

Summary: Intervention & Options

Department /Agency:	Title: Partial Impact Assessment of draft (partial) Immigration and Citizenship Bill	
Stage:	Version: 16.00	Date: 25 June 2008
Related Publications:		

Available to view or download at:

<http://www>.

Contact for enquiries: Simplification Project Team

Telephone: 020 7035 1353

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

The biggest shake-up to our border protection and immigration system for over 45 years is well underway. Now we propose to replace almost all our current immigration laws to make sure these changes stick

What are the policy objectives and the intended effects?

- stronger borders
- controlled migration
- ensuring newcomers earn the right to stay
- a firm but fair system

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

1. Do nothing and maintain the existing complex legislation
2. Consolidate the existing Acts without making any further changes
3. A fundamental overhaul of the existing law

Both option 1 and 2 would retain the existing complexity of immigration law

Option 3 allows the simplification and strengthening of key concepts , language and approach and will maximise the benefits of change

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

Ministerial Sign-off For consultation stage Impact Assessments:

I have read the Impact Assessment and I am satisfied that, given the available evidence, it represents a reasonable view of the likely costs, benefits and impact of the leading options

Signed by the responsible Minister:

Liam Byrne

Date: 26/06/08

Summary: Analysis & Evidence

Policy Option: 3

Description: Consolidation of Existing Acts and Simplification of Existing Law where appropriate – Preferred Option

COSTS	ANNUAL COSTS		Description and scale of key monetised costs by 'main affected groups': (public: £6-7m, private: £3-4m, third sector: £1-2m)	
	One-off (Transition)	Yrs		
	£			
	Average Annual Cost (excluding one-off)			
	£		Total Cost (PV)	£
Other key non-monetised costs by 'main affected groups'				

BENEFITS	ANNUAL BENEFITS		Description and scale of key monetised benefits by 'main affected groups'	
	One-off	Yrs		
	£			
	Average Annual Benefit (excluding one-off)			
	£ 1.75m		Total Benefit (PV)	£ 17.5m
Other key non-monetised benefits by 'main affected groups'				

Key Assumptions/Sensitivities/Risks

Price Base Year	Time Period Years	Net Benefit Range (NPV) £ -17.5m to +18.3m	NET BENEFIT (NPV Best estimate) £
--------------------	----------------------	--	---

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

Impact on Admin Burdens Baseline (2005 Prices)		(Increase - Decrease)	
Increase of	£ 0	Decrease of	£ 415k
		Net Impact	- £ 415k

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

Evidence Base (for summary sheets)

BACKGROUND

The biggest shake-up to our border protection and immigration system for over 45 years is well underway. Now we propose to replace almost all our current immigration laws to make sure these changes stick. The changes we propose will mean:

- stronger borders, with fingerprint checks overseas; the introduction of a strong new force at the border equipped with modern powers; rolling out systems for counting people in and out of the country; and the introduction of identity cards for foreign nationals.
- controlled migration, through the roll out of the Australian style points system, ending low skilled migration from outside Europe, and overhauling other routes into the UK for visitors and family members, including spouses.
- ensuring newcomers earn the right to stay by learning English, paying taxes and obeying the law.
- in a firm but fair system, enforcing the deal that newcomers make - including the automatic deportation of foreign criminals and civil penalties for the employers who do not make the right checks and employ illegal workers; and with faster decision making – to help people who need our protection and to act against migrants who break the law.

To ensure these changes take real effect, we propose a fundamental overhaul of the law.

We will use this reform to cut red tape and accelerate the speed of our work. It will help us make fair decisions that are right first time more often. The new law will say what it means and mean what it says, and will be easier for the UKBA to enforce.

RATIONALE FOR INTERVENTION

The Immigration Act 1971 is the foundation of the UK's current legal framework, although that Act was passed in a very different world. Subsequent legislation has provided vital additions and strengthening measures to respond to the enormous changes in patterns of international migration there have been over the last thirty five years. The legal framework currently consists of 10 immigration Acts, a range of secondary legislation, and the Immigration Rules. These Acts include:

- Immigration (Carrier's Liability) Act 1987
- Immigration Act 1988.
- Asylum and Immigration Appeals Act 1993,
- Asylum and Immigration Act 1996,
- Special Immigration Appeals Commission Act 1997
- Immigration and Asylum Act 1999,
- Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act 2002,
- Asylum and Immigration (Treatment of Claimants, etc) Act 2004,
- Immigration, Asylum and Nationality Act 2006,
- UK Borders Act 2007.

CONSULTATION

Initial Consultation

“*Simplifying Immigration Law – An Initial Consultation*” was published on 6 June 2007, setting out principles for simplification and inviting views. The consultation period ended on 29 August 2007 and an analysis of the responses was published in December 2007.

The Green Paper ‘*The Path to Citizenship: Next Steps in Reforming the Immigration System*’ was published on 20 February 2008 and ended on 14 May 2008. The response to this Green Paper has been published alongside the draft (partial) Bill.

The draft (partial) Immigration and Citizenship Bill is the next stage in the Government’s consultation.

OPTIONS

For the purpose of this Impact Assessment, we set out below some broad assessments of the impacts associated with each of the key areas of immigration law which have been included in the draft (partial) Bill. Due to the fact that many areas of the law need to be covered in a future Bill for introduction this assessment can be no more than an indicative estimate of where we are.

In developing the draft legislation we are considering three broad options in each area of immigration law. These are also being considered against the backdrop of all the other changes to the immigration system, such as the points based system and e-borders which have been made or which are under development. The three options for change are:

1. Do nothing and maintain the existing complex legislation
2. Replace the existing Acts without making any further changes to the existing provisions
3. Replace the existing Acts and simplify the existing law where appropriate

Each of the key areas of immigration legislation will be reviewed to decide whether there are significant costs and benefits associated with either consolidation or simplification. The preferred option represents the current mix of consolidation and simplification proposals that aim to maximise the net benefits of legal reform.

As we are presenting a partial Draft Bill at this stage it is not possible to fully quantify the costs and benefits of each of the above options. A more detailed cost and benefit analysis will be developed as detailed provisions are finalised and will be published when the Bill is introduced to Parliament.

It will be important to look carefully at the links between the different parts of the law when the whole package has been prepared. It is also very important to take full account of wider

changes to the system which will be being made over the same period. For the purpose of this Impact Assessment, we set out below some broad assessments of the impacts associated with each of the key areas of immigration law which have been included in the Draft Bill.

A summary of the main provisions in the draft Bill is below:

	what is in the draft Bill	what it replaces
PART 1: Regulation of entry into and stay in the UK	<p>A single concept of permission which will be simpler and easier to understand and use. Duty for all those in the UK without valid permission to make an application to regularise their stay. Power to grant permission to certain groups, primarily those currently exempt from control, by statutory instrument rather than primary legislation.</p> <p>Transit permission will be required for travellers passing through the UK without entering, on their way to another country. Again there will be power to confer permission by order in classes of case, rather than in response to individual applications.</p> <p>Powers under the Bill are generally assigned to the Secretary of State and will be delegated to officers in the UK Border Agency. This part of the Bill also provides for the designation of trained and suitable officials to carry out specific functions on behalf of the Secretary of State.</p>	<p>Entry clearance, leave to enter and leave to remain are currently separate concepts, although changes to the law since the Immigration Act 1971 have blurred the distinctions between them. A clearer power to cancel permission at the border, abroad and elsewhere will replace a number of separate powers. The changes will make the system clearer and provide a firmer basis for enforcement.</p>
PART 2: Powers to examine etc	<p>Single power to expel from the UK those who are refused permission; have overstayed or</p>	<p>The examination powers broadly follow the powers currently available to examine</p>

	<p>otherwise breached conditions attached to their permission; obtained permission by deception; are liable to automatic expulsion following a conviction; and whose presence is otherwise not conducive to the public good. An automatic bar from return to the UK after expulsion subject to a time period based on the reason for removal and with shorter periods for those who leave voluntarily.</p>	<p>passengers at ports, but are extended in-country and overseas.</p>
<p>PART 3: Citizenship</p>	<p>Ensuring that eligibility for citizenship and the time taken to obtain it is determined by the shared values of speaking English, making an economic contribution, obeying the law and being involved in the community.</p>	<p>These are amendments to the British Nationality Act 1981. The case for change is set out in the "Path to citizenship" and the response to that consultation.</p>
<p>PART 4: Expulsion, exclusion & removal etc from the UK</p>	<p>Single power to expel from the UK those who are refused permission; have overstayed or otherwise breached conditions attached to their permission; obtained permission by deception; are liable to automatic expulsion following a conviction; and whose presence is otherwise not conducive to the public good. An automatic bar from return to the UK after expulsion subject to a time period based on the reason for removal and with shorter periods for those who leave voluntarily. This part of the Bill also provides for assistance to voluntary leavers. (We are looking at how the new approach to the repayment of costs by those expelled will be</p>	<p>Powers and procedures for deportation and administrative removals are dealt with separately in the current immigration legislation. There is no automatic bar on return for those who are removed rather than deported. The new Bill retains the provisions for the automatic expulsion of foreign criminals enacted in the UK Borders Act 2007.</p>

	applied to those helped to leave voluntarily.)	
PART 5: Powers to detain & immigration bail	<p>This part of the Bill brings together powers to detain those without permission who are not immediately required to leave; and to grant “immigration bail” as an alternative to detention (the term is not yet settled and we will welcome comments on it).</p> <p>The detention powers consolidate existing provisions for a person to be detained while their case is considered or practical preparations are made for their departure.</p> <p>This part of the Bill also sets out powers to provide assistance to those leaving the UK voluntarily and to participate in international projects on migration. The main change from existing provision is to extend the ability to assist to nationals of European Economic Area countries who are victims of trafficking.</p>	<p>The new provisions for immigration bail would replace the existing use of separate procedures for temporary admission, temporary release and bail. These are variously exercised under different arrangements by officials on behalf of the Secretary of State, chief immigration officers and the Asylum and Immigration Tribunal. A single power with a broad menu of conditions which can be attached – including residence, reporting, financial securities, and electronic monitoring – will allow greater clarity and control in these cases.</p>
PART 6: Detained persons and removal centres	<p>This part of the Bill consolidates existing provisions for removal centres in which immigration detainees may be held and for escort arrangements when detainees are moved.</p>	<p>No significant changes from existing provision.</p>
PART 7: Offences	<p>Consolidated provisions for criminal offences relating to immigration control and the penalties they carry - puts the key offences together, in one place and closes any loopholes.</p>	<p>This part of the Bill is also intended primarily to consolidate existing provisions and bring together in one place the range of criminal offences which have been created in different Acts. We are also taking the opportunity to review</p>

		<p>their coverage, to remove any unnecessary overlaps and duplication, and to consider whether it would be appropriate to add any further civil penalties alongside existing criminal sanctions.</p>
<p>PART 8: Carriers' Liability</p>	<p>Maintaining and strengthening provisions for the imposition of penalties for inadequately documented passengers and clandestine entrants.</p>	<p>This part of the Bill consolidates provisions for penalties for those bringing inadequately documented passengers and clandestine entrants to the UK. It extends carriers' liability to bringing passengers to the UK who claim to be British citizens or EEA entrants but have no satisfactory documentation to establish their status.</p>
<p>PART 9: Illegal Workers</p>	<p>As now, civil penalties and a criminal offence for employing illegal workers. It is an important element of our wider partnerships to tackle immigration crime that employers play their part in checking that those they employ are entitled to work here.</p>	<p>This part of the Bill retains the civil penalty for employers employing illegal workers which was successfully introduced on 29 February 2008.</p>
<p>PART 10: Appeals</p>	<p>This part of the Bill retains the broad system of a "one-stop" right of appeal against specified immigration decisions to the Asylum and Immigration Tribunal. It introduces some simplification and clarification of currently complex provisions for appeals against immigration decisions to the Asylum and Immigration Tribunal. (We are consulting on further changes bearing on onward rights of appeal from the Tribunal and the handling of judicial review cases. In the light of that consultation we will bring</p>	<p>Currently the AIT is able to review the SoS's exercise of discretion. Current provision sets out 7 grounds of appeal.</p>

	forward further measures on appeals in the full Bill for introduction.)	
PARTS 11-13: General supplementary provisions, definitions & final provisions	The concluding parts of the Bill are largely technical and follow existing provision. They include a new streamlined provision for setting fees for immigration applications and other services. New provision to allow a fee to cover a person's removal expenses to be charged if they return to the UK. Orders setting levels of fees will continue to be subject to Parliamentary approval under affirmative procedure.	There are also general provisions on the making of orders, rules and regulations; on giving notices; and on a range of definitions. There are standard provisions on money, repeals, commencement, extent, etc. The Bill generally extends to the United Kingdom, with a few provisions not applying to Scotland. There is power to extend provisions to the Channel Islands and Isle of Man by Order in Council.

We have looked in turn at the main provisions of the draft Bill and identified where they lie between option 3- active simplification – and an approach closer to option 2 – consolidation.

COSTS AND BENEFITS

The key potential costs and benefits of consolidation and simplification are set out below:

KEY COSTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simplifying the law will cause costs to Government of modifying systems, retraining staff to apply new framework, and staffing a project team, all of which will be addressed in a wider framework of business change • There will also be costs to businesses, migrants, legal representatives and the third sector of understanding the new legislation and guidance and changing their working methods to accommodate it
KEY BENEFITS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Border Agency staff will benefit from fewer speculative and unfounded applications, quicker decision making processes and fewer appeals as a result of the simpler legal framework that will govern the immigration process. In addition, there may be an administrative saving in the future as the process of legislative amendment becomes less frequent • Business migrants, legal representatives, the third sector and other BIA stakeholders will realise benefits from dealing with simpler legal guidance and migration laws, suffering fewer refused applications, fighting fewer appeals and having less need to rely on specialist advice • There will also be increased public confidence in the immigration system with greater transparency arising from a clearer set of rules and less use of discretion

COSTS

The estimated costs are indicative estimates based on high level assumptions around how much additional training and/or familiarisation time will be required for case workers and relevant stakeholders to understand the draft proposals.

The current high level assumptions are set out at Annex B. (There will be additional costs for the UKBA in making necessary system changes and developing new guidance and instructions. At this stage it is not possible to separate out the specific additional impact of legislative change, when set against the major reforms and business changes which are already planned or in prospect.)

OPTION 1 – Do Nothing

There will be no significant costs associated with option 1. However, there will continue to be complexities with the current immigration legislation leading to inefficiency, risks of delays and mistakes, risks of legal challenge and lack of clear understanding of the rules and laws.

OPTION 2 – Consolidation

Consolidation of legislation will require private, public and voluntary sector staff to familiarise themselves with the new legislation. There will also be transitional costs for staff that require training. These set up costs will be lower for option 2 as the changes are less significant; however, there will still be significant transitional costs associated with consolidation proposals as staff and relevant stakeholders will have to familiarise themselves with the new legislation. Using current assumptions, the set-up costs associated with Consolidation are as follows:

- **Training set-up costs** (over years 1 and 2) = **£2-3m**
- **Familiarisation set-up costs** (over years 1 and 2) = **£7-8m**
 - Of which:
 - Private sector costs = £3m
 - Public sector costs = £2-4m
 - Third sector costs = £1m

OPTION 3 – Consolidation and Simplification

Consolidation and Simplification of legislation will require private, public and voluntary sector staff to familiarise themselves with the new legislation. There will also be transitional costs for staff that require training. These set up costs will be higher than under option 2, as training and familiarisation costs will be significantly higher for staff and relevant stakeholders in areas of legislation where there are significant changes associated with simplification. Using current assumptions, the set-up costs associated with Simplification are as follows:

- **Training set-up costs** (over years 1 and 2) = **£5-6m**
- **Familiarisation set-up costs** (over years 1 and 2) = **£11-12m**
 - Of which:
 - Private sector costs = £3-4m
 - Public sector costs = £6-7m
 - Third sector costs = £1-2m

BENEFITS

It is not possible at this stage to accurately estimate whether there will be a significant reduction in ongoing familiarisation times and in ongoing case working times as a result of consolidation and/or simplification proposals. However, we are able to make some informed judgements as to the scale of benefits under each of the options. In addition, given the estimated setup costs, it is possible to estimate how much the simplification proposals would need to reduce UKBA case working times on average in order for the policy to break even. There are two ways of approaching this:

Firstly, we can estimate how much all UKBA case working times would need to be reduced by on average in order for the benefits to exceed the costs. However, whilst this provides an indication of the scale of efficiency savings required, it does not accurately reflect how the measures will impact upon case working in each of the key business areas affected in UKBA.

Secondly, a more accurate approach is to consider precisely which business areas are affected by each of the specific measures. We can then analyse how much impact each measure would need to have on case working and familiarisation in the affected business area in order for the combined impact of the measures to ensure break-even. As a result of using this approach, the total estimated burden on the business is lower, as many measures will impact upon a number of different business areas.

Whilst neither of these approaches provides evidence that the proposed options will break even, they should indicate whether the savings required to break even are realistic and achievable.

OPTION 1 – Do Nothing

There will be no significant benefits associated with option 1.

OPTION 2 – Consolidation

It is likely that consolidation will lead to benefits due to legislation being made available in a more consistent and accessible format. These may reduce some of the current problems and inefficiencies and hence lead to a reduction in ongoing case working and familiarisation costs.

Using the first methodology discussed above, UKBA case working and ongoing familiarisation costs would need to be reduced by **approximately 0.85%** on average for all UKBA cases in order to break even. However, whilst this provides an indication of the scale of efficiency savings required, it does not accurately reflect how the measures will impact upon case working each of the key business areas affected in UKBA.

Using the second methodology discussed above, UKBA case working and ongoing familiarisation costs would need to be reduced by **approximately 0.63%** on average for each of the key measures, in order to break even.

OPTION 3 – Consolidation and Simplification

In addition to the benefits of consolidation, simplification proposals in specific areas of legislation have been designed to help reduce the complexities and problems with the current set of legislation and the difficulties these cause with case working, as set out at Annex B.

Using the first methodology discussed above, UKBA case working and ongoing familiarisation costs would need to be reduced by **approximately 1.5%** on average for all UKBA cases in order to break even. However, whilst this provides an indication of the scale of efficiency savings required, it does not accurately reflect how the measures will impact upon case working each of the key business areas affected in UKBA.

Using the second methodology, and assuming only the measures where significant changes are proposed lead to efficiency savings, case working times would need to be reduced on average by **approximately 1.1%** for each of the key measures, in order for the policy to break even.

Whilst neither of these approaches provides evidence that the simplification proposals will break even, they indicate that the savings required to break even are realistic and achievable. If the savings exceed these amounts, then there may be significant additional benefits.

SUMMARY

The preferred option is option 3. Whilst the costs of option 3 are greater than option 2, there is much greater scope for benefits to arise under option 3, where simplification is proposed in specific areas of immigration legislation, compared to the benefits that may be realised under option 2, where there is only consolidation of current legislation.

SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS – RANGE OF OUTCOMES

Whilst it is unlikely that the key costs of consolidation and simplification will change significantly, it is possible that the benefits may be significantly smaller or larger than required to breakeven, depending upon the extent to which changes impact upon front-line operations and case working decision making. It is therefore prudent to analyse ranges of possible benefits. However, we will limit this analysis to option 3 as, firstly, this is our preferred and, secondly, this is the only option where significant changes may occur to case working and familiarisation.

SCENARIO	IMPACT ON CASE WORKING (Percentage reduction)	NET PRESENT VALUE (10 year)
NO SAVING	0%	-£17.5m
LOW	0.5%	-£11.6m
LOW-MEDIUM	1%	-£5.6m
CENTRAL	1.5%	£0
HIGH-MEDIUM	3%	£18.3m
HIGH	5%	£42.3m

Note – this analysis uses methodology 1 described above (p.13)

For prudence, we have used a range of savings from 0 - 3% in order to provide a range of net benefit outcomes in the Summary, Analysis and Evidence section on page 2.

Specific Impact Tests: Checklist

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

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

Type of testing undertaken	<i>Results in Evidence Base?</i>	<i>Results annexed?</i>
Competition Assessment	No	No
Small Firms Impact Test	No	No
Legal Aid	No	No
Sustainable Development	No	No
Carbon Assessment	No	No
Other Environment	No	No
Health Impact Assessment	No	No
Race Equality	No	[to follow]
Disability Equality	No	[to follow]
Gender Equality	No	
Human Rights	Yes	No
Rural Proofing	No	No

ANNEX A: WORKING WITH OTHER PROJECTS

In going forward to simplify the legal framework we need to take account of major changes already underway in the way in which the Agency does its business. The Simplification Project Team are engaged with other policy development projects and have identified significant interconnections with programmes seeking greater efficiency and streamlining of the Agency's business processes principally:

Creation of the UK Border Agency

The new UK Border Agency, established as a shadow agency of the Home Office, will protect our borders, control migration for the benefit of the country, prevent border tax fraud, smuggling and immigration crime and implement quick and fair decisions.

Over 1000 frontline staff will be conferred with both immigration and custom powers and staff in England and Wales will be equipped with police-like powers as set out in the UK Borders Act 2007. A full merger will follow new legislation presented to the House in the Autumn.

Points Based System (PBS)

The PBS is focused on bringing in migrants who are highly skilled, or who can do key jobs that cannot be filled from the domestic labour force or from the European Union. It consists of five tiers to replace the approximately 80 routes to work and study that currently exist.

The Points Based System is being phased in from 2008 and will enable us to control migration to the United Kingdom more effectively, tackle abuse and attract the most talented workers into the United Kingdom economy.

The law in this area must take account of the wide ranging changes that have been made to the way in which the Agency does its work and the Points Based System for managed migration represent fundamental changes to our processes.

Immigration Casework (ICW) Programme

The ICW programme has a strategic vision to support the Home Office and the UK Border Agency in achieving their strategic objectives, through the delivery of a world-class case working capability. ICW will achieve this by radically improving case work processes for the Agency and modernizing the supporting IT to deliver benefits in four areas:

- improved efficiency in the case work operation
- better quality decisions with fewer mistakes
- improved customer service; and
- a fit for purpose IT infrastructure for case work.

Process improvements under ICW and the associated benefits are to a large extent dependent on removing complexities and constraints associated with the current legal framework. We are working closely with the ICW team to identify and address any such issues. We are also in discussion with ICW about how to translate future legislation into improved case working processes in practise.

ANNEX B - High Level Assumptions for Simplification Draft Bill Partial Impact Assessment

Measure and Description	Business Area Affected	OPTION 1 – Do Nothing Assumptions	OPTION 2 - Consolidation Assumptions	OPTION 3 - Simplification Assumptions	Issues, Sensitivities and Risks
<p>Permission</p> <p>Changing LTE and LTR to “Permission” to increase clarity of entitlement of migrants to be in the UK.</p>	<p>Managed Migration UkVisas Asylum Appeals Enforcement Borders</p> <p><u>Other stakeholders</u> Sponsors/ Employers Third sector organisations</p>	<p><u>Training</u> No change <u>Guidance</u> No change <u>Ongoing familiarisation</u> No change <u>Ongoing process/ case working times</u> No change</p>	<p><u>Training</u> 1 hr <u>Familiarisation</u> 1 hr</p> <p><u>Ongoing familiarisation</u> Reduction <u>Ongoing process/ case working times</u> Reduction per case</p>	<p><u>Training</u> 2 hrs <u>Familiarisation</u> 2 hrs</p> <p><u>Ongoing familiarisation</u> Reduction <u>Ongoing process/ case working times</u> Reduction per case</p>	<p>Not yet clear the extent to which changes will lead to training requirements and/or how they will affect ongoing training or case times – estimates are therefore preliminary. However this is a relatively significant change so may have a large impact.</p> <p><u>Sensitivities and risks</u> May need longer training and/or familiarisation. May be no impact on ongoing training/case working</p>
<p>EEA Nationals</p> <p>Rights of entry and residence in UK for EEA nationals and their families</p>	<p>Managed EU caseworkers and FM Migration Asylum Appeals Enforcement</p>	<p><u>Training</u> No change <u>Guidance</u> No change <u>Ongoing familiarisation</u> No change <u>Ongoing process/ case working times</u> No change</p>	<p><u>Training</u> 0 hrs <u>Familiarisation</u> 0 hrs</p> <p><u>Ongoing familiarisation</u> No change <u>Ongoing process/ case working times</u> No change</p>	<p><u>Training</u> 0 hrs <u>Familiarisation</u> 0 hrs</p> <p><u>Ongoing familiarisation</u> No change <u>Ongoing process/ case working times</u> No change</p>	<p>There maybe an impact in transposing the FM Directive into domestic legislation Not clear the extent to which changes will lead to training requirements and/or change ongoing training or case times – these estimates are preliminary. However there will be no significant change so there will be a limited impact.</p> <p><u>Sensitivities and risks</u> May need more training and/or familiarisation.</p>
<p>Detention and Conditional Release</p> <p>Definition of circumstances in</p>	<p>Asylum Appeals Enforcement</p>	<p><u>Training</u> No change <u>Guidance</u> No change <u>Ongoing familiarisation</u></p>	<p><u>Training</u> 2 hrs <u>Familiarisation</u> 2 hrs</p> <p><u>Ongoing familiarisation</u></p>	<p><u>Training</u> 4 hrs <u>Familiarisation</u> 4 hrs</p> <p><u>Ongoing familiarisation</u></p>	<p>Not clear the extent to which changes will lead to training requirements and/or change ongoing training or case times – these estimates are preliminary. However this is a significant change so may have a significant impact.</p>

which a person is liable to be detained, allowed temporary admission, granted temporary release, bail or restriction orders		No change <u>Ongoing process/ case working times</u> No change	Reduction <u>Ongoing process/ case working times</u> Reduction per case	Reduction <u>Ongoing process/ case working times</u> Reduction per case	<u>Sensitivities and risks</u> May need longer training and/or familiarisation. May be no impact on ongoing training/case working
Expulsion Changing of definitions of deportation and administrative removal with “expulsion”	Asylum Appeals Enforcement	<u>Training</u> No change <u>Guidance</u> No change <u>Ongoing familiarisation</u> No change <u>Ongoing process/ case working times</u> No change	<u>Training</u> 2 hrs <u>Familiarisation</u> 2 hrs <u>Ongoing familiarisation</u> Reduction <u>Ongoing process/ case working times</u> Reduction per case	<u>Training</u> 5 hrs <u>Familiarisation</u> 5 hrs <u>Ongoing familiarisation</u> Reduction <u>Ongoing process/ case working times</u> Reduction per case	Not clear the extent to which changes will lead to training requirements and/or change ongoing training or case times – these estimates are preliminary. However this is a significant change so may have a significant impact. <u>Sensitivities and risks</u> May need longer training and/or familiarisation. May be no impact on ongoing training/case working Risks of an increase in removals (and costs)
Offences List and definition of offences requiring penalties and enforcement	Enforcement	<u>Training</u> No change <u>Guidance</u> No change <u>Ongoing familiarisation</u> No change <u>Ongoing process/ case working times</u> No change	<u>Training</u> 0 hrs <u>Familiarisation</u> 0.5 hrs <u>Ongoing familiarisation</u> No change <u>Ongoing process/ case working times</u> No change	<u>Training</u> 1 hr <u>Familiarisation</u> 1 hr <u>Ongoing familiarisation</u> No change <u>Ongoing process/ case working times</u> No change	Not clear the extent to which changes will lead to training requirements and/or change ongoing training or case times – these estimates are preliminary. However this is a relatively small change so will have a small impact. <u>Sensitivities and risks</u> May need more training and/or familiarisation.

Appeals	Appeals	<u>Training</u> No change <u>Guidance</u> No change <u>Ongoing familiarisation</u> No change <u>Ongoing process/ case working times</u> No change	<u>Training</u> 0 hrs <u>Familiarisation</u> 0hrs <u>Ongoing familiarisation</u> No change <u>Ongoing process/ case working times</u> No change	<u>Training</u> 1 hrs <u>Familiarisation</u> 0 hrs <u>Ongoing familiarisation</u> No change <u>Ongoing process/ case working times</u> No change	Not clear the extent to which changes will lead to training requirements and/or change ongoing training or case times – these estimates are preliminary. However this is a relatively small change so will have a small impact. <u>Sensitivities and risks</u> May need longer training and/or familiarisation. Risk of increase in appeals if major changes to law
Carriers Liability and Civil Penalties	Enforcement	<u>Training</u> No change <u>Guidance</u> No change <u>Ongoing familiarisation</u> No change <u>Ongoing process/ case working times</u> No change	<u>Training</u> 0 hrs <u>Familiarisation</u> 0 hrs <u>Ongoing familiarisation</u> No change <u>Ongoing process/ case working times</u> No change	<u>Training</u> 0 hrs <u>Familiarisation</u> 0 hrs <u>Ongoing familiarisation</u> No change <u>Ongoing process/ case working times</u> No change	Not clear the extent to which changes will lead to training requirements and/or change ongoing training or case times – these estimates are preliminary. However this is a relatively small change so will have limited impact. <u>Sensitivities and risks</u> May need longer training and familiarisation.
Illegal Working	Enforcement	<u>Training</u> No change <u>Guidance</u> No change <u>Ongoing familiarisation</u> No change <u>Ongoing process/ case working times</u> No change	<u>Training</u> 0 hrs <u>Familiarisation</u> 0.5 hrs <u>Ongoing familiarisation</u> No change <u>Ongoing process/ case working times</u> No change	<u>Training</u> 0 hrs <u>Familiarisation</u> 1 hr <u>Ongoing familiarisation</u> No change <u>Ongoing process/ case working times</u> No change Simplification of current legislation will have limited impact on case worker training/ familiarisation or	Not clear the extent to which changes will lead to training requirements and/or change ongoing training or case times – these estimates are preliminary. However this is a relatively small change so will have small impact. <u>Sensitivities and risks</u> May need longer training and/or familiarisation.

				processes	
Charging	Managed Migration. UKvisas	<u>Training</u> No change <u>Guidance</u> No change <u>Ongoing familiarisation</u> No change <u>Ongoing process/ case working times</u> No change Do nothing will have no impact on training, familiarisation or case working	<u>Training</u> 0 hours <u>Familiarisation</u> 0.5 hours <u>On-going familiarisation</u> 0 hours <u>Ongoing process/ case working times</u> 0 hours Changes in the current process by which we set fees by laying a fees order and then two fee regulations to one	<u>Training</u> 0 hours <u>Familiarisation</u> 0.5 hours <u>On-going familiarisation</u> 0 hours <u>Ongoing process/ case working times</u> 0 hours Simplification of current legislation will have limited impact on a caseworkers time	There are no issues or sensitivities around simplifying the process of setting fees. Making the process simpler will be less time consuming.
JR, Powers, Data Sharing, Returns, Biometrics	Not in Scope				
Asylum Support	Not in Scope				
TOTAL	UKBA Sponsors Stakeholders (Private and Voluntary) Applicants	<u>Training</u> No change <u>Familiarisation</u> No change <u>Ongoing familiarisation</u> No change <u>Ongoing process/ case working times</u> No change	<u>Training</u> 5 hrs for various staff <u>Familiarisation</u> 7.5 hrs for various staff <u>On-going familiarisation</u> Reduction for staff affected <u>Ongoing process/ case working times</u> Reduction for cases affected	<u>Training</u> 13 hrs for various staff <u>Familiarisation</u> 15.5 hrs for various staff <u>On-going familiarisation</u> Reduction for staff affected <u>Ongoing process/ case working times</u> Reduction for cases affected	It is not clear the extent to which changes will lead to training and familiarisation requirements and/or change ongoing familiarisation or case working times – these estimates are preliminary. However there will be significant changes so there may be significant impacts. <u>Sensitivities and risks</u> May need longer training and/or familiarisation. May be no impact on ongoing training/case working Risks of an increase in removals (and costs) Risks of changes to appeals (and costs)