



Ministry of
JUSTICE

Victims of Terrorism Overseas

Equality Impact Assessment

Victims of Terrorism Overseas

Equality Impact Assessment

Introduction

1. This Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) is concerned with current proposals for making payments to eligible victims of terrorism overseas which will apply to British, European Union (EU) and European Economic Area (EEA) citizens who are resident in the United Kingdom (UK).
2. The Crime and Security Act 2010 contains provisions enabling the creation of a scheme to compensate victims of terrorism overseas. During Second Reading of the Bill the then Government announced that it would make separate payments to eligible victims of certain prior incidents. These payments were not introduced before the change of Government. This Government has been considering these proposals.
3. The Government's plans with respect to victims of terrorism overseas are twofold:
 - To make arrangements in accordance with the provisions in the Crime and Security Act 2010 for a compensation scheme for eligible victims that will make payments under the same categories as the revised¹ domestic Criminal Injuries Compensation Scheme (CICS) and come into force at the same time as the revised domestic scheme.
 - To make ex gratia payments to eligible victims in line with what was intended by the previous Government and announced in Parliament at the Second Reading of the Crime and Security Bill. These payments will be limited to payments under the existing (2008) tariff and therefore do not include payments for loss of earnings or special expenses. Additionally, payments will be limited to those victims who continue to suffer [HB1] an ongoing disability as a direct result of injuries sustained and therefore will not be available to bereaved relatives. It is our intention to open the scheme to applications in April 2012, the earliest the systems for processing applications will be in place, and it will run until the commencement of the statutory based scheme.
4. These plans are set out in the consultation document 'Getting it right for Victims and Witnesses' which also sets out the Government's proposals regarding victims and witnesses in England and Wales, and Scotland in relation to domestic [HB2] compensation for criminal injuries in Great Britain. As these plans for victims of terrorism overseas, which apply to the UK as a whole[HB3] , are not new policies the Government is not seeking views on them in the consultation document.
5. This EIA gives consideration to the equality impacts of this policy and their implementation. It analyses the potential effects of the proposals on the elimination of unlawful discrimination, harassment, victimisation and other forms of prohibited

¹ See consultation document 'Getting it right for Victims and Witnesses' for proposals related to revising the domestic scheme.

conduct, the advancement of opportunity and the fostering of good relations against the protected characteristics of age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, marriage and civil partnership, sex and sexual orientation. It is designed to ensure that the Government understands the impact of policy decisions on, and pays due regard to, these needs, in accordance with its statutory duties under section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 (“the public sector equality duty”).²

6. This EIA should be read alongside the Impact Assessment (IA) and the consultation document which sets out the Government’s plans for implementing payments to victims of terrorism overseas as well as consulting on the proposed reforms of the domestic Criminal Injuries Compensation Scheme (CICS), commissioning of services for victims and witnesses and improving reparation to victims.
7. This EIA is a screening of the potential impacts of the policy proposals for the two schemes making payments to victims of terrorism overseas, based on the available evidence. It is a living document and, although the Government is not seeking views on the policy, we would welcome any other evidence sources that we should consider in assessing the equality impacts of the policy. This will allow us to improve our understanding of the potential equality impacts of the policy and if relevant, propose any mitigation. We plan to publish an updated version of this EIA document at the point at which we open the application process for the ex gratia scheme.

Summary

8. Public authorities in Great Britain have a statutory equality duty under section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. The duty requires the Ministry of Justice to have due regard to the need to:

‘(a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and other conduct which is prohibited by or under this Act;

(b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant characteristic and persons who do not share it; and

(c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.’

9. The specific types of discrimination or “protected characteristics” to which the duty to have due regard now applies, following the entry into force the Equality Act 2010, are:

(i) age; (ii) disability; (iii) gender reassignment; (iv) marriage and civil partnership (*applies to the first limb (a) only*) (v) pregnancy and maternity; (vi) race (vii) religion or belief (viii) sex; and (ix) sexual orientation. These types of discrimination are all defined in Part 2 of the Equality Act 2010.

² When policy development and work on this EIA commenced, the relevant duties were under section 76A Sex Discrimination Act 1975, section 71 Race Relations Act 1976 and section 49A Disability Discrimination Act 1995.

10. This EIA assesses the two proposals to make payments to victims of terrorism overseas against each of the limbs of the public sector equality duty and by reference to the protected characteristics.

Elimination of unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation

Direct discrimination, harassment and victimisation

11. Direct discrimination is defined, in section 13(1) of the Equality Act 2010, as follows:

'A person (A) discriminates against another (B) if, because of a protected characteristic, A treats B less favourably than A treats or would treat others.'

12. We have considered whether the current proposals give rise to the possibility of a person being treated less favourably by reason of their protected characteristic. Overall these proposals have a net positive impact because they make new provision where previously there was none. It is our view that the proposals do not directly discriminate against those with protected characteristics as the current proposals would apply to all people irrespective of their age, disability, pregnancy and maternity status, race (in respects other than nationality), religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation, and irrespective of whether they have the protected characteristic of gender reassignment or whether they are married or a civil partner.
13. With regard to the citizenship requirements that form part of the proposals in the schemes, these will provide more favourable treatment to British, EU and EEA citizens. However the Equality Act 2010 makes specific provision in Schedule 23, that such provisions will not breach the prohibitions on direct or indirect discrimination in the Equality Act 2010 if the action is in compliance with arrangements made by, or with, the approval of a Minister of the Crown, or in pursuance of an instrument made by a member of the Executive under an enactment. The ex gratia and statutory schemes would fall within the scope of this provision. In particular, in relation to the statutory scheme, section 48 of the Crime and Security Act 2010 specifically provides that any scheme may determine eligibility by reference to nationality, residence or length of residence.
14. Our proposals provide a positive impact for those who are disabled as a result of injuries sustained during terrorist acts overseas, subsequently designated for the purposes of these schemes. The ex gratia scheme will only make payments to those with an ongoing disability as a result of the attack at the time the application is made and the statutory scheme will have a positive impact by making payments to those who are seriously injured, who are more likely to be disabled than the general population.

Indirect discrimination

15. Indirect discrimination is defined in section 19 of the Equality Act 2010, which reads in material part as follows:

'(1) A person (A) discriminates against another (B) if A applies to B a provision, criterion or practice which is discriminatory in relation to a relevant protected characteristic of B's.

(2) For the purposes of subsection (1), a provision, criterion or practice is discriminatory in relation to a relevant protected characteristic of B's if –

(a) A applies, or would apply, it to people with whom B does not share the characteristic,

(b) it puts, or would put, people with whom B shares the characteristic at a particular disadvantage when compared with people with whom B does not share it,

(c) it puts, or would put, B at that disadvantage, and

(d) A cannot show it to be a proportionate means of achieving a legitimate aim.

16. We have considered whether the current proposals give rise to the possibility of a person being indirectly treated less favourably by reason of their protected characteristic. We have concluded that the proposals may give rise to potential adverse effects in relation to the protected characteristics of race and religion, due to the inclusion of Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO) travel advice as a relevant circumstance for the purpose of designation of a terrorist incident as falling within the schemes. The proposals also give rise to potential adverse effects in relation to the protected characteristic of race due to the residence requirement that forms part of both schemes. We have set out the reasons for each of our proposals and why we think any discriminatory effects can be justified as a proportionate means of achieving a legitimate aim.

Other Forms of Prohibited Conduct

17. The public sector equality duty also requires public authorities to have due regard to the need to eliminate other forms of prohibited conduct under the Equality Act 2010. These include specific work-related forms of the discrimination or breaches of equality rules but we consider that the most relevant in relation to these proposals for reform relate to disability.

Discrimination arising from disability and reasonable adjustments

18. Section 15 of the Equality Act 2010 states:

(1) A person (A) discriminates against a disabled person (B) if-

(a) A treats B unfavourably because of something arising in consequence of B's disability; and

(b) A cannot show that the treatment is a proportionate means of achieving a legitimate aim.

19. Sections 20 and 21 of the Equality Act 2010 also impose a duty to make reasonable adjustments where a disabled person is placed at a substantial disadvantage in comparison with a non-disabled person. The adjustments are to take such steps as is reasonable to avoid the disadvantage, including by finding a reasonable alternative method of providing the service; removing a physical feature or providing an auxiliary aid.
20. As stated above the two schemes will provide a positive impact for those who are disabled either directly, as in the ex gratia scheme where a disability is a pre-condition of a payment under the scheme, or indirectly, as in the statutory scheme where disabled people are more likely to be eligible to receive payments than non-disabled people.

Harassment and victimisation

21. Harassment and victimisation are defined in sections 26 and 27 of the 2010 Act respectively as certain forms of unwanted conduct related to relevant protected characteristics and subjecting a person to a detriment in certain circumstances.
22. We have, consistent with our equality duties, considered whether the current proposals give rise to the possibility that a person having a relevant characteristic will be harassed or victimised. We do not consider that these proposals will have any effect on instances of harassment and victimisation.

Advancing equality of opportunity

23. Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 provides further guidance on fulfilling the second and third limbs of the public sector equality duty.
24. Having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity involves in particular having due regard to the need to:

“(a) remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;

(b) take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it;

(c) encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.”

25. Furthermore, the steps involved in meeting the needs of disabled persons that are different from the needs of persons who are not disabled include, in particular, steps to take account of disabled persons' disabilities.
26. Our proposals for an ex gratia scheme provide payments for those with an ongoing disability. Although ex gratia payments are not intended as compensation but rather a

demonstration of solidarity with victims of overseas terrorist attacks, to the extent those payments are used by the recipient to minimise a disadvantage incurred as a result of the disability, they may contribute to advancing equality of opportunity. Payments under the forward looking statutory scheme, particularly those addressing loss of earnings and other special expenses, may assist in advancing equality of opportunity for disabled people by addressing, in part, an aspect of the disadvantage suffered as a result of the disabling injury.

Fostering good relations

27. Having due regard to the need to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to:
 - tackle prejudice, and
 - promote understanding.
28. We have also considered the need to promote equality of opportunity between disabled persons and other persons, the need to take steps to take account of disabled persons' disabilities, the need to promote positive attitudes towards disabled persons and the need to encourage participation by disabled persons in public life.
29. We do not believe that the proposals make the attainment of these objectives more difficult.

Background to the proposals

30. This equality impact assessment is concerned with the intention to make available payments for eligible victims of overseas terrorist attacks, subsequently designated for the purposes of these schemes.
31. Currently, victims of crime, including victims of terrorism, who sustain injury in Great Britain, can apply for compensation from the CICS. Awards may be made up of payments for injuries and, where relevant, additional payments for loss of earnings and special expenses with the total award capped at £500,000. The Scheme operates in England & Wales and Scotland with a similar scheme operating in Northern Ireland. However, none of these schemes currently include any arrangements for making payments to British and EU residents of the UK affected by terrorist attacks abroad.
32. In some cases, the victims of overseas terrorist acts may have little or no chance of seeking financial redress from the perpetrators, the sponsors of terrorists, or from the state in which the incident occurred. Since 2006, the EU Directive 2004/80/EC has required all EU Member States to have in place arrangements for paying fair and appropriate compensation to victims of intentional, violent crime. Beyond the EU, there are many countries that do not have analogous state compensation arrangements in place.

33. There is some insurance cover available for some aspects of overseas terrorist attacks, in particular cover for medical expenses and repatriation. However, around 40% of travel insurance policies specifically exclude payments in respect of injuries sustained as a result of terrorist attacks³. Furthermore travel insurance cover generally does not extend to compensation for loss of earnings, nor provide compensation for pain and suffering associated with the injuries sustained.
34. UK residents affected by overseas terrorist acts can currently claim financial assistance from the Red Cross Relief Fund for UK Victims of Terrorism Abroad which was launched in May 2007 following a Government contribution of £1m. The Fund is administered by the British Red Cross and provides an immediate grant of £3,000 to help cover costs such as hospital bills, additional accommodation, replacement of lost belongings and repatriation to the UK. A further £12,000 is available for ongoing costs.
35. British nationals affected by terrorism overseas may also access emergency support from the Exceptional Assistance Measures (EAM) scheme run by the FCO. The EAM makes available emergency assistance to cover immediate needs such as flights, accommodation and subsistence if these cannot be met from other sources, such as insurance arrangements. Assistance under these measures is not made available to those who have travelled to a region where the FCO had advised against all travel.
36. In some circumstances, charitable help may also be available. However, this often follows in the aftermath of a major event and amounts vary considerably. For example, the London Bombings Charitable Relief Fund was established following an outpouring of public donations to provide financial relief to victims and their families following the 7/7 attack. Conversely, the Bali, Sharm el Sheikh and Turkish bombings generated nothing for British or UK resident victims as there was no appeal fund set up in the wake of the attacks.

Policy Considerations and Objectives

37. The Government recognises that terrorism is intended as a political statement and attack on society as a whole and has ramifications beyond those who are directly affected by it. As such, the aim of the proposal is to show solidarity with British and EU/EEA victims who are part of our community and have been caught up in terrorist attacks overseas, subsequently designated for the purposes of these schemes, by making payments to those who have been seriously affected and who could not have reasonably anticipated a significant threat to their safety and security when travelling abroad.
38. The statutory scheme will be based on the revised domestic compensation scheme and the intention is that it will be implemented at the same time as the revised domestic scheme. This will include tariff payments for personal injuries and, where relevant, loss of earnings, special expenses and bereavement payments.

³ Association of British Insurers:
www.abi.org.uk/Information/Consumers/General/Terrorist_incidents.aspx

39. The ex gratia scheme will make payments to individuals injured in acts of terrorism from 1 January 2002 based on the current domestic 2008 scheme tariff only for those who continue to suffer an ongoing disability. There will be no additional payments for loss of earnings, special expenses, and bereavement payments or indeed to those who have recovered from their injuries. The intention is to open the ex gratia scheme to applications in April 2012, the earliest the systems for processing applications will be in place, and it will run until the commencement of the statutory based scheme.

Methodology

40. Due to the unpredictable nature of terrorist attacks and the uncertainty around when and where an attack that might be designated for the purposes of these schemes might occur, there is limited evidence available to assess the potential equality impacts of these proposals. The unpredictable nature of terrorism means that we do not think that information on past events is a useful indication of future events. In any case, there is no published data on UK residents injured or affected by terrorism overseas.
41. State funded payments for victims of terrorism overseas is a new provision being introduced by the Government. As such, information is not yet available on the characteristics of claimants of these payments. There is some information available on British victims who have been injured in terrorist attacks on or after 1 January 2002 who may be eligible for payments under the ex gratia scheme. However it is not known whether these individuals will meet the eligibility criteria for the scheme, whether all eligible victims are included or what all the equality characteristics of these individuals are. Therefore this information has not been used within this EIA.
42. In addition, there is no evidence to indicate whether certain people are more at risk of being a victim of terrorism. For all these reasons it is difficult to draw conclusions on whether there is the potential for some groups to be differentially affected by the proposals for making payments to victims of terrorism overseas.
43. The relevant evidence is mainly concerned with the characteristics of UK residents who travel abroad and the nationality of UK residents. We have used the highest quality evidence available, which is mainly national or official government statistics, but we have also drawn on other sources where appropriate. We have considered the following evidence sources:
- Statistics on overseas travel undertaken by UK residents from the 2010 International Passenger Survey, conducted by the Office for National Statistics.⁴ This data has been used to assess whether some groups of people are more likely to travel overseas than others.

⁴ The International Passenger Survey (IPS) is a large face-to-face survey that collects information from a sample of passengers as they enter or leave the UK travelling via the principal airports, sea routes and the Channel Tunnel. Travellers passing through passport control are randomly selected for interview and all interviews are conducted on a voluntary and anonymous basis. Interviewing is carried out throughout the year and in 2010, 316,000 interviews were recorded, which represented about 0.2 per cent of all travellers. The overall response rate for the 2010 survey was 81 per cent. For further details see Office for National Statistics, Travel Trends 2010, published 28 July 2011.

- Statistics on the nationality and country of birth of UK residents from the Annual Population Survey, conducted by the Office for National Statistics.⁵ This data has been used to assess whether some groups will be more affected by the proposed nationality requirements of the schemes than others.
44. Our methodology, in accordance with our equality duties, has been to consider the effects of each of our proposed policies against each protected characteristic (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, marriage and civil partnership, race, religion or belief, sex, and sexual orientation). As well as considering whether individuals with a particular protected characteristic are likely to be over- (or under-) represented amongst those affected, we also explore the potential for proposals to particularly affect certain groups due to their protected characteristics.
 45. Consideration is also given to how any potential equality impacts might be (a) eliminated/reduced or (b) justified.

Evidence Gaps

46. As set out above, there is no data on potential applicants for payments as victims of terrorism overseas. Whilst there is some information available on British victims who may be eligible for payments under the ex gratia scheme this does not include data on all the equality characteristics of these individuals. Therefore there are gaps in the evidence on potential applicants related to all of the protected characteristics (age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation).
47. There are gaps in the evidence on characteristics of UK residents who travel abroad relating to disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race (in respects other than nationality), religion or belief, and sexual orientation.
48. There are gaps in the evidence on the nationality of UK residents relating to age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race (in respects other than nationality), religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation. The existing data shows the nationality of UK residents, rather than citizenship of UK residents (which is a subgroup of UK nationals).
49. To improve our evidence base we shall systematically gather data on the protected characteristics from applicants to the schemes once they are opened. We will explore the possibility of whether other sources of data can provide useful information.

⁵ The Annual Population Survey (APS) is the Labour Force Survey (LFS) plus various sample boosts to increase the size of the survey sample. The LFS is household survey of people in the UK. Its purpose is to provide information on the UK labour market but it includes data on a variety of other variables such as country of birth and nationality. More robust estimates are available by using the APS than from the main LFS; APS datasets are produced quarterly with each dataset containing 12 months of data. There are approximately 360,000 persons per dataset. For further details see Office of National Statistics, Migration Statistics Quarterly Report, published 25 August 2011.

Analysis

General overview of potential impact of the policy

50. This section looks at the overall policy of making payments to victims of terrorism overseas to assess the potential effects of this policy on individuals with the protected characteristics. Statistics on overseas travel undertaken by UK residents gives some indication of those that may be affected by terrorist attacks overseas.
51. The 2010 International Passenger Survey estimated that there were an estimated 55.6m visits abroad by UK residents. Of these, 36.4m (66%) were holiday visits, 6.6m (12%) for business purposes, 10.8m (20%) to visit family and friends, and a further 1.7m (3%) for miscellaneous reasons. The majority of all visits abroad in 2010 were to Spain (10.4m visits, 19% of all visits abroad), followed by France (9.1m, 16%) and the USA (3.2m, 6%). A similar pattern was found when looking at the most popular destinations by the reasons for travel (See Table 1 in Annex A).
52. The 2010 International Passenger Survey found the following in relation to the protected characteristics of age, race (on the basis of nationality) and sex:
- The majority of visits abroad by UK residents were undertaken by people aged 25 to 54; 19% of all visits abroad were undertaken by 25-34 year olds, 21% were undertaken by 35-44 year olds and 20% by 45-54 year olds. There was no clear pattern in travel to different countries by age groups, but some differences were apparent; for example 80% of cruises were taken by people aged 45 and over, and 48% of visits to Poland were made by the 25-34 age group (Table 2, Annex A).
 - The majority (83%) of all visits abroad were undertaken by British Nationals, 17% were undertaken by those of another nationality that were resident in the UK. However, the majority of visits to Lithuania, Poland, Romania and Slovakia were by nationals of those countries that were resident in the UK in comparison to visits to these countries by British Nationals. For example, 88% of visits to Lithuania were by Lithuanian Nationals, 11% were by British Nationals, and 1% was by people with another nationality (Table 3, in Annex A).
 - Men were more likely to travel abroad than women; 55% of all visits abroad were undertaken by men. In general, travel to different countries was fairly comparable between genders. However, the majority of visits to Luxembourg, the Netherlands and areas of North Africa were undertaken by men (69%, 68% and 67% of visits respectively). While the majority of visits to Lithuania, Tunisia and Jamaica were undertaken by women (58%, 56% and 56% of visits respectively) (see Table 4 in Annex A).
53. This would suggest that there may be potential for the proposals to have particular impacts with regard to age, race and sex. However, in the absence of comprehensive data with regard to the overseas travelling habits of UK residents, particularly in relation to the other protected characteristics (disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race (in respects other than nationality), religion or belief, and sexual orientation) it is difficult to create a more precise

demographic profile of individuals who may be eligible for payments as a result of being caught up in terrorist attacks overseas, subsequently designated for the purposes of these schemes.

54. Introducing a systematic collection of equality data from applicants to the schemes once they are opened will help identify any particular impact on an equality group. This data will then serve to inform policy development to improve services and support for victims, and take positive action to promote any victims services particular to that equality group.

Assessment of Potential Effects of specific elements of the Policy

55. The section below takes each policy proposal and analyses the potential effects of that proposal on the nine protected characteristics.

Eligibility based on British/EU/EEA citizenship and residence in the UK for a minimum period of 3 years

56. Our proposal is to extend eligibility for the schemes to British citizens, and their dependants, resident in the UK for a minimum period of three years or more immediately prior to the time of the terrorist incident. EU and EEA citizens, and their dependents, would also be included to ensure compliance with EU law.
57. We do not consider this proposal to have any particular effect on any of the protected characteristics of disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, religion or belief, sex, and sexual orientation. We have identified the following effect on the following protected characteristics:

Age

58. Children under the age of 3 years will not be able to meet the minimum residency requirement by virtue of their age, therefore we intend for eligibility to derive from the parent or legal guardian with whom they reside, with special provision for those children in local authority care.

Race

59. There are two elements to the eligibility criteria based on British and EU/EEA citizenship in combination with a minimum 3 year residence requirement. We have assessed the equality implications of both elements.
60. The citizenship requirement in the schemes will have a negative equality impact on the protected characteristic of race in so far as it relates to nationality because the schemes will exclude citizens who are not of British, EU or EEA citizenship.
61. People lawfully resident in the UK, but who do not hold British citizenship, who are not EU or EEA citizens, or who are not dependants of UK, EU or EEA citizens, will not be

eligible for payments under these schemes. The 2010 Annual Population Survey⁶ estimated that, in the 12 months to December 2010, 93% (56.9m) of UK residents were British nationals; not all of these individuals will be British citizens, and therefore not all will be eligible for the schemes. In addition, the 2010 Annual Population Survey estimated that 2m UK residents were EU/EEA nationals, and 2.5m were non-EU nationals. Of the 2.5m non-EU nationals, we would expect a number of these to still be eligible as dependants of British or EU/EEA citizens.

62. At present, around 50 countries do not permit people to hold dual citizenship, or have restrictions around holding dual citizenship for example India, Kenya and China, meaning that some UK residents who might be eligible for British citizenship, may have chosen to retain the citizenship of, for example, their birth country. Such individuals will therefore not be eligible for these schemes even if they have been resident in the UK for a number of years. It is not known from the present data how many people this may effect. Data from the Office for National Statistics⁷ on country of birth and nationality reflects the degree to which people born abroad have naturalised to British citizenship. This shows that 64% of the residents of the UK who were foreign born had a foreign nationality. There are systematic differences by country of birth. Most residents born in European countries (such as Austria, Portugal, Sweden and several EU A8 countries)⁸ have the nationality of their country of birth, while residents born in many African or South Asian countries do not have the nationality of their country of birth. This suggests that the citizenship requirement is unlikely to have a significant impact on individuals from Commonwealth countries who have been resident in the UK for many years.
63. In regards to the residence requirement, we do not know from the existing data on the nationality of people resident in the UK, how long these people had been resident in the UK. However, we assume that British citizens may find it easier to satisfy the minimum three year residence threshold than those of non-British citizenship.

Rationale and mitigating actions

64. The aim of the two schemes is to demonstrate solidarity with those in our community who have been affected by terrorist incidents overseas taking into account the nature of terrorist attacks as a political statement and attack on our society. The aim being pursued by the citizenship and residence requirements is to limit payments to British and EU/EEA citizens, and their dependents, affected by terrorism overseas who are part of that community, as evidenced by three years of residence. We believe it is proportionate and necessary for the schemes to focus limited new resources on those who have a clear and sufficient connection to the UK before they are able to claim subject to the UK's international and European obligations.

⁶ Office of National Statistics, Migration Statistics Quarterly Report, published 25 August 2011.

⁷ International Migration and the United Kingdom Report of the United Kingdom SOPEMI Correspondent to the OECD 2010: www.geog.ucl.ac.uk/research/mobility-identity-and-security/migration-research-unit/pdfs/Sop10_final_2112.pdf

⁸ The EU A8 consists of the Eastern European countries that joined the EU in 2004: Czech Republic, Estonia, Poland, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Slovakia and Slovenia.

65. Parliament, through the Crime and Security Act 2010, specifically provided that eligibility to the statutory scheme could be determined on the basis of nationality, residency and length of residency.
66. For those who cannot meet the citizenship criteria or the three year residence requirement, the effects may be mitigated by the fact that they may be able to access Government funded medical treatment on the NHS, benefits, local authority provision and support services for victims, e.g. from Victim Support and other voluntary sector organisations.
67. Children under the age of 3 years will not be able to meet the minimum residency requirement by virtue of their age, therefore we intend for eligibility to derive from the parent or legal guardian with whom they reside, with special provision for those children in local authority care.

Designation of a terrorist act for the purposes of the schemes

68. Payments under the statutory scheme can only be made in respect of incidents that the Secretary of State (in practice, the Foreign Secretary) has decided it is appropriate to designate in accordance with section 47 of the Crime and Security Act 2010. When deciding whether it is appropriate to designate an incident, the Secretary of State will have regard to all the circumstances and in particular the FCO travel advice to the area at the time of the incident. The effect of this is that, subject to exceptional circumstances, incidents will not be designated for the purpose of the scheme where they occur in regions of the world the FCO that has advised against all travel. The same designation process will apply to the ex gratia scheme.
69. We do not consider this proposal to have any particular effect on any of the protected characteristics of age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, sex, and sexual orientation. We have identified the possibility of some detrimental impact on the following protected characteristics:

Race

70. The British and EU/EEA resident population of the UK is made up of people of different colour and different ethnic origins as well as the different nationalities that make up the EU and EEA. We know that there are a significant number of UK residents of Pakistani and Afghani origin, a number of whom are likely to be British citizens. By ruling out payments in respect of incidents in areas that the FCO has advised against all travel, the schemes would currently exclude incidents in a number of regions in Pakistan and Afghanistan. If terrorist incidents occurred in those regions, the policy could have an impact on those British citizens whose ethnic or national origins derived from those regions and who consequently might be more likely to travel to such areas to visit friends and family compared to UK citizens of different ethnic or national origins. There could be a similar impact on other UK/EU/EEA citizens with ethnic or national origins deriving from other troubled regions in the world subject to FCO advice.
71. The 2010 International Passenger Survey estimated that there were an estimated 55.6m visits abroad by UK residents; 10.8m (20%) to visit friends or relatives. The most

common destinations for these visits to friends or relatives were France and the Republic of Ireland (1.2m visits to each in 2010). There were an estimated 363,000 visits to Pakistan to visits friends or relatives (3% of all visits to friends or relatives), while visits to Afghanistan were not separately estimated due to the small number of visits recorded (See Table 1 in Annex A).⁹

72. As FCO travel advice is constantly changing based on an assessment of risk to the safety and security of British nationals, this is a potential impact that is difficult to mitigate against.

Religion or belief

73. The current list of regions to which the FCO advises against travel,¹⁰ appears to relate to regions whose populations are predominantly Muslim¹¹. There may therefore be an indirect disproportionately negative impact on the protected characteristic of religion for some individuals who may be more likely to travel to such areas to visit friends and family. However as we do not have information on those travelling to these countries because of the small number of visits recorded (discussed above)¹² it is not possible to estimate accurately the impact. In addition, as travel advice is constantly changing, this is a potential impact that is difficult to mitigate against.

Rationale and mitigating actions

74. The aim of considering FCO travel advice as a relevant factor is to focus limited new resources on those victims who could not reasonably have anticipated a significant threat to their safety or security when travelling abroad.
75. We are aware that it is in the nature of terrorist crime that there may be little individuals can do to prevent themselves from becoming caught up in a terrorist act abroad. However, FCO travel advice is based on an objective assessment of the risks to British nationals and aims to give British travellers the information they need to make their own informed decisions about travelling to a particular country or region.
76. We believe including travel advice in the designation criteria is a reasonable and proportionate means of achieving the aim of compensating individuals caught up in a terrorist incident in those areas of the world where they could not have reasonably anticipated a threat to their safety and security on the basis of FCO travel advice. We consider this reasonable on the basis that there is greater opportunity for individuals to ensure they have adequate provisions in place, such as additional employer or private insurance cover, for travel to these regions.
77. Victims lawfully in the UK remain entitled to access Government funded medical treatment on the NHS, benefits, local authority provision and support services for victims, e.g. from Victim Support and other voluntary sector organisations, subject to any local eligibility requirements.

⁹ For further details see Office for National Statistics, Travel Trends 2010, published 28 July 2011.

¹⁰ FCO travel advice at the time of writing advised against all travel to the following countries or regions; Syria, parts of Pakistan, Yemen, Somalia, parts of Afghanistan, Gaza and parts of Libya.

¹¹ CIA World Factbook.

¹² With the exception of visits to Pakistan, see Table 1 in Annex A.

Types of compensation available

78. In relation to the ex gratia scheme we intend to make payments under the current (2008) tariff only. We do not intend to make payments for loss of earnings or special expenses. We do not consider that this has any particular effect on any of the protected characteristics of age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex, and sexual orientation.
79. The Government does not, in principle, apply policy retrospectively. We are conferring a new payment on those who are currently suffering an ongoing disability as a direct result of injuries sustained following a terrorist act overseas which was not available before. Overall we consider the impact of this policy to have a net benefit.
80. Payments under the statutory scheme for victims of overseas terrorism will be made on the same basis that it is paid in the domestic scheme; a tariff payment, payments for loss of earnings and special expenses. The proposed reforms of the domestic scheme are contained in the consultation document 'Getting it right for Victims and Witnesses' and subject to a consultation period.
81. Our proposals provide a positive impact for those who are disabled as a result of injuries sustained during terrorist acts overseas designated for the purposes of these schemes. The ex gratia scheme will only make payments to those with an ongoing disability as a result of the attack at the time the application is made and the statutory scheme will have a positive impact by making payments to those who are seriously injured, who are more likely to be disabled than the general population.
82. Victims remain entitled to access Government funded medical treatment on the NHS, state-funded benefits, local authority provision and support services for victims, e.g. from Victim Support and other voluntary sector organisations, subject to any local eligibility requirements.

Conclusion

83. Overall, these proposals have a net positive impact because they make new provision where previously there was none. We have concluded that the proposals do give rise to potential adverse effects in relation to the protected characteristics of race and religion due to FCO travel advice as a relevant circumstance for the purpose of designation of an incident. They also give rise to potential adverse effects in relation to the protected characteristic of race due to the citizenship and residence requirement that forms part of both schemes. We believe any negative impact is justified as proportionate means of achieving the legitimate aims set out in this document
84. To improve our evidence base we shall systematically gather data on the protected characteristics from applicants to the schemes once they are opened. We will explore the possibility of whether other sources of data can provide useful information.

Contributing to this EIA

85. As discussed above the Government is not consulting on these policies. However comments are invited in relation to the accuracy and extent of the effects identified in this screening EIA. We welcome views on the potential equality impacts from stakeholders on all the protected characteristics and on any other sources of evidence that we should consider in assessing the equality impacts of the policy. All responses received will be used to inform the updated version of this document which we envisage publishing at the point at which we open the application process for the ex gratia scheme.

86. Responses can be submitted directly through the Ministry of Justice website at <http://consult.justice.gov.uk/digital-communications/victims-witnesses>, via email to victimsconsultation@justice.gsi.gov.uk or by post to Victim and Witness Unit, Ministry of Justice, 8th Floor, 102 Petty France, London, SW1H 9AJ.

Annex A

Evidence tables

Table 1: Visits abroad, by purpose of visit and main country visited, 2010

2010 International Passenger Survey

	Number of visits (thousands)					Percentage of visits				
	Holiday	Business	Visiting friends or relatives	Miscellaneous	Total	Holiday	Business	Visiting friends or relatives	Miscellaneous	Total
Canada	186	47	173	7	413	1%	1%	2%	0%	1%
USA	2,128	541	515	56	3,240	6%	8%	5%	3%	6%
North America	2,314	587	688	63	3,653	6%	9%	6%	4%	7%
Austria	479	64	51	7	600	1%	1%	0%	0%	1%
Belgium	690	356	177	147	1,370	2%	5%	2%	9%	2%
Bulgaria	157	7	62	3	229	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%
Czech Republic	197	59	95	15	366	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Cyprus	769	13	88	12	882	2%	0%	1%	1%	2%
Denmark	79	105	61	7	252	0%	2%	1%	0%	0%
Finland	49	32	19	1	101	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
France	6,347	1,053	1,215	442	9,058	17%	16%	11%	27%	16%
Germany	691	795	534	61	2,082	2%	12%	5%	4%	4%
Greece	1,532	29	102	9	1,672	4%	0%	1%	1%	3%
Hungary	98	35	117	18	268	0%	1%	1%	1%	0%
Irish Republic	916	636	1,210	210	2,972	3%	10%	11%	13%	5%
Italy	1,568	284	345	52	2,248	4%	4%	3%	3%	4%
Lithuania	20	4	99	7	131	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%
Luxembourg	28	61	11	1	102	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%
Malta	364	20	53	3	439	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Netherlands	825	519	363	50	1,758	2%	8%	3%	3%	3%
Norway	67	76	75	4	222	0%	1%	1%	0%	0%
Poland	308	90	996	49	1,443	1%	1%	9%	3%	3%
Portugal	1,615	56	180	16	1,867	4%	1%	2%	1%	3%
Romania	24	29	92	16	160	0%	0%	1%	1%	0%
Russia	24	38	26	2	90	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%
Slovakia	24	9	79	2	114	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%
Spain	9,259	298	717	108	10,383	25%	4%	7%	7%	19%
Sweden	98	105	110	8	320	0%	2%	1%	0%	1%
Switzerland	454	256	159	21	890	1%	4%	1%	1%	2%
Turkey	1,632	64	110	10	1,815	4%	1%	1%	1%	3%
Rest of Europe	378	98	236	18	731	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%
Europe	28,692	5,193	7,380	1,300	42,565	79%	78%	68%	79%	77%
- of which EU27	26,154	4,679	6,845	1,246	38,925	72%	70%	63%	75%	70%
- of which EU25	25,974	4,643	6,692	1,227	38,536	71%	70%	62%	74%	69%
- of which EU15	24,176	4,394	5,095	1,119	34,784	66%	66%	47%	68%	63%
Egypt	600	31	39	2	671	2%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Morocco	264	16	25	3	308	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Tunisia	394	10	17	2	423	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%

Table 1 (continued): Visits abroad, by purpose of visit and main country visited, 2010

2010 International Passenger Survey

	Number of visits (thousands)					Percentage of visits				
	Holiday	Business	Visiting friends or relatives	Miscellaneous	Total	Holiday	Business	Visiting friends or relatives	Miscellaneous	Total
Other North Africa	8	16	61	2	87	0%	0%	1%	0%	
South Africa	176	58	116	21	371	0%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Nigeria	22	15	73	8	117	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%
Other Africa	284	61	206	38	590	1%	1%	2%	2%	1%
Israel	40	16	38	5	98	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
United Arab Emirates	277	93	119	10	499	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Other Middle East	91	80	181	59	410	0%	1%	2%	4%	1%
Hong Kong (China)	44	28	81	5	157	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%
Other China	78	81	122	7	287	0%	1%	1%	0%	1%
India	269	91	452	38	850	1%	1%	4%	2%	2%
Japan	31	31	36	3	101	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Pakistan	39	7	363	21	430	0%	0%	3%	1%	1%
Sri Lanka	72	5	37	3	116	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Thailand	261	13	55	10	339	1%	0%	1%	1%	1%
Other Asia	312	75	240	11	637	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%
Australia	145	35	264	10	454	0%	1%	2%	1%	1%
New Zealand	65	4	69	3	141	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%
Barbados	77	4	10	1	91	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Jamaica	121	9	63	6	199	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%
Other Caribbean	516	16	42	10	583	1%	0%	0%	1%	1%
Brazil	35	24	35	2	96	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Mexico	293	12	9	1	314	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Other Central & Sth America	72	22	29	7	131	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Rest of the World	209	9	3	2	222	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Fly/cruise (stay onboard)	621	.	.	.	621	2%	.	.	.	1%
Other Countries	5,416	859	2,781	289	9,344	15%	13%	26%	17%	17%
Total World	36,422	6,639	10,850	1,652	55,562	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

1. The figures relate to the number of visits, not the number of visitors. The count of visits relates to UK residents returning to this country, those leaving the United Kingdom more than once in the same period are counted on each visit.

2. Visits for miscellaneous purposes include those for study, to attend sporting events, for shopping, health, religious or other purposes, together with visits for more than one purpose when no one purpose predominates (for example visits both on business and on holiday).

3. "Rest of the World" includes estimates of cruises abroad which ended in the UK. Fly/cruise (stay onboard) has been separated from "Rest of the World".

Source: Office for National Statistics, Travel Trends 2010, published 28 July 2011.

Table 2: Visits to specified countries, by main country visited and age, 2010

2010 International Passenger Survey

	Age 0-15		Age 16-24		Age 25-34		Age 35-44		Age 45-54		Age 55-64		Age 65 and over		Total
	No. of visits (1,000s)	% of visits	No. of visits (1,000s)	% of visits	No. of visits (1,000s)	% of visits	No. of visits (1,000s)	% of visits	No. of visits (1,000s)	% of visits	No. of visits (1,000s)	% of visits	No. of visits (1,000s)	% of visits	
Canada	15	4%	39	9%	67	16%	84	20%	73	18%	83	20%	53	13%	413
USA	117	4%	250	8%	605	19%	834	26%	733	23%	463	14%	234	7%	3,240
North America	131	4%	288	8%	672	18%	917	25%	806	22%	546	15%	288	8%	3,653
Austria	70	12%	64	11%	92	15%	103	17%	103	17%	98	16%	68	11%	600
Belgium	111	8%	98	7%	234	17%	282	21%	292	21%	207	15%	145	11%	1,370
Bulgaria	18	8%	32	14%	54	24%	44	19%	45	19%	24	11%	11	5%	229
Czech Republic	19	5%	44	12%	113	31%	69	19%	66	18%	43	12%	12	3%	366
Cyprus	45	5%	68	8%	111	13%	164	19%	189	21%	195	22%	109	12%	882
Denmark	6	2%	13	5%	78	31%	53	21%	65	26%	22	9%	14	5%	252
Finland	6	6%	4	4%	28	28%	36	35%	16	16%	8	8%	3	3%	101
France	834	9%	716	8%	1,443	16%	2,004	22%	1,728	19%	1,461	16%	865	10%	9,058
Germany	106	5%	186	9%	492	24%	489	23%	411	20%	264	13%	129	6%	2,082
Greece	69	4%	245	15%	263	16%	299	18%	374	22%	286	17%	133	8%	1,672
Hungary	7	3%	32	12%	98	37%	56	21%	28	11%	30	11%	16	6%	268
Irish Republic	93	3%	218	7%	588	20%	619	21%	672	23%	439	15%	345	12%	2,972
Italy	128	6%	166	7%	448	20%	447	20%	454	20%	343	15%	257	11%	2,248
Lithuania	7	5%	31	23%	52	40%	26	20%	12	9%	4	3%	.	.	131
Luxembourg	2	2%	10	9%	13	13%	19	18%	16	16%	31	30%	12	12%	102
Malta	23	5%	22	5%	51	12%	60	14%	92	21%	107	24%	84	19%	439
Netherlands	58	3%	245	14%	442	25%	402	23%	334	19%	196	11%	78	4%	1,758
Norway	7	3%	22	10%	54	24%	49	22%	42	19%	31	14%	18	8%	222
Poland	100	7%	198	14%	691	48%	199	14%	143	10%	82	6%	29	2%	1,443
Portugal	85	5%	133	7%	283	15%	390	21%	392	21%	348	19%	234	13%	1,867
Romania	2	1%	35	22%	64	40%	29	18%	19	12%	10	6%	1	1%	160
Russia	1	1%	12	13%	22	24%	23	26%	16	18%	10	12%	6	7%	90
Slovakia	9	8%	19	16%	41	36%	24	21%	13	11%	6	5%	3	3%	114
Spain	680	7%	937	9%	1,524	15%	1,946	19%	2,085	20%	1,844	18%	1,348	13%	10,383
Sweden	6	2%	48	15%	89	28%	81	25%	57	18%	30	9%	8	3%	320
Switzerland	41	5%	89	10%	201	23%	248	28%	156	18%	95	11%	58	6%	890
Turkey	116	6%	202	11%	284	16%	378	21%	394	22%	286	16%	151	8%	1,815
Rest of Europe	25	3%	101	14%	186	25%	147	20%	128	17%	90	12%	53	7%	731
Europe	2,675	6%	3,988	9%	8,040	19%	8,685	20%	8,342	20%	6,592	15%	4,192	10%	42,565
- of which EU27	2,489	6%	3,590	9%	7,349	19%	7,866	20%	7,614	20%	6,075	16%	3,898	10%	38,925
- of which EU25	2,469	6%	3,523	9%	7,230	19%	7,793	20%	7,551	20%	6,041	16%	3,886	10%	38,536
- of which EU15	2,255	6%	3,082	9%	6,018	17%	7,170	21%	7,000	20%	5,579	16%	3,640	10%	34,784
Egypt	27	4%	42	6%	121	18%	141	21%	161	24%	135	20%	46	7%	671
Morocco	4	1%	28	9%	85	28%	71	23%	48	16%	53	17%	20	6%	308
Tunisia	23	6%	44	10%	69	16%	90	21%	91	21%	61	14%	44	11%	423

Table 2 (continued): Visits to specified countries, by main country visited and age, 2010

2010 International Passenger Survey

	Age 0-15		Age 16-24		Age 25-34		Age 35-44		Age 45-54		Age 55-64		Age 65 and over		Total
	No. of visits (1,000s)	% of visits	No. of visits (1,000s)	% of visits	No. of visits (1,000s)	% of visits	No. of visits (1,000s)	% of visits	No. of visits (1,000s)	% of visits	No. of visits (1,000s)	% of visits	No. of visits (1,000s)	% of visits	
Other North Africa	4	4%	5	5%	15	17%	29	33%	22	25%	9	11%	3	4%	87
South Africa	8	2%	25	7%	80	22%	79	21%	72	19%	71	19%	35	9%	371
Nigeria	3	2%	10	9%	29	25%	37	32%	28	24%	8	6%	3	2%	117
Other Africa	18	3%	60	10%	129	22%	151	26%	112	19%	89	15%	30	5%	590
Israel	5	5%	15	15%	16	16%	15	15%	20	20%	16	17%	11	11%	98
United Arab Emirates	24	5%	37	7%	109	22%	129	26%	110	22%	54	11%	36	7%	499
Other Middle East	22	5%	47	11%	109	27%	88	22%	75	18%	44	11%	24	6%	410
Hong Kong (China)	6	4%	36	23%	26	17%	18	11%	36	23%	21	13%	14	9%	157
Other China	6	2%	88	31%	70	24%	42	15%	45	16%	27	9%	10	3%	287
India	26	3%	59	7%	243	29%	170	20%	169	20%	120	14%	61	7%	850
Japan	3	3%	8	8%	33	33%	26	26%	14	14%	12	12%	5	5%	101
Pakistan	37	9%	50	12%	131	30%	90	21%	58	14%	32	7%	31	7%	430
Sri Lanka	5	4%	10	8%	26	22%	27	23%	23	20%	20	17%	5	4%	116
Thailand	6	2%	35	10%	101	30%	67	20%	61	18%	52	15%	15	5%	339
Other Asia	16	2%	71	11%	159	25%	140	22%	126	20%	97	15%	29	5%	637
Australia	14	3%	46	10%	89	20%	72	16%	67	15%	94	21%	73	16%	454
New Zealand	1	1%	14	10%	22	16%	23	16%	25	18%	29	21%	26	18%	141
Barbados	3	3%	6	7%	6	7%	19	21%	29	32%	19	21%	9	10%	91
Jamaica	4	2%	12	6%	29	15%	43	22%	63	32%	32	16%	16	8%	199
Other Caribbean	19	3%	47	8%	101	17%	129	22%	137	24%	113	19%	35	6%	583
Brazil	2	2%	10	11%	29	30%	26	27%	17	18%	10	10%	3	3%	96
Mexico	10	3%	33	11%	87	28%	54	17%	74	24%	42	13%	14	4%	314
Other Central & Sth. America	1	1%	13	10%	31	24%	38	29%	25	19%	18	14%	6	4%	131
Rest of the World	.	.	3	1%	6	3%	6	3%	7	3%	2	1%	3	1%	222
Fly/cruise (stay onboard)	15	2%	20	3%	24	4%	64	10%	149	24%	190	31%	160	26%	621
Other Countries	314	3%	879	9%	1,984	21%	1,902	20%	1,910	20%	1,527	16%	818	9%	9,344
Total World	3,121	6%	5,155	9%	10,696	19%	11,504	21%	11,058	20%	8,665	16%	5,297	10%	55,562

1. Fly/cruise (stay onboard) has been separated from "Rest of the World".

2. Total Rest of the World figure includes estimates of cruises abroad which ended in the UK. Methodology for estimating these visits was revised in 2010 (see Appendix C of Travel Trends for further details).

Source: Office for National Statistics, Travel Trends 2010, published 28 July 2011.

Table 3: Visits to specified countries, by main country visited and nationality, 2010

2010 International Passenger Survey

	Nationality						Total
	UK		Country of visit		Other		
	No. of visits (1,000s)	% of visits	No. of visits (1,000s)	% of visits	No. of visits (1,000s)	% of visits	
Canada	359	87%	24	6%	30	7%	413
USA	2,927	90%	116	4%	197	6%	3,240
North America	3,286	90%	157	4%	210	6%	3,653
Austria	533	89%	24	4%	43	7%	600
Belgium	1,184	86%	45	3%	141	10%	1,370
Bulgaria	166	73%	55	24%	7	3%	229
Czech Republic	270	74%	58	16%	38	10%	366
Cyprus	843	96%	24	3%	15	2%	882
Denmark	185	73%	30	12%	38	15%	252
Finland	77	76%	13	13%	11	11%	101
France	7,938	88%	521	6%	599	7%	9,058
Germany	1,608	77%	250	12%	224	11%	2,082
Greece	1,525	91%	70	4%	77	5%	1,672
Hungary	147	55%	102	38%	19	7%	268
Irish Republic	1,591	54%	504	17%	878	30%	2,972
Italy	1,844	82%	233	10%	171	8%	2,248
Lithuania	14	11%	115	88%	1	1%	131
Luxembourg	80	78%	.	.	22	22%	102
Malta	410	93%	16	4%	13	3%	439
Netherlands	1,457	83%	126	7%	175	10%	1,758
Norway	159	71%	32	14%	32	14%	222
Poland	346	24%	1,057	73%	41	3%	1,443
Portugal	1,656	89%	122	7%	89	5%	1,867
Romania	53	33%	99	62%	8	5%	160
Russia	58	64%	21	23%	12	13%	90
Slovakia	37	33%	70	62%	7	6%	114
Spain	9,831	95%	163	2%	389	4%	10,383
Sweden	218	68%	57	18%	45	14%	320
Switzerland	715	80%	29	3%	146	16%	890
Turkey	1,695	93%	46	3%	74	4%	1,815
Rest of Europe	532	73%	142	19%	57	8%	731
Europe	35,171	83%	5,657	13%	1,736	4%	42,565
- of which EU27	32,035	82%	5,176	13%	1,714	4%	38,925
- of which EU25	31,815	83%	4,971	13%	1,750	5%	38,536
- of which EU15	29,726	85%	3,092	9%	1,966	6%	34,784
Egypt	634	94%	7	1%	30	4%	671
Morocco	279	91%	6	2%	23	7%	308
Tunisia	393	93%	8	2%	21	5%	423
Other North Africa	59	68%	22	25%	6	7%	87
South Africa	309	83%	39	11%	23	6%	371
Nigeria	58	50%	52	44%	7	6%	117
Other Africa	455	77%	91	15%	44	7%	590
Israel	80	81%	9	9%	10	10%	98
United Arab Emirates	448	90%	10	2%	41	8%	499
Other Middle East	301	73%	77	19%	33	8%	410
Hong Kong (China)	120	76%	12	8%	25	16%	157
Other China	150	52%	116	41%	21	7%	287
India	556	65%	258	30%	36	4%	850
Japan	63	63%	27	27%	10	10%	101
Pakistan	324	75%	95	22%	11	3%	430
Sri Lanka	96	82%	13	12%	7	6%	116
Thailand	288	85%	26	8%	25	7%	339
Other Asia	463	73%	129	20%	45	7%	637
Australia	401	88%	33	7%	19	4%	454
New Zealand	125	89%	9	7%	6	4%	141

Table 3 (continued): Visits to specified countries, by main country visited and nationality, 2010

2010 International Passenger Survey

	Nationality						Total
	UK		Country of visit		Other		
	No. of visits (1,000s)	% of visits	No. of visits (1,000s)	% of visits	No. of visits (1,000s)	% of visits	
Barbados	90	99%	1	1%	.	.	91
Jamaica	182	91%	9	5%	8	4%	199
Other Caribbean	549	94%	6	1%	28	5%	583
Brazil	57	59%	21	22%	18	19%	96
Mexico	298	95%	2	1%	13	4%	314
Other Central & Sth. America	102	78%	10	8%	19	14%	131
Fly/cruise (stay onboard)	604	97%	.	.	17	3%	621
Other Countries	7,507	80%	1,447	15%	390	4%	9,344
Total World	45,965	83%	9,597	17%	.	.	55,562

1. Figures for Rest of World have been removed as they are mainly estimates of cruises abroad which ended in the UK.

2. Fly/cruise (stay onboard) has been separated from "Rest of the World".

Source: Office for National Statistics, Travel Trends 2010, published 28 July 2011.

Table 4: Visits to specified countries, by main country visited and gender, 2010

2010 International Passenger Survey

	Male		Female		Total
	No. of visits (1,000s)	% of visits	No. of visits (1,000s)	% of visits	
Canada	217	52%	196	47%	413
USA	1,785	55%	1,450	45%	3,240
North America	2,002	55%	1,646	45%	3,653
Austria	342	57%	258	43%	600
Belgium	848	62%	522	38%	1,370
Bulgaria	122	53%	107	47%	229
Czech Republic	208	57%	158	43%	366
Cyprus	468	53%	414	47%	882
Denmark	161	64%	90	36%	252
Finland	54	54%	47	46%	101
France	5,100	56%	3,954	44%	9,058
Germany	1,343	64%	734	35%	2,082
Greece	871	52%	800	48%	1,672
Hungary	149	56%	119	44%	268
Irish Republic	1,628	55%	1,345	45%	2,972
Italy	1,192	53%	1,052	47%	2,248
Lithuania	55	42%	75	58%	131
Luxembourg	70	69%	32	31%	102
Malta	251	57%	188	43%	439
Netherlands	1,201	68%	555	32%	1,758
Norway	140	63%	83	37%	222
Poland	783	54%	659	46%	1,443
Portugal	920	49%	947	51%	1,867
Romania	100	62%	60	37%	160
Russia	54	60%	36	40%	90
Slovakia	61	54%	53	46%	114
Spain	5,353	52%	5,016	48%	10,383
Sweden	192	60%	128	40%	320
Switzerland	536	60%	352	40%	890
Turkey	915	50%	895	49%	1,815
Rest of Europe	408	56%	321	44%	731
Europe	23,524	55%	18,997	45%	42,565
- of which EU27	21,521	55%	17,368	45%	38,925
- of which EU25	21,300	55%	17,201	45%	38,536
- of which EU15	19,274	55%	15,479	44%	34,784
Egypt	361	54%	311	46%	671
Morocco	167	54%	140	46%	308
Tunisia	186	44%	236	56%	423
Other North Africa	59	67%	28	32%	87
South Africa	207	56%	164	44%	371
Nigeria	59	51%	58	49%	117
Other Africa	308	52%	282	48%	590
Israel	53	54%	45	46%	98
United Arab Emirates	264	53%	235	47%	499
Other Middle East	261	64%	148	36%	410
Hong Kong (China)	89	57%	68	43%	157
Other China	173	60%	115	40%	287
India	509	60%	338	40%	850
Japan	57	56%	44	44%	101
Pakistan	278	65%	151	35%	430
Sri Lanka	67	58%	49	42%	116
Thailand	217	64%	121	36%	339
Other Asia	381	60%	256	40%	637
Australia	225	50%	229	50%	454
New Zealand	69	49%	71	51%	141

Table 4 (continued): Visits to specified countries, by main country visited and gender, 2010

2010 International Passenger Survey

	Male		Female		Total
	No. of visits (1,000s)	% of visits	No. of visits (1,000s)	% of visits	
Barbados	55	60%	36	40%	91
Jamaica	89	44%	111	56%	199
Other Caribbean	325	56%	258	44%	583
Brazil	56	59%	39	41%	96
Mexico	172	55%	141	45%	314
Other Central & Sth. America	73	56%	58	44%	131
Rest of the World	16	7%	10	5%	222
Fly/cruise (stay onboard)	303	49%	318	51%	621
Other Countries	5,175	55%	4,160	45%	9,344
Total World	30,604	55%	24,702	44%	55,562

1. Fly/cruise (stay onboard) has been separated from "Rest of the World".

2. Total Rest of the World figure includes estimates of cruises abroad which ended in the UK. Methodology for estimating these visits was revised in 2010 (see Appendix C of Travel Trends for further details).

3. Aggregated number of visits for males and females were not published in 2010 Travel Trends; the numbers presented are based on a total of the number of visits for Leisure and the number of visits for Business and may not be comparable to the overall total due to rounding.

Source: Office for National Statistics, Travel Trends 2010, published 28 July 2011.