

## Official Sensitive



Homeland Security  
Group  
2 Marsham Street  
London  
SW1P 4DF  
[www.gov.uk/home-office](http://www.gov.uk/home-office)

13 March 2025

**Dear Channel/Prevent Practitioners**

**Channel/PMAP chairs, deputy chairs and Channel panel members  
Cc: Prevent Leads and Coordinators, Counter Terrorism Case Officers,  
Regional Prevent Coordinators, DfE Regional Coordinators/PEOs, DHSC  
Regional Safeguarding Leads**

### **Prevent/Channel policy clarification and assurance measures**

On the 21 January 2025, following the conviction of Axel Rudakubana for the Southport attack, the Home Secretary gave a [statement in Parliament](#) where she outlined a number of next steps. This included determining whether Prevent is currently able to effectively manage the rapidly evolving risks presented by the cohort of young people who are fascinated by violence, but without a clear terrorist ideology.

Whilst longer term improvements are considered, measures are being introduced to clarify the policy position and strengthen assurance on two significant issues: **repeat referrals** and **referrals categorised as ‘fascination with extreme violence or mass casualty attacks.’** This work has been jointly developed and agreed by the Home Office and CTPHQ in response to the changing profile of those requiring support, and the need to increase consistency in the assessment and progression of Prevent referrals.

Cohorts categorised as ‘fascination with extreme violence or mass casualty attacks’ have been relevant for Prevent since 2019, although analysis has shown there to be significant inconsistency with how such referrals are progressed through the system. The ideology list, shared with the network in early May 2024, provides a clear definition and is attached again for ease of reference. There should be one consistent and proportionate threshold applied to Prevent activity across the full range of radicalisation concerns. While there may be times when the precise ideological driver is not clear, referrals should proceed if there is a concern that someone may be susceptible to radicalisation.

In your decision-making it is important to consider both the harm to the person, as well as the potential wider societal harm committed by the person. Where Prevent concerns are present, these must not be dismissed or accounted for based on a person’s mental ill-health. If other support mechanisms are simultaneously required or being considered, these should proceed unless there is a good reason not to do so. It must also be remembered that other services, such as safeguarding, do not have a remit to assess a person’s CT risk.

## Official Sensitive

CTP are introducing interim operational policy changes that will come into effect immediately, to strengthen decision-making and assurance at the assessment stage. All repeat referrals will be progressed for information gathering and will be subject to additional senior sign-off and assurance checks before exit. This will support CTP decision-making, as well as reflect the cumulative risk of repeat referrals, and build in greater assurance.

A summary of the revised measures is provided below with separate communications issued across the CTP network by CTPHQ:

- Clearer definitions of repeat referrals and referrals categorised as 'fascination with extreme violence or mass casualty attacks' within the interim policy.
- Increased Inspector oversight to review risks and agree an action plan with the CTCO and their supervisor.
- These types of cases should go through the PGA. A decision to close at PGA should be the exception requiring endorsement by a RPC or appointed deputy.
- Full information gathering and additional checks must take place.
- A contact visit is required prior to closure (to exhaust all investigative routes to understand risk factors) for referrals not meeting the S36 threshold which are to be closed at 'Information Gathering'.
- Referral closure prior to Channel is to be endorsed by the RPC.
- All other ideologies should continue to be handled as they have been previously.
- The interim policy will be subject to review in 3 months.

Where repeat referrals, or those categorised under 'fascination with extreme violence or mass casualty attacks' are referred to Channel panels for consideration, we endorse the adoption of these cases where appropriate (such as if there are concerns that the person may be on a pathway that could lead to terrorism). In instances where the Channel panel decide **not to adopt a case, but residual vulnerabilities remain**, an interim policy addendum is attached outlining updated signposting arrangements, and steps to be taken which strengthen existing exit pathway requirements detailed in paragraphs 81-85 of the [Channel Duty Guidance](#). Channel panels may begin to see these Prevent referrals progressed more routinely for Channel consideration following this policy clarification.

We recognise that the pace and scale of improvements across Prevent is significant. Your support in delivering Prevent at the local level remains vital as we further shape our policy and operational approach. We fully appreciate the hard work and dedication of practitioners in delivering this important work and would like to take this opportunity to thank you for the continuing professionalism and dedication that you and your panel show in the delivery of Channel and Prevent.

## Official Sensitive

We will continue to keep you abreast of developments as they occur and communicate any advice promptly as it relates to your Channel practice. In the meantime, if you have any questions, please do reach out to us at [Channel@homeoffice.gov.uk](mailto:Channel@homeoffice.gov.uk) or contact your Channel Quality Assurance leads or Prevent Advisers for further advice.

Yours,

**Signature**

Cathryn Ellsmore  
Deputy Director, Prevent  
Homeland Security Group

Enclosed.

- Channel exit pathways policy addendum
- PCMT ideology category definitions (issued May 2024)