

Title: Revising the Victims' Code IA No: MoJ005/2015 Lead department or agency: Ministry of Justice Other departments or agencies:	Impact Assessment (IA)	
	Date: 16 July 2015	
	Stage: Consultation	
	Source of intervention: EU	
	Type of measure: Other	
Contact for enquiries: VictimsCodeConsultation@justice.gsi.gov.uk		
Summary: Intervention and Options		RPC Opinion: Not Applicable

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

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

The statutory Code of Practice for Victims of Crime ("the "Code") sets out how victims should be treated by the criminal justice system. We last revised the Code in December 2013. We are now consulting on further revisions to the Code to address some gaps which remain in relation to the support and information provided to victims of crime. The revised Code will implement parts of Directive 2012/29/EU of the European Parliament and the Council of 25 October 2012 ("the Directive") which establishes minimum standards on the rights, support and protection of victims of crime, which comes into force on 16 November 2015.

What are the policy objectives and the intended effects?

1. To extend the services offered under the Code to victims of any criminal offence which is reported to the police, not just victims of criminal offences that are notifiable under the National Crime Recording Standards (NCRS).
2. To make sure that victims are entitled to receive support and information from relevant public sector investigative and prosecutorial organisations, not just the police and Crown Prosecution Service.
3. To make sure that victims who report crimes receive a written acknowledgement from the police, which states the basic elements of the criminal offence concerned.
4. To make other amendments to the Code to better represent what happens in practice and address remaining requirements under the Directive.

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

Option 1: Do Nothing.

Option 2: Revise the Victims' Code.

The preferred option is Option 2. Doing nothing is not an option as changes are needed to the Code to comply with the Directive.

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

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 2

Description: Revise the Victims' Code

FULL ECONOMIC ASSESSMENT

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

COSTS (£m)	Total Transition (Constant Price) Years	Average Annual (excl. Transition) (Constant Price)	Total Cost (Present Value)
Low	NQ	NQ	NQ
High	NQ	NQ	NQ
Best Estimate	Not Quantified	Not Quantified	Not Quantified

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

Not quantifiable.

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

Costs to police. By expanding the Code to cover all victims of crime, we expect there will be modest extra resource costs for the police in providing support to more victims but we believe that the number of additional victims receiving support in practice will be small, so we consider the additional costs to the police will be low. There will be additional resource costs for the police to provide written acknowledgement of the crime to all victims who report a crime.

Costs to Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs). Broadening the definition of victim means that more victims might take advantage of their existing entitlement to access the services commissioned by PCCs. This could increase the cost to PCCs of providing those services.

Costs to other investigative and prosecutorial organisations. Relevant investigative and prosecutorial organisations (other than the police and CPS) will incur some resource costs from providing services to victims in line with the updated Code. We expect that for most of these organisations the increase in costs will be small. The Serious Fraud Office and National Crime Agency may experience a greater increase in costs than the other organisations as their core business is investigating and prosecuting criminal offences, yet they are not currently covered by the Code.

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

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

Not quantifiable.

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

Benefits to victims of crime. Victims of non-NCRS (less serious summary only) offences will benefit by becoming eligible to receive services under the Code. For what we assume to be a small number of victims who do not currently receive these services on a discretionary basis, this may be a substantial benefit.

Victims of crimes who are dealt with by other investigative and prosecutorial organisations will benefit by becoming eligible to receive services under the Code. We think the number of victims who benefit will be small but for those victims the benefit may be substantial.

Victims will benefit from receiving a written acknowledgement when they report a crime.

Key assumptions/sensitivities/risks	Discount rate (%)	N/A
<p>We have assumed that there are a small number of victims of non-NCRS offences and that most victims of non-NCRS offences typically have low need for support and/or are already given support on a discretionary basis.</p> <p>We have assumed that the number of victims dealt with by other investigative and prosecutorial organisations is small.</p> <p>We have assumed that the police will incorporate the additional information that they will have to provide to victims into the materials they currently provide and that this will not create a major change in process.</p>		

BUSINESS ASSESSMENT (Option 2)

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

[Type here]

Evidence Base (for summary sheets)

Introduction

1. This Impact Assessment focuses on proposed changes to the Code of Practice for Victims of Crime (“the Code”). The Impact Assessment supports the consultation, ‘Revising the Victims’ Code’, published 16 July which seeks feedback on the impacts identified in our proposed changes to the Code by 16 August.
2. This is a consultation stage impact assessment and will be updated as we finalise changes to the Code in response to the consultation.
3. The Code places obligations on core criminal justice agencies to provide victims of crime with a minimum level of information and other services such as notification of important developments in their case. The Code sets out over 100 duties on core criminal justice agencies to provide entitlements to victims of crime.
4. We revised the Code in December 2013 to include some additional entitlements, make it clearer and more readable, and to give greater flexibility to core criminal justice agencies to tailor services according to individual need. The Code specifies that an enhanced service must be provided to:
 - (a) Victims of the most serious crime;
 - (b) Persistently targeted victims; and
 - (c) Vulnerable or intimidated victims.
5. The Code is central to our strategy for transposing the EU Victims’ Directive (“the Directive”) which will come into force on 16 November 2015. We transposed a considerable amount of the Directive when we revised the Code in December 2013. There are still some gaps and we therefore propose to amend the Code again.

Rationale for Intervention

6. The conventional economic approach to Government intervention to resolve a problem is based on efficiency or equity arguments. The Government may consider intervening if there are strong enough failures in the way markets operate (e.g. monopolies overcharging consumers) or there are strong enough failures in existing government interventions (e.g. waste generated by misdirected rules). The proposed new interventions should avoid creating a further set of disproportionate costs and distortions. The Government may also intervene for equity (fairness) and redistributive reasons (e.g. to reallocate goods and services to the more needy groups in society).
7. The rationale for intervention in this case relates to equity. Revising the Code should ensure that all victims of crime receive support and information from the criminal justice system rather than only those who are the victims of NCRS offences.

Policy objectives

8. The policy objectives are:
 - a) To extend the services offered under the Code to victims of any criminal offence which is reported to the police, not just victims of criminal offences that are notifiable under the National Crime Recording Standards (NCRS).
 - b) To make sure that victims are entitled to receive support and information from relevant public sector investigative and prosecutorial organisations, not just the police and Crown Prosecution Service.
 - c) To make sure that victims who report crimes receive a written acknowledgement from the police, which states the basic elements of the criminal offence concerned.

- d) To make other amendments to the Code to better represent what happens in practice and address remaining requirements under the Directive.

Policy Options considered

9. Two approaches have been considered and are reflected in the consultation paper.

- (a) **Option 1:** Do Nothing.
(b) **Option 2:** Revise the Victims' Code.

10. **The preferred option is Option 2.** Doing nothing is not an option as changes are needed to the Code to comply with the Directive.

11. Under Option 2, to deliver our policy objectives we would do the following:

a) Extending the services offered under the Code to victims of any criminal offence which is reported to the police

12. We propose to broaden our current definition of "victim". At present, the Code defines a victim as someone who has suffered harm directly caused by a criminal offence that is notifiable under the National Crime Recording Standards (NCRS). The NCRS is a standard of recording crime by the police. It deals primarily with indictable or triable-either way offences (serious offences which may be punished by more than 6 months imprisonment). The NCRS excludes summary offences such as careless driving or drink driving – therefore victims of these crimes are not covered by our definition – and, while in practice they may receive services under the Victims' Code on a discretionary basis, they are not entitled to them.
13. The Directive, however, confers rights upon persons who have suffered harm caused directly by **any** criminal offence.
14. When revising the Code in 2013, we decided to retain the limitation to NCRS offences to reduce the impact on core criminal justice agencies having to provide services to victims of low-level offences. Such offences are high in volume but we judge that a small number of victims are likely to need support. We recognised the difficulty victims of non-NCRS offences face in accessing support which is why the Code allows agencies to provide services to such victims on a discretionary basis. After further consultation with police representatives and the National Crime Registrar, we now judge that the volumes are not as high as we originally thought in 2013 and that in practice agencies are exercising this discretion to provide relevant services and support wherever there is an identifiable victim. We judge that the impact of broadening the definition is therefore likely to be small.

b) Extending the Code to other investigative and prosecutorial organisations

15. The term "competent authority" is employed throughout the Directive to describe the body (or bodies) that have a duty to provide services to victims of crime. It is for national law to determine the identity of competent authorities. We have added the organisations listed in Annex A as competent authorities because they are public sector organisations which perform functions in relation to victims as defined by the Directive with respect to one or more of its Articles.
16. We propose to revise the Code by adding a new chapter. The new chapter will set out the information, help and services that service providers listed in Annex A must provide to victims of crime and bereaved close relatives. Along with the earlier chapters in the Code it implements relevant provisions of the Directive but deals with service providers not previously covered in previous versions of this Code.
17. The service providers in the new chapter commonly have either an investigative or a prosecutorial function (while some have both). Their functions largely determine which services they are to provide. The new chapter will refer in places to service providers by the function performed - where a service provider has both investigative and prosecutorial functions both references will apply as appropriate.

18. The duties on service providers set out in the amended Introduction to the Code will apply equally to service providers listed in the new chapter.

c) Making sure that victims who report crimes receive a written acknowledgement from the police, which states the basic elements of the criminal offence concerned

19. When victims report a crime, the police give them an “information for victims of crime” leaflet which tells them what to expect from the criminal justice system. The Directive requires victims to be given a written acknowledgement which states the basic elements of the criminal offence. We propose to revise the Code to entitle victims to receive such a written acknowledgement when they report a crime.

d) Other amendments

20. We propose to make a number of other, smaller amendments to the Code that will apply to all victims covered by the Code. We consider that these will have little, or no impact, on organisations required to provide duties under the Code because we think either these things are already happening in practice or that what happens in practice will require minimal adjustment. As we expect these changes to have minimal or no cost we have not assessed them in this Impact Assessment. We would welcome any information, as part of the consultation, regarding the impact of these changes. These amendments are:

- a) Clarification that a victims’ needs assessments will identify whether and to what extent the victim may benefit from special measures. (No change in practice as this is already part of the purpose of the needs assessment.)
- b) Give victims a right of review against police decisions not to prosecute, as well as CPS decisions not to prosecute. (No change in practice. Both the police and CPS Victims Right to Review schemes are operative owing to domestic case-law.)
- c) Clarification of how the CPS and police Victims Right to Review scheme works. (No change in practice.)
- d) A more detailed description of the restorative justice services to which victims are entitled in areas where restorative justice is provided. (No change in practice.)
- e) Clarification of the information that victims who do not speak or understand English are entitled to have interpreted or translated. Where a victim is unhappy with a decision not to provide translation or interpretation services they are entitled to make a complaint to the relevant service provider or organisation. (No change in practice.)
- f) Clarification that victims will be entitled where possible to have the same person conduct all the interviews, unless to do so would prejudice the proper handling of the investigation. (No change in practice.)
- g) Medical examinations of the victim will be kept to a minimum and carried out only where strictly necessary for the purposes of criminal proceedings. (No change in practice.)
- h) The Witness Care Unit, which already notifies victims about decisions taken by the court, will provide the victim with a brief summary of the reasons why that decision was taken, where such reasons are available. (Small change in practice, but as the requirement is to do so only where such reasons are available, the resource implications will be small.)
- i) Amendment to clarify that access to services to help victims cope and recover (commissioned by Police and Crime Commissioners) is not dependent on an individual having reported to the police that they are a victim of crime. (No change in practice.)
- j) Clarification of the information victims are to receive at the point of first contact with the police or other relevant organisation about what to expect from the criminal justice system. (No change in practice.)
- k) All victims of sexual violence, gender-based violence or domestic violence will be offered the opportunity to have their interview conducted by a person of the same gender wherever possible, unless doing so is likely to prejudice the criminal investigation. (Small change in

practice but, as the requirement is to do so wherever possible, the resource implications will be small.)

Groups Affected

21. The main groups affected by these proposals are:

- a) All victims of crime (of which there will be particular impacts on victims of non-NCRS crimes and victims dealt with by other competent authorities).
- b) Wider society.
- c) The following core criminal justice agencies with specific obligations in the Code:
 - i. All police forces in England and Wales, the British Transport Police and the Ministry of Defence Police;
 - ii. The Crown Prosecution Service (CPS);
 - iii. Her Majesty's Courts and Tribunals Service;
 - iv. Police and Crime Commissioners; and
 - v. Witness Care Units (joint police/CPS units).
- d) Other organisations assessed to be competent authorities for the purposes of the Directive (see Annex A).

Note on territorial application

22. The proposals set out in this Impact Assessment will have effect in England and Wales only. Measures to transpose the EU Directive in Scotland, Northern Ireland and Gibraltar are dealt with separately by the relevant devolved administration.

Cost and Benefits

Base Case / Option 1 – Do Nothing

23. The base case is the “do nothing” option, making no changes to the current Code. This means that as this option can only be compared with itself, the costs and benefits will be zero initially, as is the option's Net Present Value.

Option 2 – Revise the Victims' Code

Transitional Costs

24. There will be modest administrative costs to the government of amending the Code which are the staffing costs of doing so, the costs of publishing some hard copies and the cost of translating the Code into Welsh. We expect these costs to be small and covered by existing budgets.
25. There may also be costs to organisations covered by the Code for training and familiarising staff with the revised Code. We expect these costs to be small and covered by existing budgets.
26. Below are set out the benefits, costs, net impact, risks, assumptions, sensitivities and data limitations which are specific to each of the three main proposed changes to the Code.

Option 2(a) – Extending the services offered under the Code to victims of any criminal offence

27. At present, the Code defines a victim as someone who has suffered harm directly caused by a criminal offence that is notifiable under the National Crime Recording Standards (NCRS). The

NCRS is a standard of recording crime by the police and it primarily includes indictable offences or triable-either way offences (serious offences which may be punished by more than 6 months imprisonment). This means that victims of summary offences are excluded.

28. There are hundreds of summary offence classifications. The vast majority of them do not have direct victims, for example, failing to register births and deaths and offences against fishery laws, but there are a small number of summary offences which sometimes have victims. The most notable examples where victims could suffer serious injury are careless driving and drink driving. There are some other summary offences that may have a victim such as being drunk in charge of a child under 7, offences relating to phone hacking and various obstruction offences, such as obstructing a constable in execution of his duty.
29. We estimate the theoretical increase in crimes eligible for services under the Code to be between 0.8m and 1.3m per year.¹ This estimate includes crimes that are recorded by the police but are not covered by the NCRS (i.e. most summary offences) and some crimes which are reported to the police but are not recorded at all. However, we think that very few of these crimes will actually involve victims because consultation with police representatives and the National Crime Registrar has suggested this to be the case.
30. We believe that this proposed policy change will have an impact on a small number of victims coming into scope but that the benefit for these victims could be substantial. There is already flexibility for the police to use their professional discretion to offer support and services in line with the Code in cases where a victim of crime is not directly eligible for support under the Code if the offence concerned does not fall under the NCRS.
31. Examples of the services which the additional victims would receive include receipt of a clear explanation of what to expect from the criminal justice process when they report a crime; written information on what to expect from the criminal justice system such as the “information for victims of crime” leaflet, automatic referral to victims’ services and updates on the status of the case.
32. In practice, we believe that in cases where victims of non-NCRS offences suffer harm, the police are already exercising their discretion to provide relevant services and support.
33. We judge that the impact on the police of broadening the definition of victim in the Code is therefore small.

Costs of Option 2(a)

Costs to criminal justice agencies

34. The change to the definition of victim will apply to all agencies covered by the Code, (including the agencies covered by the change in Option 2(b) and the impact on those agencies is considered under Option 2(b)). In practice, of the core criminal justice agencies, we expect that only the police will be affected. The vast majority of victims coming into scope would not require more than the services provided at the stage of reporting the crime due to the low-level nature of the crimes. We think there will be some modest costs to the police and no costs to other agencies.
35. There will be some extra resource costs for the police in providing support to more victims such as an assessment of their needs, providing information about the crime and keeping them informed of the status of their case. We believe that there will be a small number of victims, many of whom will have a low need for services and the police already provide some services to non-NCRS victims on a discretionary basis so the costs to the police will be low. We do not hold any data centrally on the level of support services currently provided to non-NCRS victims on a discretionary basis or any information on the average costs to the police of providing services

¹ This figure is based on the numbers of crimes reported to the Crime Survey for England and Wales and the number of NCRS crimes recorded, each in 2013, and also on an (HMIP) Inspection Report which quantified a shortfall in recorded crime.

under the Code. As a result we are unable to quantify this impact. We would welcome any information, as part of the consultation, on the possible costs of these changes.

36. For summary offences with victims, we consider that there will be no impact on agencies other than the police. For such cases that go to court, we believe that agencies such as the CPS and HMCTS do not differentiate between victims of NCRS offences and victims of non-NCRS offences and that therefore there will be no additional costs for other agencies.
37. There may be an impact on Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs). All victims of crime are already entitled to access "victims' services" commissioned by PCCs to help victims cope and recover from the impact of crime. PCCs have to comply with the Directive according to the terms of their grant agreements.
38. The Code currently entitles victims to be referred to these services by the police when they report a crime. While there will be no change in the number of victims eligible to receive services commissioned by PCCs, broadening the definition of victim means that there may be an increase in the number of victims who get referred to those services. Therefore more victims might become aware of their entitlement to access these services and take up that entitlement. This could increase the number of victims seeking to access the services commissioned by PCCs and potentially the cost of providing those services, although the cost would depend on the level of need of those victims.

Benefits of Option 2(a)

Benefits to victims of crime

39. This change will make victims of non-NCRS offences eligible to receive services under the Code such as receiving a clear explanation of what to expect from the criminal justice process when they report a crime and to receive information about victims' services including their contact details from the police so that they can access their support at any time. For a small number of victims, this may be of substantial benefit but we think the number of victims who benefit in practice will be small for the reasons outlined above.
40. As explained above we do not hold any information on the number of additional victims affected and therefore cannot quantify this impact. We would welcome any information, as part of the consultation, on the possible benefits of these changes.

Net Impact of Option 2(a)

41. We judge that the net impact will be a modest rise in resource costs for the police and a modest benefit to victims of crime.

Risks, assumptions and sensitivities for option 2(a)

42. We have assumed that there are a small number of victims of non-NCRS offences and that victims of non-NCRS offences typically have low need for support and/ or are already provided support on a discretionary basis.
43. We have assumed that all agencies will comply with the revised Code. However, it is possible that some agencies may not comply fully with the changes, in which case the costs and benefits would be lower and there might be more complaints made by victims, and increased costs for agencies in dealing with those complaints.

Option 2(b) – Extending the Code to other investigative and prosecutorial organisations

44. The term “competent authority” is employed throughout the Directive to describe the body (or bodies) that have a duty to provide services to victims. It is down to national law to determine the identity of competent authorities. We have added the organisations listed in Annex A as competent authorities because they are public sector organisations which perform functions in relation to victims as defined by the Directive with respect to one or more of its Articles.
45. The current organisations that are included in the Code are listed at Annex B.
46. While the great majority of criminal offences are investigated by the police and prosecuted by the Crown Prosecution Service, there are a number of other public sector investigative or prosecutorial organisations that are not covered by the Code which routinely, or occasionally, provide services to victims and which are considered to be competent authorities for the purposes of the Directive. These are listed in Annex A which shows whether the organisations have investigative or prosecutorial functions or both.
47. The duties on organisations relate to the following Articles of the Directive:
- Article 3 - Right to understand and to be understood
 - Article 4 - Right to receive information from the first contact with a competent authority
 - Article 5 - Right of victims when making a complaint (reporting a crime)
 - Article 6 - Right to receive information about their case
 - Article 7 - Right to interpretation and translation
 - Article 8 – Referral of victims to victim support services
 - Article 10 - Right to be heard
 - Article 11 - Rights in the event of a decision not to prosecute
 - Article 14 – Right to reimbursement of expenses
 - Article 15 – Right to return of property
 - Article 18 – Right to protection
 - Article 19 – Right to avoid contact between victim and offender
 - Article 20 – Right to protection of victim during criminal investigation
 - Article 21 – Right to protection of privacy
 - Article 22 – Individual assessment of victims to identify specific protection needs
 - Article 23 – Right to protection of victims with specific protection needs during criminal proceedings
 - Article 24 – Right to protection of child victims during criminal proceedings
48. We propose to revise the Code by adding a new chapter which will place duties to provide services to victims on other relevant public sector investigative or prosecutorial organisations, in addition to the core criminal justice agencies. The duties that will apply to each organisation will vary because each organisation has a unique set of functions and encounters victims in different ways.
49. The duties on service providers set out in the Introduction of the Code will apply equally to service providers listed in the new chapter.

50. There is no extra funding being provided to other public sector investigative or prosecutorial organisations to carry out new duties for victims.

Costs of Option 2(b)

Costs to other investigative and prosecutorial organisations (see Annex A)

51. These organisations are likely to incur some resource costs from providing services to victims in line with the updated Code.

52. We expect that the majority of the organisations will deal with few victims each year and as a result we expect that any increase in resource costs will be small. Some of these organisations are law enforcement agencies and deal routinely with victims of crime (e.g. National Crime Agency, Serious Fraud Office). Most of the others seldom deal with victims of crime but encounter them during the course of certain investigations or prosecutions.

53. We expect that the impact of the proposed changes will be greater on the National Crime Agency and the Serious Fraud Office due to the nature of their work involving victims of serious and organised crime. We expect that the impact will be much lower on the other organisations listed in Annex A because we consider that their contact with victims is much less frequent.

54. We do not hold any information centrally on the number of victims that these organisations deal with or their likely demand for services under the Code. As a result we are unable to quantify this impact. We would welcome any information, as part of the consultation, on the possible costs of these changes.

Benefits of Option 2(b)

Benefits to victims of crime

55. Victims of crimes which are dealt with solely by these organisations and not by core criminal justice agencies would benefit by becoming eligible to receive services under the Code.

56. We think the number of victims who benefit will be small but for those victims the benefit may be substantial.

57. We do not hold any data centrally that would allow us to estimate the number of victims affected and as such we are unable to quantify this impact. We would welcome any information, as part of the consultation, on the possible benefits of these changes.

Net impact of option 2(b)

58. We judge that the net impact will be an appreciable rise in costs for the Serious Fraud Office and National Crime Agency and a small rise in costs for the other organisations and a modest benefit to victims of crime.

Risks, assumptions and sensitivities for option 2(b)

59. We have assumed that the number of victims dealt with by these organisations is small.

60. We have assumed that all agencies will comply with the revised Code. However, it is possible that some agencies may not comply fully with the changes, in which case the costs and benefits would be lower and there might be more complaints made by victims, and increased costs for agencies in dealing with those complaints.

Option 2(c) – Making sure that victims who report crimes receive a written acknowledgement from the police which states the basic elements of the criminal offence concerned

61. We propose to revise the Code to make sure that, as part of the existing process, when a police officer either provides written information to victims when reporting a crime on what to expect from the criminal justice system (such as the “information for victims of crime” leaflet), the police officer also provides the victim with the basic elements of the crime.
62. We expect that the police would be required to spend a few additional minutes writing down the additional details of the case onto the leaflet. This estimate is based on initial discussions with the police and the Home Office. We would welcome any information, as part of the consultation, on the likely impact of this change. Currently the leaflet has a space in which victims are able to note down details of the crime, if they wish.
63. This requirement will apply to every crime reported by a victim to the police regardless of whether the crime is recorded.
64. This requirement will also apply to other relevant public sector organisations to which victims report crimes. That impact is assessed as part of Option 2(b) rather than Option 2(c).

Costs of Option 2(c)

Costs to police

65. Any additional costs would fall to police forces as it is the police who would need to provide the written acknowledgement. There would be no additional funding to carry out this work.
66. Police recorded approximately 3.8m crimes in the year ending December 2014.² The total number of crimes reported to the police is higher than this as the police do not record every crime which is reported to them. Some police forces may already be compliant with the requirement to provide victims of reported crime with a written acknowledgement of the crime.
67. We do not hold information centrally on the number of victims who already receive this information and therefore are unable to quantify this impact. We would welcome any information, as part of the consultation, on the likely impact of this change.

Benefits of Option 2(c)

Benefits to victims

Victims will benefit from receiving a written acknowledgement when they report a crime.

Net impact of option 2(c)

68. We judge that the net impact will be an appreciable rise in resource time for the police but we are unable to quantify this impact at present.

Risks, assumptions and sensitivities for option 2(c)

69. It is assumed that the police (or other competent authority) will be able to incorporate the required additional information into the materials they currently provide to a person reporting a crime at first contact and that this requirement will not create a major change in process.

² <http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/rel/crime-stats/crime-statistics/year-ending-december-2014/crime-in-england-and-wales--year-ending-december-2014.html#tab-Summary>

Specific Impact Tests

Statutory Equality Duty

A separate Equalities Statement has been produced and is available at the following link:
<https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/revising-the-victims-code>

Competition Assessment

The proposals will only affect public sector organisations and therefore will have no effect on competition.

Small Firms Impact Test

The proposals will only affect public sector organisations and therefore will have no effect on small businesses.

Small and Micro Business Assessment

The proposals will only affect public sector organisations and therefore will have no effect on small businesses.

Greenhouse gas assessment

We do not expect any significant impact on carbon emissions.

Wider Environmental issues

We do not expect any significant impact on other environmental issues.

Health and Well-being Impact Assessment

Extending the current definition of crime and including other relevant public sector investigative or prosecutorial organisations in the Code is a positive development. This should have a beneficial impact on the health and lifestyle of victims and reduce the need for social care. We do not expect the proposals to have a significant impact on the following wider determinants of health such as income, environment, transport, housing, education, employment, agriculture or social cohesion.

Human Rights

The proposals are compliant with the Human Rights Act (1998).

Justice Impact Test

The overall impact on the Justice System is outlined in the evidence base of this Impact Assessment.

Sustainable Development

We do not anticipate the proposals having any negative effect on the principles of sustainable development.

The proposals may have a small positive effect on the principle of “ensuring a strong, healthy and just society” by providing additional services to victims of any crime.

Privacy Impact Test (an MOJ Specific Impact Test)

Not applicable.

Post Implementation Review

A PIR should be undertaken, usually three to five years after implementation of the policy, but exceptionally a longer period may be more appropriate. A PIR should examine the extent to which the implemented regulations have achieved their objectives, assess their costs and benefits and identify whether they are having any unintended consequences. Please set out the PIR Plan as detailed below. If there is no plan to do a PIR please provide reasons below.

Basis of the review N/A
Review Objective N/A
Review approach and rationale N/A
Baseline N/A
Success Criteria N/A
Monitoring Information arrangements N/A
Reasons for not planning a PIR We do not intend to publish a post-implementation review. The reasons are: (a) we will conduct by October 2015 a post-implementation review of the major revisions we made to the Code in 2013; (b) there is no scope to undo these changes to the Code as they are necessary to comply with the Directive; and (c) The Victims' Commissioner has a statutory duty to monitor the operation of the Code.

Annex A

Organisations we consider to be competent authorities

Name of organisation	Functions relevant to victims
The Competition and Markets Authority	Investigative and Prosecuting
The Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (Criminal Enforcement)	Investigative and Prosecuting
Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs	Investigative
The Health and Safety Executive	Investigative and Prosecuting
The Information Commissioner's Office	Prosecuting
The Independent Police Complaints Commission	Investigative
The National Crime Agency	Investigative and Prosecuting
The Office for Rail and Road ³	Investigative and Prosecuting
The Serious Fraud Office	Investigative and Prosecuting

³ For legal purposes, the Office for Rail and Road is using the name Office of Rail Regulation until mid-October 2015.