

## Summary: Intervention & Options

<b>Department /Agency:</b>	<b>Title:</b> <b>Partial Impact Assessment of Common Travel Area (CTA) Reform</b>	
<b>Stage:</b> Partial IA for consultation	<b>Version:</b> 1.0	<b>Date:</b> 24 July 2008
<b>Related Publications:</b> 'Securing the UK Border' (Strategy, published July 2007), 'Security in a Global Hub: Establishing the UK's new border arrangements' (Cabinet Office report, published July 2007)		

### Available to view or download at:

<http://www.ukba.homeoffice.gov.uk/aboutus/consultations/current>

**Contact for enquiries:** Fiona Baguley

**Telephone:** 020 8760 8488

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

The purpose of UKBA is to secure our border and control migration for the benefit of our country. One of the key objectives is to create and maintain strong borders.

The Common Travel Area (CTA) is a longstanding arrangement between the UK, the Republic of Ireland and the Crown dependencies and permits movement without immigration controls for all CTA nationals.

The UK Border Agency made a public commitment to review and strengthen the CTA arrangements in the 2007 'Securing the UK Border' strategy, and the Cabinet Office's 'Security in a Global Hub: Establishing the UK's new border arrangements' report. CTA reform forms part of the Government's commitment to ensure the UK's borders are amongst the toughest in the world.

### What are the policy objectives and the intended effects?

**Policy objectives:** To strengthen further the UK's borders and the security of the non-UK CTA borders in a proportionate manner.

**Intended effects:** a) guard against immigration abuse, organised crime and security risks within the CTA; and b) minimise impact on industry and the travelling public.

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

**Option 1** Continue with currently resourced activities only: Mobile Response Teams (MRTs); current joint operational activity; revision of legislation; placement of CTA Liaison Officer; and the roll out of e-Borders on CTA routes.

**Option 2** As (1) but also introduce or enhance a range of local measures including: intelligence-led operations; improved data sharing and communication between CTA authorities; strengthen the UK immigration controls for non-CTA nationals on sea and air routes between the UK and the Republic of Ireland; and put in place measures to verify the identities of British and Irish nationals.

**Preferred option**

**Option 2** This option will better support the future needs of the UK Border Agency and will enable an appropriate and proportionate response to the threats and challenges that the UK border will face. This option avoids imposing disproportionate costs on the public or private sector.

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

The policy will be reviewed by officials on an annual basis.

**Ministerial Sign-off** For CONSULTATION 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:



**Date:** 24 July 2008

## Summary: Analysis & Evidence

Policy Option: 1	Description: maintain the status-quo/do minimum – only continue activity already resourced
------------------	--

<b>COSTS</b>	<b>ANNUAL COSTS</b>	Description and scale of <b>key monetised costs</b> by 'main affected groups' No new costs. Activity already funded.
	<b>One-off</b> (Transition) <b>Yrs</b>	
	£0	
	<b>Average Annual Cost</b> (excluding one-off)	
£0	<b>Total Cost (PV)</b>	<b>£0</b>
Other <b>key non-monetised costs</b> by 'main affected groups' N/A. Already accounted for elsewhere.		

<b>BENEFITS</b>	<b>ANNUAL BENEFITS</b>	Description and scale of <b>key monetised benefits</b> by 'main affected groups' No new benefits. Ongoing or agreed activities.
	<b>One-off</b> <b>Yrs</b>	
	£0	
	<b>Average Annual Benefit</b> (excluding one-off)	
£0	<b>Total Benefit (PV)</b>	<b>£0</b>
Other <b>key non-monetised benefits</b> by 'main affected groups' N/A already accounted for elsewhere.		

**Key Assumptions/Sensitivities/Risks** Success is subject to the successful delivery of existing dependent programmes within UKBA (e.g. e-Borders, simplification of immigration legislation) and the Border Force (e.g. existing joint operational activity, Mobile Response Teams). Sensitivities regarding operations at the Irish/UK land border remain constant.

<b>Price Base Year</b>	<b>Time Period Years</b>	<b>Net Benefit Range (NPV)</b> £0	<b>NET BENEFIT (NPV Best estimate)</b> £0
------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------------------	--

What is the geographic coverage of the policy/option?	The UK, mainly ports dealing with CTA traffic			
On what date will the policy be implemented?	Implementation already underway and will continue until 2014			
Which organisation(s) will enforce the policy?	Carriers, UKBA, Police and CTA equivalents			
What is the total annual cost of enforcement for these organisations?	£0 No new costs			
Does enforcement comply with Hampton principles?	Yes			
Will implementation go beyond minimum EU requirements?	N/A			
What is the value of the proposed offsetting measure per year?	£			
What is the value of changes in greenhouse gas emissions?	£ N/A			
Will the proposal have a significant impact on competition?	No			
Annual cost (£-£) per organisation (excluding one-off)	Micro	Small	Medium	Large
Are any of these organisations exempt?	Yes/No	Yes/No	N/A	N/A
<b>Impact on Admin Burdens Baseline</b> (2005 Prices) (Increase – Decrease)				
Increase of £	Decrease of £		<b>Net Impact £</b>	
Key:	<b>Annual costs and benefits: Constant Prices</b>		<b>(Net) Present Value</b>	

## Summary: Analysis & Evidence

<b>Policy Option:</b>	<b>Description:</b> as (1) but also introduce or enhance a range of local measures; and strengthen the UK immigration controls.
-----------------------	--

<b>COSTS</b>	<b>ANNUAL COSTS</b>	<p>Description and scale of <b>key monetised costs</b> by 'main affected groups' UKBA-training costs (£31k each year), staff costs of increasing joint operations (£240k each year), communication costs (£687k each year), border control staff costs (£9.5m each year), watchlist machines (£1m each year).</p> <p>UK Economy – lost tourism expenditure (£0-12m per year). This is dependent on the type of documentation required – to be determined in consultation</p>
	<b>One-off</b> (Transition) <b>Yrs</b>	
	£ unknown      3	
	<b>Average Annual Cost</b> (excluding one-off)	
	£8m-13m <b>Total Cost (PV)</b> £ 80m-125m	
<p>Other <b>key non-monetised costs</b> by 'main affected groups' Private sector – costs of accommodating new immigration controls between UK and the Republic of Ireland. Costs to be determined after consultation.</p>		
<b>BENEFITS</b>	<b>ANNUAL BENEFITS</b>	<p>Description and scale of <b>key monetised benefits</b> by 'main affected groups'</p> <p>Economy – reduction in fiscal fraud on alcohol (£1.1m-£1.5m per year) and tobacco (£8-£10m per year).</p>
	<b>One-off</b> <b>Yrs</b>	
	£0	
	<b>Average Annual Benefit</b> (excluding one-off)	
	£10m <b>Total Benefit (PV)</b> £103m	
<p>Other <b>key non-monetised benefits</b> by 'main affected groups' UKBA – reduction in imported asylum cases and abuse of immigration system, enhanced border security.</p> <p>Economy – reduction in number of illegal migrants, potential reduction in illegal working and reduction in crime and tourism benefits associated with common (short stay visit) visa, as more visitors to the Republic of Ireland will also travel to the UK.</p>		

<b>Key Assumptions/Sensitivities/Risks Assumptions</b>				
Achievement subject to the successful delivery of existing dependent programmes within UKBA (e-Borders and simplification of immigration legislation) and the Border Force; sensitivities regarding operations at the Irish/UK land border remain constant.				
<b>Price Base Year</b> 2008/09	<b>Time Period Years</b> 10	<b>Net Benefit Range (NPV)</b> £-22m to 18m	<b>NET BENEFIT (NPV Best estimate)</b> £-22m to 23m	
What is the geographic coverage of the policy/option?			The UK, mainly ports dealing with CTA traffic	
On what date will the policy be implemented?			Present to 2014	
Which organisation(s) will enforce the policy?			Carriers, UKBA, Police and CTA equivalents	
What is the total annual cost of enforcement for these organisations?			£ unknown – awaiting consultation	
Does enforcement comply with Hampton principles?			Yes	
Will implementation go beyond minimum EU requirements?			N/A	
What is the value of the proposed offsetting measure per year?			£ unknown	
What is the value of changes in greenhouse gas emissions?			£ unknown	
Will the proposal have a significant impact on competition?				
Annual cost (£-£) per organisation (excluding one-off)	Micro N/A	Small	Medium	Large N/A
Are any of these organisations exempt?	Yes/No	Yes/No	N/A	N/A
<b>Impact on Admin Burdens Baseline</b> (2005 Prices) (Increase – Decrease)				
Increase of £0		Decrease of £0		<b>Net Impact £0</b>
Key:	<b>Annual costs and benefits: Constant Prices</b>			<b>(Net) Present Value</b>

## Evidence Base (for summary sheets)

### 1. Background

- 1.1 The Common Travel Area (CTA) comprises the United Kingdom, the Crown dependencies<sup>1</sup> and the Republic of Ireland.
- 1.2 The CTA dates back to the 1920s when the creation of the Irish Free State required changes in border control in the British Isles for immigration purposes. The CTA was given full statutory recognition in the UK under s.1(3) of the Immigration Act 1971 (the 1971 Act) and Immigration (Control of Entry through the Republic of Ireland) Order 1972 (as amended). The CTA was established essentially through administrative agreements in 1922 and 1952 – there is no formal agreement between the constituent territories which underpin the CTA. Although the origins of the CTA are unclear, the 1997 European Treaty of Amsterdam explicitly recognised its provisions in order to distinguish it from the Schengen area.
- 1.3 Apart from limited attempts to control the land border between the United Kingdom and the Republic of Ireland during and after the Second World War, the CTA has remained in essence a free movement zone. Essentially, the CTA permits citizens of the UK, Crown dependencies and Republic of Ireland to move freely between the jurisdictions without a requirement to carry a passport.
- 1.4 Approximately 15.6 million passengers travelled between Republic of Ireland and the UK and Crown dependencies in 2006 by air and sea, of which 12.4 million journeys were by air<sup>2</sup> and the remaining 3.2 by sea<sup>3</sup>. Total UK passenger flows are expected to grow from 228 million in 2005<sup>4</sup>, to 465 million passengers per annum by 2030<sup>5</sup>. This is a predicted passenger increase of 104 per cent by 2030 by air alone. Similarly, Irish flows are estimated to grow by a further 42 per cent by 2010 by air<sup>6</sup>. The assumption is that the projected increase in passenger flows will also be reflected on CTA routes. Globalisation will see further increases to legal and illegal migration flows.

<sup>1</sup> The Bailiwick of Jersey and the Bailiwick of Guernsey (the Channel Islands) and the Isle of Man

<sup>2</sup> [http://www.caa.co.uk/docs/80/airport\\_data/2006Annual/Table\\_12\\_1\\_Intl\\_Air\\_Pax\\_Route\\_Analysis\\_2006.pdf](http://www.caa.co.uk/docs/80/airport_data/2006Annual/Table_12_1_Intl_Air_Pax_Route_Analysis_2006.pdf)

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.dft.gov.uk/162259/162469/221412/221658/228808/222300/223699/213486/SeaPassenger2006PDF>

<sup>4</sup> Passenger air travel at UK airports  
<http://www.dft.gov.uk/about/strategy/whitepapers/air/aviationprogressreportsection/?version=1>

<sup>5</sup> Forecasts of the future demand for passenger air travel at UK airports, constrained by expected future airport capacity  
<http://www.dft.gov.uk/about/strategy/whitepapers/air/aviationprogressreportsection/?version=1>

<sup>6</sup> [http://www.transport21.ie/WHAT\\_IS\\_TRANSPORT\\_21/TRANSPORT\\_21/Economic\\_and\\_Demographic\\_Trends.html](http://www.transport21.ie/WHAT_IS_TRANSPORT_21/TRANSPORT_21/Economic_and_Demographic_Trends.html)

## 2. Current legal interpretation

- 2.1 Under the 1971 Act, arrival in and departure from the UK on a local journey from or to any of the Channel Islands, Isle of Man or the Republic of Ireland shall not be subject to control, nor shall a person requiring leave to enter the UK, except in so far as any of those places is for any purpose excluded from s 1(3) of the 1971 Act. The UK, the Channel Islands, Isle of Man and the Republic of Ireland shall be collectively referred to as “the common travel area” (CTA) (s1(3) & s11(4) of the 1971 Act).
- 2.2 There are some exceptions to this rule under s.9 of the 1971 Act:
- Persons subject to a deportation order issued by UK authorities - Immigration (Entry Otherwise than by Sea or Air) Order 2002 (SI 2002/1832);
  - Persons who have been excluded from the UK by the Secretary of State because their exclusion is conducive to the public good (exclusion is limited to cases involving national security for the Crown dependencies, and provided an immigration officer gives the person written notice of the exclusion on the person’s arrival in the UK) – s.9(4) of the 1971 Act;
  - Persons who have at any time been refused leave to enter the UK and have not since been given leave (either by the UK or the Crown dependencies) – s.9 (4) of the 1971 Act.
- 2.3 Under s.9(5) of the 1971 Act, the Secretary of State for the Home Department (SSH) can exclude, by order, any of the Crown dependencies from s.1(3) (1971 Act), if it appears necessary to do so by reason of differences in UK and any of the Crown dependencies’ immigration laws. S.9(6) provides that the SSH can also exclude, by order, Republic of Ireland from s1(3) (1971 Act) for purposes that may be specified in the order.
- 2.4 Under s.3(4) of the 1971 Act, leave to enter or leave to remain lapses on going to a country or territory outside the CTA, unless the person returns to the UK during the period of leave in circumstances under which he is not required to obtain leave to enter. If he does return to the UK, his previous leave shall continue to apply.
- 2.5 Notwithstanding the principle of free travel within the CTA, it is not lawful for a person who is not a British Citizen to enter the UK (including the Crown dependencies) where their presence was unlawful in another part of the CTA, unless they are given leave to enter. The practical effect of this is that if someone with valid leave in the UK or Islands travels to another part of the CTA, and their leave subsequently expires, and that person then



returns to the UK or Islands, without obtaining further leave, that person becomes an illegal entrant. This integration further enhances the CTA and enables enforcement action to be taken when appropriate.

### **3. Rationale for action**

- 3.1 We are currently well underway with the biggest shake-up in our border protection and immigration system for over 45 years. We have already begun the creation of a strong new force at the border equipped with new powers and world-leading technology. The UK Border Agency is a £2 billion force bringing together 25,000 immigration, customs, and visas staff. 13,000 staff now work at the border alongside 3,000 police officers.
- 3.2 Our tough new checks now start abroad and we are re-introducing checks to count people in and out of the country. Persons applying to the Agency for a visa now have their fingerprints checked prior to travelling to the UK. Our approach to strengthening the CTA is an integral part of our border reform process.
- 3.3 Movement without immigration controls for all nationals of the CTA is an important component of the special relationship which exists between the peoples of the islands that comprise the CTA, and provides long established political, economic and social benefits. However, the CTA was developed some time ago: following dramatic increases in mobility, it is recognised that the privileges bestowed on CTA nationals may be abused by others, for example, facilitating illegal immigration, crime, smuggling, tax evasion and other risks.
- 3.4 As the United Kingdom's border controls become much tougher, there is clearly a risk of displacing efforts of those who seek to exploit our borders illegally. We must therefore guard against the risk of any part of our border security becoming a 'weaker link'.

### **4. Objectives**

- 4.1 CTA reform will strengthen further the UK's borders and the security of the non-UK CTA borders in a proportionate manner. The intended effects are to:
  - a) guard against immigration abuse, organised crime and security risks within the CTA; and
  - b) minimise impact on industry and the travelling public.

## 5. Options

- 5.1 This section describes the main options considered in the impact assessment to achieve the policy objectives and the key costs and benefits of each. Further detail on the initial costs, the benefits and assumptions are summarised in **Annex A**. Section 6 assesses the key costs and benefits of the options and sets out the rationale behind the preferred option (option 2).
- 5.2 **Option 1:** take minimum action and only pursue current activity already resourced – joint operational activities, Mobile Response Teams, CTA Liaison Officer, simplification of legislation and roll out of the e-Borders programme.
- 5.3 **Resource implications and costs:** No new resource implications or costs to the UK Border Agency, other government departments or private sector. These activities are already approved and resourced.
- 5.4 **Option 2:** as option (1) but also introduce or enhance a range of local measures, including intelligence-led operations, data sharing and communication; strengthen UK immigration controls for non-CTA nationals on sea and air borders between the UK and the Republic of Ireland; and put in place measures to verify the identities of British and Irish nationals.
- 5.5 **Resource implications:** Dependent on the scope of individual operations but initiatives are likely to require around 250 additional staff. Further detail may be found in **Annex A**.
- 5.6 **Costs:** see Annex B for indicative figures and assumptions.

## 6. Cost/benefit analysis

**Table 1: Summary of policy options and key costs and benefits**

<p><b>Option 1:</b> do minimum, continue only with current activity already resourced – joint operational activity, Mobile Response Teams, CTA Liaison Officer, simplification of legislation and the introduction of e-Borders.</p>	
Benefits	Costs
<p>No additional costs to UKBA, other Government departments or private sector.</p> <p>Already includes joint operational activity, Mobile Response Teams, CTA Liaison Officer, simplification of legislation and e-Borders, some of which have already begun to deliver results.</p> <p>Minimal impact on industry and the travelling public.</p>	<p>This option involves limited steps to address illegal immigration and organised crime.</p> <p>Damage to UKBA, Home Office and overall HMG reputation in the case of a lack of decisive and effective action to tackle identified risks, especially following public commitment to do so.</p>
<p><b>Option 2:</b> continue with activity already resourced; introduce a range of local measures such as joint training opportunities; enhance cooperation between UK-Irish ALON; increase data sharing; establishment of joint intelligence unit; increase joint operational activity; improve communication; perform ad hoc vehicle checks on the Northern Ireland side of the land border; and introduce border controls on all air and sea travel from the Republic of Ireland to the UK.</p>	
<p>Will significantly strengthen the UK border and the wider CTA border to reduce immigration and other abuse and organised crime.</p> <p>Will complement the e-Borders programme.</p> <p>Minimal additional impact on industry and the travelling public.</p> <p>Benefits for UKBA and HMG by improving security at the UK border.</p>	<p>Significant redesign of UKBA processes.</p> <p>Passengers on air and sea routes will experience some delay due to the introduction of border controls. Possible reputation costs for UKBA and HMG as a result.</p> <p>New funding will be required to implement these initiatives.</p>
<p><b>Conclusion:</b> Option 2 is preferred. It proposes proportionate action to mitigate against the potential risks and enhance UKBA’s ability to detect and tackle abuse of the CTA, whilst also facilitating legitimate travel. This option would be aligned with other UKBA and OGD programmes.</p>	

## 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	Results in Evidence Base?	Results annexed?
Competition Assessment	No	Yes
Small Firms Impact Test	No	Yes
Legal Aid	No	Yes
Sustainable Development	No	Yes
Carbon Assessment	No	Yes
Other Environment	No	Yes
Health Impact Assessment	No	Yes
Race Equality	No	Yes
Disability Equality	No	Yes
Gender Equality	No	Yes
Human Rights	No	Yes
Rural Proofing	No	Yes

## Annex A: Summary of Key Costs and Benefits and Initial Assumptions

<b>OPTION 1</b>			
<b>Measure and Description</b>	<b>Costs and benefits</b>	<b>Assumptions</b>	<b>Issues, Sensitivities and Risks</b>
Only continue with activity already resourced – existing joint operational activity, Mobile Response Teams, CTA Liaison Officer, simplification of legislation and roll out of the e-Borders programme.	No new resource implications or costs to the UK Border Agency, other government departments or private sector. These activities are already approved and resourced.		
<b>OPTION 2</b>			
<b>Measure and Description</b>	<b>Monetised costs and benefits</b>	<b>Assumptions</b>	<b>Issues, Sensitivities and Risks</b>
As option (1) but also introduce a range of local measures including:			

<p><b>Carriers' liability</b></p> <p>Application of carriers' liability to CTA routes to reduce the number of illegal immigrants entering the UK from the Republic of Ireland. The application would be in line with existing procedures on other routes into the UK.</p>	<p><i>Private sector:</i> The application of carriers' liability to CTA routes may have a resource impact on the carriers (both air and sea) that operate between the Republic of Ireland and the UK. To be confirmed through consultation</p> <p>An estimated total of <b>£1.3m</b> will fall to carriers through the current Carrier's Liability Penalty of £2,000.</p> <p><i>Public sector:</i> A net gain of <b>£1.3m</b> from the fixed charge.</p>	<p>The number of arrivals into the UK from other parts of the CTA is approx. 15.6m. The rate of Inadequately Documented Arrivals (IDAs) is sufficiently similar to the average rate of IDAs identified on other routes into the UK (approx. 0.0064%). 0.0064% of 15.6m is approx. 998.4. Of that figure, the fixed charge of £2,000 will apply to approx. 35% of cases. 35% of 998 is approx. 349.44. 349.44 x £2,000 = £1.3m.</p> <p>The level of IDAs should fall, as will the number of imported asylum cases and cases of illegal entry into the UK. This should reduce illegal working in the UK.</p>	<p>Figure could be higher or lower. However, it is not possible to assess this because documents have not historically been systematically checked by the UK Border Agency on traffic arriving from the Republic of Ireland or the Crown Dependencies.</p>
---	--	--	--

**Joint UK/the Republic of Ireland working**

More effective sharing of resources with the Irish Government, including increasing the range of **joint training** opportunities.

*Private sector:* No resource implications.

*Public sector:* Joint UK/Republic of Ireland training - approx. **£1,200**. New UKBA staff to cover CTA arrivals - approximately **£30,000**.

Joint UK/Republic of Ireland training figure based on a two day training course for 10 Irish Gardi broken down as follows:

- Scoping day x 1 trainer, return flight, one night accommodation and food
- 2 day course x 2 trainers - return flight, three night accommodation and food; 10 x delegates – lunch; conference/training room.

UKBA training requirements based on:

- 247.5 additional staff
- £30 average hourly wage
- 4 hours of training per person

Joint UK/Republic of Ireland training will be available to more than 10 Gardi.

Likely that with the introduction of the UKBA, fewer staff will be required.

Average wage is higher or lower.

Number of training hours required is higher or lower.

<p>Increased <b>data sharing</b> initiatives between the UK and Republic of Ireland.</p>	<p><i>Private sector:</i> No resource implications.</p> <p><i>Public sector:</i> The UK Border Agency already collects the relevant data and has resources allocated to data sharing projects, so minimal set-up and transmissions costs would apply.</p>	<p>The specific resource implications would depend on the scope of each individual project, but likely to be absorbed by existing resources.</p>	<p>Increased national concerns with Government management/handling of data. Strict guidelines need to be followed to ensure individuals are sufficiently protected.</p>
<p>Increasing <b>joint operational activity</b> focusing on illegal movements between the UK and the Republic of Ireland.</p>	<p><i>Private sector:</i> No resource implications.</p> <p><i>Public sector:</i></p> <p><b>Benefits:</b> Reduction in the number of imported asylum cases and hence total asylum support costs borne by UKBA.</p> <p>2007 - 2008: <b>£45k</b></p> <p>2008 - 2009: <b>£45k</b></p> <p>Assuming that the number of imported asylum cases detected would grow in direct proportion to the increase in activity from 8 - 9 days to 20 - 25 days per month.</p> <p>2009 - 2010: <b>£113k - £125k.</b></p>		



<p>Increasing joint operational activity focusing on illegal movements between the UK and the Republic of Ireland.</p>	<p>Staff - Release 5 members of staff back to Liverpool for 8/9 days per month as joint operations will have dedicated resources. – <b>£39k - £47k.</b></p> <p>Staff travel and accommodation costs in the Republic of Ireland is funded under Operation Gull. Recruiting staff based in Northern Ireland will save <b>£80k-90k</b> per year.</p> <p><b>Costs:</b></p> <p>Some operational activity is <i>already resourced</i>. Increasing activity by employing locally based resources would cost approximately <b>£240k</b> per annum for 7 staff.</p>	<p>The resource implications will be dependant on the level of increased activity and the structure of the UK Border Agency workforce in Northern Ireland.</p> <p>Locally based UK Border Agency staff would cover both joint operations and ad-hoc vehicle checks in their remit splitting their time equally between the two operations.</p> <p>Range assumes staff earn between minimum and target for each grade boundary.</p> <p>Costs are currently £3000 per 5 people per 5 days – £120 per person per day.</p> <p>7 staff at 8/9 days per month equates to 672-756 man days per year (released from joint operational activities).</p>	
--	--	--	--

<p>Enhanced cooperation between UK-Irish <b>Airline Liaison Officers Networks</b> (ALON) and the establishment of a <b>joint intelligence unit</b> to pool existing and emerging passenger intelligence and other passenger intelligence sharing measures.</p>	<p>No new resource implications or costs to the UK Border Agency, other government departments or private sector. These activities will use existing resources.</p>		
<p>Introduction of a fully integrated <b>common (short stay visit) visa</b> with the Republic of Ireland. This could be either a common visa issued by a single organisation, or as in the Schengen border zone, mutual recognition of two national visas operating to the same framework and standards. Alternatively, it could involve a combination of the two options.</p>	<p><i>Private sector:</i> No resource implications.</p> <p><i>Public sector:</i> Cost subject to further scoping during the consultation period</p> <p><b>Benefits:</b> £3-4m p.a. from visits by nationals of countries requiring a visa. Our assumptions mean that they would be deterred from travelling if they are required to obtain a visa for travel from Ireland to the UK. A common visa will mean no visitors are deterred, thus there is a saving to tourism.</p>	<p>That the full common (short stay visit) visa option will be implemented.</p>	

<p>Introduction of <b>ad hoc vehicle checks</b> on the Northern Ireland side of the land border mirroring activity conducted in the Republic of Ireland. The focus will be on illegal movements between the UK and the Republic of Ireland.</p>	<p><i>Private sector:</i> No resource implications.</p> <p><i>Public sector:</i>  <b>Benefits:</b> It will capture likely increase in immigration offences as traffic is displaced from the sea and air routes as a result of the introduction of controls.</p> <p>It is likely that movements of illegal goods will switch to N.I. ports via the land border. UKBA will provide staff to operate vehicle checks on the land border. These staff will be trained in fraud/commodity detection, and can be expected to seize goods.</p> <p>These could include greater detection of alcohol, tobacco and hydrocarbon oil fiscal fraud on the sea routes.  Alcohol and Cigarettes – <b>£10m per year</b>  Oils - <b>£0</b> (will remain with HMRC)</p>	<p>Locally based UK Border Agency staff would cover both joint operations and ad-hoc vehicle checks in their remit.</p> <p><b>Cigarettes</b>  Cigarette RRP £5.40, increases with inflation  Duty + VAT approximately £0.20 per stick – increases with inflation  2 billion sticks seized annually, 75m in N.I.  Vehicle checks increased by 50% over current frequency.</p> <p><b>Spirits</b>  Illicit spirits market remains 5% over time  Market value grows with inflation each year.  N.I. proportion based on consumption and population  1.66% of illicit market seized each year.  Vehicle checks increased by 50% over current frequency.</p>	
---	--	--	--

		<p>Locally based UK Border Agency staff would cover both joint operations and ad-hoc vehicle checks in their remit, splitting their time equally between the two operations.</p>	
<p><b>Communication</b> Improved communication on CTA procedure with travellers and carriers, such as comprehensive but understandable instructions on the UK Border Agency website; instruction leaflets on carriers operating between the Republic of Ireland and the UK; and improved signage at ports.</p>	<p><i>Private sector:</i></p> <p><i>Public sector: £687k</i> plus installation costs in the first year.</p> <p>Leaflets to inform the travelling public of the change in procedure range from <b>£4k</b> - <b>£9k</b></p>	<p>29 ports require new or improved signage costing approximately £20,155 (based on 1 light box sign per port + VAT + installation costs).</p> <p>Figures based on 500,000 leaflets ranging from A5 2 page leaflet printed in 2 colours on both sides to 210 x 99cm 6 page (A4) printed in 4 colours throughout on silk/gloss and fold.</p>	

**Immigration controls**

Strengthen the UK immigration controls for non-CTA nationals on sea and air borders between the UK and the Republic of Ireland, and put in place measures to verify the identities of British and Irish nationals.

*Private sector:*  
Building Work: Costs to private sector should become clear upon consultation with private sector.

*Public sector:*  
Staff: Approx. **£9.5m** to cover staffing costs for approximately 240-250 staff. Staff will be deployed gradually over the period 2010/11 to 2013/14.

IT: approx. **£42k** of which £5k is a one off cost, £36 is per annum and £1m for WI machines

*Economic costs:* Loss in revenue from tourism could reach a maximum of approx. **£12m** in the first full year of border controls. (2013/14) – assumes a passport is needed for travel between UK and the Republic of Ireland.

CTA nationals will be required to prove their nationality with a passport or national id card<sup>7</sup> on all air and sea routes between the Republic of Ireland and the UK.

11 ports require completely new buildings.

Assume that costs fall as passengers adjust to new requirements.

Increase in air travel -2.89% p.a. until 2030. Maritime traffic - demand stable.

99% Irish and UK air travellers have passports.

20% of the remainder wishing to travel get passport yearly.

90% Irish and UK ferry travellers have passports.

Leisure travellers needing visa - 10% are deterred.

Business travellers all have passports.

The staff requirements were submitted prior to the announcement of the UK Border Agency. The assumption is that once the new staff/operational model has been finalised the number of staff required will be reduced significantly due to effective resource management.

<sup>7</sup> When this is adopted.

	<p><b>Non-monetised benefit:</b> more rigorous checking of identity and nationality of those travelling within the CTA will help mitigate security risks. Known and suspected terrorists are more likely to be identified if all travellers within the CTA must either present a passport or ID card or otherwise satisfy an immigration officer of their identity (British or Irish citizenship).</p>	<p>Only 5% of business travellers needing visas deterred. Return ferry and air fares are £100.</p> <p>IT costs based on 33 additional computers at 9 ports</p> <p>Expected that the Crown dependencies will mirror the process of the UK on all air and sea routes into the islands.</p>	
--	--	--	--

## Annex B: Specific Impact Tests

### **Small Firms Impact Test**

No businesses in the shipping, aviation or rail sectors are defined as 'small'. Based on the information available to date, the proposals in this document will not have any significant impact on small business.

However, we will work closely with BERR and DfT to ensure any small firms with an interest in the proposed reforms are encouraged to contribute to the 12 week online public consultation at

**<http://www.ukba.homeoffice.gov.uk/aboutus/consultations/current>**

### **Legal Aid**

We have carefully considered the impact on legal aid and have concluded that implications are likely to arise as a result of the proposed reforms. We will continue to work with the Ministry of Justice throughout the consultation period to further assess the impact in this area.

### **Equality Impact Assessment**

The proposed reforms do not discriminate on the grounds of race, age, faith and belief, disability, sexual orientation or gender. In making this assessment we have considered S75 of the Northern Ireland Act 1998, which sets out the statutory duty on public authorities with regard to the promotion of equal opportunities.

### **Other Environment**

A potential impact on the local environment and economy may occur should the proposals cause large queues to develop at airports/seaports. We are committed to managing this risk and ensuring that as far as possible processes for strengthened border controls do not take significantly longer overall than the present process. This potential impact will be kept under review.

### **Sustainable Development**

#### **Carbon Assessment**

#### **Health Impact Assessment**

#### **Human Rights**

#### **Rural Proofing**

We have carefully considered all of the other tests above and consider that there are no implications arising as a result of the proposed reforms.

