implementation of the proposals. Respondents to the Green Paper are also asked to consider the costs and benefits of the proposals.

Carbon Assessment - This has not been completed as none of the proposals contained in the Green Paper will have an impact on emissions of greenhouse gases.

Other Environment - none of the proposals contained in the Green Paper will have an impact on climate change.

Health Impact Assessment - none of the proposals contained in the Green Paper will have a direct impact on health or health inequalities.

Race Equality, Disability Equality, and Gender Equality - we will be undertaking an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) of the Green Paper as a whole and the policies and initiatives it contains. The EIA process involves consideration and assessment of the various policies, services and functions from the perspective of the six equalities groups and is intended to help identify any potential unintended consequences or negative impact on any particular group or individual. The EIA process itself involves consultation with and involvement of individuals and organisations representative of the equalities groups. We will further develop the Impact Assessment during the consultation period and also draw on additional views from consultation responses. We would expect to publish the final, full EIA alongside the summary of responses and next steps document. We would welcome thoughts from respondents on what any impacts on these groups might be.

Human rights – This will be considered as part of the Equality Impact Assessment of the Green Paper mentioned above.

Rural Proofing – as these proposals develop we will consider whether any of them are likely to have a different impact in rural areas, because of particular rural circumstances or needs. A key theme of the Green Paper is to make the criminal justice service more accountable and responsive to local communities, taking into account community needs, concerns and priorities. This means tailoring the work of the criminal justice services to the demographics of their communities, including engaging and involving people living in rural areas. We would welcome any views on how this could be done.

