



COUNTER TERRORISM POLICING

National Standards for Intelligence Management

(NSIM)

Annex B
Prevent

Annex B Prevent 6

 1. **The statutory role of Prevent** 6

 2. **The Prevent Process** 7

 3. **The role of IMUs within Prevent**..... 7

 4. **CTP relevance for Prevent teams** 7

 5. **The Police Gateway Assessment (PGA)** 8

 6. **Early dissemination and Briefing of local Prevent teams** 8

Annex B Prevent

1. The statutory role of Prevent

Prevent is now a statutory duty under s.26 of the Counter Terrorism and Security Act 2015. The statutory Prevent guidance states that Police have two main functions:

- i. Engage and disrupt extremism activity in partnership with other agencies**
- ii. Work with partners to support individuals identified as vulnerable to being drawn into terrorism**

In order to be able to fulfil this statutory duty it is necessary for Police working within the Prevent space to be aware of extremist activity which requires disruption and be aware of those individuals who are vulnerable to radicalisation.

Keynote:

Vulnerability to Radicalisation and Prevent

The police service play an essential role in most aspects of Prevent work alongside other agencies and partners as set out under the Counter Terrorism and Security Act 2015. Whilst the police may hold key information which can help assess the risk of radicalisation and disrupt people engaged in drawing others into terrorism, it is important to remember that Prevent seeks to intervene at the earliest possible opportunity and safeguard individuals by reducing or eliminating the risk of them becoming involved in terrorism using a range of both police and multi-agency led tactical options.

Within Prevent the term 'vulnerability' describes factors and characteristics associated with susceptibility to radicalisation which if present, may potentially make an individual more vulnerable to extremist narratives. These could include significant emotional events, personal loss or trauma, mental ill health, perception of disadvantage or social exclusion, identity confusion and sense of grievance. Whilst this list is not exhaustive and each case will be different, an individuals' potential vulnerability to extremism should always be considered as part of the overall assessment and decision making process.

2. The Prevent Process

All cases, whether an individual, institution or ideology, deemed suitable for Prevent by an Intelligence Management Unit are referred to a local Police Prevent team. This team will determine whether there is a vulnerability requiring a safeguarding response or extremist activity requiring disruption.

Where cases require a multi-agency safeguarding response they will be managed within a Channel multi-agency panel which will determine the most appropriate safeguarding mechanisms. The Panel, which consists of partners such as health, social services and education alongside police, may commission the services of a specialist intervention provider to work within an individual to reduce their vulnerability to radicalisation.

Where cases are unsuitable for Channel they will be managed with the Police-led space which will often necessitate mechanisms to disrupt extremist activity.

3. The role of IMUs within Prevent

Before Prevent undertake any activity it is necessary for any relevant intelligence to have first undergone IMU Assessment. This ensures that cases are CTP relevant, are not part of existing activity or reach the threshold for an IHM Lead or Priority Investigation.

Predominantly Prevent suitable intelligence will receive a RADO 5 outcome (CTP relevant but no further IMU development required) and then be disseminated to a local Prevent team. In some cases local Prevent teams may also act as a task-able asset for IMUs to assist post RADO 1-6 Outcomes, in particular, RADO 2 (IHM Lead) and RADO 4 (Intelligence Enhancement).

Once a case has been deemed suitable for Prevent then the local Prevent team will continue to submit any relevant intelligence obtained through their case management back to the IMU for continuous assessment through to case closure.

IMUs should consider Prevent during all IMU Assessments of intelligence and whether a local Prevent team can add value.

4. CTP relevance for Prevent teams

Important:

Case reviews have identified multiple occasions in which cases suitable for Prevent have not reached local teams due to a RADO 6 outcome (No CTP relevance) during IMU Assessment. Where intelligence has been submitted directly to an IMU or come through a route in which the local Prevent team were unsuspected they have been left unaware of such cases.

During IMU Assessment it is important to keep in mind the key objective of Prevent is to protect vulnerable individuals from being drawn into terrorism. Where intelligence suggests a vulnerability CTP relevance should be considered in its widest sense including the potential for that person to be drawn into terrorism.

In many cases a partner will refer an individual to the Police with the intention it is received by Prevent. This may be on a referral form which specifically mentions Prevent or Prevent may be mentioned within the wording of the referral. In such cases, unless the intelligence reaches the threshold for a Priority Investigation, IHM Lead, Police Investigation or Intelligence Development, the local Prevent team should be made aware, even if the IMU Assessment results in a RADO 6 outcome.

OFFICIAL SENSITIVE

IMUs should be aware that local Prevent teams may consider cases assessed as RADO 6 under IMU Assessment as CTP relevant for the purpose of Prevent and such cases may still be managed with that team. In such cases there will still be intelligence submitted back into the IMU as part of the Prevent Intelligence Cycle during case management.

5. The Police Gateway Assessment (PGA)

Local Prevent teams will use the PGA to determine whether a case is suitable for management under Prevent or whether it should be exited from the process. The PGA is a structured professional judgement tool, which requires a Prevent practitioner to consider key factors in the case. It may be helpful for IMUs to be aware of the factors within the PGA that local Prevent teams will use to determine whether the case is suitable for Prevent. The key factors considered under the PGA are listed as follows:

- **Vulnerability**
- **Opportunity**
- **Ideology**
- **Capability**
- **Engagement** □ **Intent**
- **Associations**
- **Grievance**

The full PGA assessment document will be hosted on [\[I&S \]](#) and PCNT website

6. Early dissemination and Briefing of local Prevent teams

IMUs should make use of the 'Research and Development' and 'Dissemination and Briefing' enablers under the NSIM model to make early contact with Prevent teams regarding potentially suitable cases, particularly where the IMU Assessor is considering a RADO 6 outcome.