



Prevent

Home Office

www.gov.uk/home-office

Nimisha Green
Homeland Security
Group
Home Office
2 Marsham Street
London
SW1P 4DF

19-05-2025

Paul Walker
Chief Executive
Herefordshire Council
Plough Lane Offices
Plough Lane
Hereford
HR4 0LE

CC:
Victoria Leader & Christine Williams
manager

Dear Paul,

Annual Prevent duty Assurance Process 2024/25

Local authorities and the Prevent Partnership have a critical role to play in countering terrorism at a local level and ensuring that people who are susceptible to radicalisation are supported.

As part of the Prevent duty refresh, the Home Office has updated its assurance process to help ensure that local authorities are delivering their statutory Prevent duty in line with the [Prevent duty guidance](#).

[The Prevent duty toolkit for local authorities](#) outlines the eight benchmarks Prevent delivery is measured against and includes suggested examples of good and best practice. The assurance process is designed for local authorities to assure themselves via a self-assessment that they are effectively delivering their statutory duty.

Once a Prevent Lead has completed a self-assessment, a Home Office Prevent Adviser will work with the local authority Prevent Lead to identify both areas of good practice and areas for improvement, where required.

We recognise that every area is different, and that the threat and risk is variable, both in terms of its nature and scale. Our expectations of delivery in lower threat areas may be different to a higher threat area where we would expect local authorities to have considered prioritising the delivery of the Prevent duty, including having dedicated Prevent resource in place.

The assurance process does not provide an in-depth evaluation of how effective the local Prevent partnership is at reducing risks from radicalisation and terrorism. Rather, it focuses on what we believe are the key elements of good practice, policy and procedure to support the effective understanding and mitigation of Prevent-related risks.

Some benchmarks are more directly related to mitigating the risk of radicalisation e.g. benchmark 2 – *local risk assessment*, whereas others are more tangential e.g. benchmark 8 – *communications and engagement*. Therefore, benchmarks are not necessarily equally important in terms of mitigating the risk, and the importance of meeting some benchmarks will be more significant than others.

Please note that benchmark 5, in relation to your Channel Panel, has not been scored as part of this process. An assessment of Channel is completed separately as part of the Annual Assurance Statement (AAS).

Summary of Assurance Process

The Council has continued to drive and coordinate the Prevent Board and has started to develop its oversight and governance capabilities. There is still a need to encourage all partners to be more proactively involved in a range of partnership activity over the next 12 months. The new Prevent Lead for the Council has continued to develop the solid base created by their predecessor. The Prevent Lead has reviewed and refreshed the partnership action plan based on the latest risk assessment. The partnership has addressed or is making good progress with addressing the recommendations made last year. It is acknowledged that the partnership's development of its understanding of how to use the referral data to review training and delivery means that in this domain it is evidencing that it is delivering to the higher level of exceeding the minimum requirements of the duty.

As part of the process the following strengths were identified as part of your Prevent delivery for financial year 2024/25:

- The continued leadership by LA Officers to drive and coordinate Prevent activity across the broader partnership.

- The introduction of an accessible Prevent plan that all relevant partners can access at any time to update or review.
- The introduction of a LA Prevent training programme

The process also identified the following actions/recommendations to assist you in improving your level of Prevent delivery, namely:

- The partnership may wish to consider continuing to develop its oversight and governance capabilities, as despite appropriate encouragement, the level of support of all partners is not consistent in terms of proactively supporting the work of the partnership board or providing appropriate assurances of their own delivery of Prevent to the group.
- The partnership may wish to consider continuing its development of how it engages with and supports schools and how it seeks appropriate assurances from schools regarding their delivery of Prevent.
- The partnership may wish to consider developing their focus on maximising the current communication and engagement opportunities it has with staff and local communities to ensure Prevent is highlighted to these respective cohorts by proportionate and effective means from with existing practices, procedures and approaches.
- The partnership may wish to consider reviewing the recommendations from the Southport Prevent Learning Review and other potential related changes to policies and practices from associated HO reviews that could be applied to strengthen their delivery of Prevent across the partnership.

I have attached a more detailed summary of the agreed assurance outcomes as an annex to this letter. Your Prevent Adviser would be very happy to discuss these in more detail with you, or your wider partnership.

Given that these also reflect the performance of your local Prevent partnership, I would encourage you to share these outcomes with your local Prevent governance group e.g. a Prevent Delivery Group (PDG), with a view to including any actions resulting from this process in your Partnership Plan and report the outcome from this process with your local strategic governance group e.g. CSP.

Lastly, I would like to thank Vicky Leader (The Prevent Lead) and Christine Williams (The current chair of the Prevent Board) for engaging with this process, including completing and returning the self-assessment, and for their time in discussing this with their Prevent Adviser. I appreciate that this can be an onerous process, though we know from the feedback we receive from local authorities that this process has been helpful in clarifying the requirements of the duty, and identifying areas that may need additional attention. It has also been helpful in identifying areas of good practice, which we routinely share with other local Prevent partnerships to support their own work to build full compliance with the duty.

We look forward to continuing to work constructively and collaboratively with your team over the coming year.

Yours sincerely,

Nimisha Green

Head of Local Delivery & Communities

Preventareas@homeoffice.gov.uk



	Benchmark	Delivery Outcome	Summary of outcome
1	Multi Agency Partnership Group- There is an effective multi-agency partnership group (also known as a board) in place to monitor and evaluate the impact of Prevent delivery and provide strategic governance.	Met	<p>The progress made by the previous Prevent Lead continued and an effective handover period happened with the new Prevent Lead, and the agreed plan now is for the previous Prevent Lead (Head of Service) to chair the Prevent Board. This will ensure continuity with the progress being made by the partnership. Attendance and engagement with the Prevent board by multi-agency partners is good which means that we have a strong partnership group contributing to the Prevent agenda. This will be strengthened within the LA by having identified Prevent Champions in a similar way as our police partners.</p> <p>PA Comments Continue to develop an effective assurance process and a collegiate and collaborative delivery of Prevent by relevant partners.</p>
2	Local Risk Assessment - The local authority produces a risk assessment reviewed against the counter terrorism local profile (CTLP) and other data sources, including local knowledge and understanding of the area.	Met	<p>The situational assessment was approved and shared with partners and is embedded into the Prevent Board agenda for every board meeting. The new Prevent Lead is working hard to ensure good attendance at the 2025 CTLP event (to include Protect and Prepare representatives) and subsequent workshop so that key partners can once again agree the key local priorities to inform the situational assessment. This will in turn inform the Prevent delivery plan which is a multi-agency plan which all partners are accountable for progressing actions within their organisations.</p> <p>PA Comments The PDG does routinely review and assess risk at their quarterly meetings and the new lead for the LA is working hard to ensure good attendance at the annual CTLP briefing and workshop. The PDG should be seeking to gain assurances from key partners on how they review delivery in line with the local threat and risk context and update staff regarding the local context. Also develop how the PDG assesses the impact of the actions.</p>

3	Partnership Plan - The area has an agreed Prevent partnership plan.	Met	<p>This action plan was approved and there is a TEAMS site for board members to update the plan each quarter to evidence how their organisations are responding to the actions. There have been some minor technical problems but the Prevent Lead updates this where required to ensure full evidence is available. Updates were also sought verbally at the most recent Prevent Board.</p> <p>PA Comments The PDG does have a partnership plan and the group needs to continue to develop a partnership wide ownership of the plan. The use of Teams to allow ongoing access by partners to update the plan has assisted with partnership support/contributions.</p>
4	Referral Pathway - There is an agreed pathway in place for the referral of those identified as susceptible to radicalisation into terrorism or supporting terrorism	Exceeding	<p>The referral pathway continues to be embedded for the LA and the new Prevent referral form has been uploaded to the council website. Further assurances have been gained from key partner agencies through the Prevent board and the assurances gained as part of updating the action plan.</p> <p>PA Comments. All partners need to ensure that they are assuring the PDG that the path is known to staff and each partner assesses the referral data to assist with reviewing their own pathway and training, if necessary</p>
5	Channel Panel - not included in this process	N/A	
6	Training Programme - Frontline staff across the local authority, including those of its contractors, have a good understanding of Prevent, are trained to recognise where a person might be susceptible to becoming radicalised into	Met	<p>There is a Prevent Training plan for each respective organisation and there is an expectation of each partner providing assurance to the Prevent Board. This has been happening although schools are missing from this expectation which will start to be addressed by inclusion of Lead Officer for Education Safeguarding on the Prevent Board.</p> <p>The Prevent Lead is now also registered as a Prevent Trainer Portal Lead and an area of focus with this will be considering DSLs and how to promote this training within school environments. The lead is attending Train the Trainer Prevent training organised by one of our Prevent board members for their organisation which has also been opened out to Prevent Board members. There is an embedded mandatory 3 year training cycle for the Local Authority which has good compliance</p>

	<p>terrorism, and are aware of available support programmes.</p> <p>Designated safeguarding leads and those with Prevent responsibilities have more in-depth training.</p>		<p>rates. Assurances from key partners are sought via the Prevent board and via the Prevent Action plan updates that are expected quarterly. This is proving to be successful.</p> <p>PA Comments There has been significant development regarding training by the LA and it suggested that each partner agency provides assurances regarding their training levels at least annually, unless they feel it is appropriate to report more frequently.</p>
7	<p>Reducing permissive environments- There is an established multi-agency forum in place (using existing structures if appropriate) to identify, agree and implement (where necessary) lawful and appropriate actions to reduce permissive spaces used by those who radicalise people into participating in, or supporting, terrorism. This includes ensuring venues or IT equipment are not used by speakers and groups who spread extremist narratives which could</p>	Met	<p>This continues to be in place and the Prevent action plan seeks to provide assurances from the multi-agency group. Permissive environments are a standing agenda item for the quarterly board meetings.</p> <p>PA Comments. The LA has a broad venue hire policy and appropriate policy to ensure access to venues by extremists is limited and access to extremist material is also denied. These need to be reviewed on at least an annual basis to ensure they are still relevant and effective.</p>

	reasonably be linked to terrorism.		
8	Communications and Engagement- A communications and engagement plan is delivered to provide people with information about Prevent, increase awareness of Prevent's aims, and ensure they know where to go if they have concerns that someone is susceptible to radicalisation. The plan includes proactive public communications on Prevent and engagement activity with a range of community groups and civil society organisations, encouraging an open dialogue on Prevent and building public confidence	Met	<p>This continues to be addressed through the Prevent board and a current example of this is where we have arranged a session involving the CT policing team on Child and Young People Radicalisation at the forthcoming Child Exploitation conference held via Children's Services. This will continue to be built upon by the Prevent lead to include consideration for appropriate social media coverage and promotion, particularly in light of the recent Southport coverage and discussion during the Prevent Board around other comms and engagement opportunities. This will also be reviewed following the next CTLP.</p> <p>PA Comments The partnership needs to ensure it is exploiting every opportunity to engage with local communities and staff in a proportionate and meaningful way regarding the local Prevent context and what to do if they would like to make a referral. Partners that have safeguarding or public information websites or intranet sites should review these at least annually to ensure the information contained within it is up to date and relevant.</p>

Annex B - Prevent Local Authority Assurance Criteria

Benchmark	Evidence & Self Assessment
Multi-agency partnership group	<p>Met</p> <p>There is a multi-agency partnership group in place meeting quarterly (unless there are circumstances where this would only need to be twice per year).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The group oversees prevent delivery. This includes evidence of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - oversight of all statutory Prevent delivery including referral pathways and Channel - agreeing and updating the local risk assessment - developing and agreeing the Prevent partnership plan - facilitating the sharing of information among partners e.g. emerging threats, risks and information vital for Prevent delivery - monitoring and reviewing performance of Prevent partnership delivery. • All specified authorities under the duty are represented on the group. • Decisions of the group are guided by a Security Threat Check. • The chair is not also the chair of the Channel panel. <p>Exceeding – in addition to Met criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A strategic officer with senior authority is proactively involved in Prevent policy-setting, delivery, and communications. • The local authority secures opportunities to work with other local authorities and has effective dialogue and coordination with community-based organisations. • There is proactive involvement of a designated elected member. <p>Not met</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no governance or only single agency governance of Prevent. • Prevent is rarely discussed within governance structures.
Local risk assessment process	<p>Met</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a written situational risk assessment (SRA) in place which clearly integrates all local risks including radicalising influences. • The corporate risks of not meeting the duty are identified and noted. • Relevant local partners of appropriate seniority are made aware of the risk assessment, and the risks identified are regularly discussed across the partnership at the Prevent partnership group and relevant boards. • The risk assessment is reviewed at least twice a year and is the basis of the partnership plan, which should seek to effectively mitigate the identified risks. • Risks are mitigated effectively. • There is a process to ensure that risks identified within the CTLP and SRA are effectively shared with frontline staff in order to ensure Prevent is delivered more effectively. <p>Exceeding- In addition to Met criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local authority partners engage with the police to develop and input into the CTLP. • The risk assessment is updated and agreed with the multi-agency partnership group quarterly. <p>Not met</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local authority Prevent Leads are uninformed about the local threat of radicalisation and terrorism. • The CTLP is not utilised and there is no written local Prevent risk assessment in place. • Any risk assessment largely correlates with the national risk rather than the local picture.
Partnership plan	Met

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Prevent partnership plan is tailored to the local circumstances and developed using local risk assessments, including the CTLP, situational and corporate risk assessments. • The plan outlines the role of each local partner (specified authority or other Prevent multi-agency partnership group member) in delivering Prevent and sets out the actions planned to reduce the identified risk. • Actions are clearly linked to the risk assessment and have clear timescales and owners. • The decision making for the plan is informed by a Security Threat Check. • The plan is discussed and updated in line with the Prevent multi-agency partnership group meeting schedule. <p>Exceeding - In addition to Met criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Prevent partnership plan is referenced in relevant corporate and service strategies, plans and policies. • Completed actions are reviewed to assess their impact and used to set future direction. • The plan is updated quarterly. <p>Not met</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is either no partnership plan in place or a plan exists but is owned by a single agency with no link to risk assessments. • Actions have no timeframes or owners and are not regularly reviewed.
Referral pathway	<p>Met</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a clear referral pathway for those who are identified as susceptible to radicalisation or supporting terrorism, which has been agreed by the Prevent multi-agency partnership group. • Counter Terrorism Police are notified of all Prevent referrals for deconfliction. • The pathway is widely shared with staff, and relevant staff are trained to understand the pathway. <p>Exceeding - In addition to Met criteria</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Prevent National Referral Form is used where appropriate, and there is a dual referral pathway in place to simultaneously send referrals to Counter Terrorism Policing and to children's or adult social care. • The success of referral pathways is reviewed regularly with partners, with training plans adapted accordingly. <p>Not met</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is either no agreed local process in place for the referral of those who are susceptible to radicalisation or supporting terrorism, • The agreed referral pathway is inconsistently applied or understood.
Channel panel	Channel is assured via a separate process. For further information contact your Channel Quality Assurance Lead or email Channel@homeoffice.gov.uk
Training programme	<p>Met</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The local authority has a training plan that measures and accounts for different levels of training need across different teams within the local authority. • All relevant staff in the local authority and its commissioned services receive the appropriate Prevent training, enabling them to recognise when a person might be susceptible to radicalisation. • The Prevent multi-agency partnership group seeks reassurance from partner organisations about the level and uptake of training. • Prevent training plan utilises the home office e-learning products found at www.gov.uk/prevent-duty-training • Suitably experienced trainers deliver face to face sessions. <p>Exceeding - In addition met criteria</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Those with Prevent-specific responsibilities refresh their training at least every two years. • Clear, accessible information and publicity material on Prevent is widely available for staff within the organisation. • A training or induction process is in place for new staff who are responsible for delivering Prevent in the area, including new Channel panel members. • Prevent training is embedded in all LA staff induction programmes. • A plan is in place to identify and deliver training jointly with statutory partners, ensuring clear uniformity and reduction in mixed messages. • Relevant staff have training to understand the local risk profile, ideologies, and emerging groups. • There is a programme which works with a variety of educational institutions in the area, to train staff members on identifying children at risk of radicalisation. <p>Not met</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training only exists as signposting to e-learning and is voluntary. • There are no records in place of those undertaking learning.
Reducing permissive environments	<p>Met</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a regular formal multi-agency group in place (this could be at the regular Prevent multi-agency partnership group meeting or equivalent) for identifying, discussing, and disrupting radicalising influences and the methods used to draw people into terrorism. • This group has a clear understanding of radicalising influences and there are auditable processes in place to track decision making. • There is a public sector venue hire policy in place that ensures measures are taken to prevent local authority venues being used by radicalisers to spread or promote terrorist ideologies and extremist narratives used to support them. • There is a local authority IT policy in place. • All policies are regularly reviewed to ensure measures are taken to stop those who may create a permissive space for radicalisation into terrorism.

	<p>Exceeding - In addition to Met criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevent multi-agency partnership group members maintain current knowledge of local issues and those who create or take advantage of permissive environments for radicalisation. • There is evidence of responding to risk and threat in the Prevent partnership plan e.g. through communications or training activity. • Venue hire staff have access to the relevant training on due diligence, including for public sector staff who deal with venue hire. • Good practice venue hire processes are shared with the wider partnership and non-local authority owned premises. • Structural arrangements exist to ensure the wider community (parish councils, faith & community organisations, private sector companies) understand the threat. <p>Not met</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no formal mechanism or strategy in place for identifying and disrupting those who create a permissive space for radicalisation. • There is limited understanding of the local risk and available disruptions methods. • Any activity conducted is solely by police. • There are no venue hire or IT policies in place.
Communications and engagement	<p>Met</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communications and engagement activity takes place as detailed in partnership action plan with aim to: • improve awareness and understanding of Prevent • increase trust and willingness to support Prevent delivery among local partners and the public • Activity is monitored by the Prevent multi-agency partnership group. • Information about the Prevent programme accessible through the local authority's platforms such as websites and social media pages.

- Proactive communications activity takes place proportionate to the risk and threat in the area.
- There are engagement activities in place with a range of community groups to raise awareness and discuss how Prevent is implemented relative to the local risk and threat.

Exceeding - In addition to Met criteria

- There is a bespoke communications and engagement strategy in place.
- Regular engagement e.g. events, meetings and roundtables are held with local citizens, including members of the public and key community figures such as school governors and faith leaders to increase awareness off Prevent.
- There is regular (e.g. monthly) publication of new materials and resources to owned channels.
- Appropriate opportunities for proactive positive messaging is utilised
- Work is ongoing with civil society organisations to deliver local initiatives that build resilience to radicalisation.
- Prevent Advisory Group, or similar, are in place to allow community members to be consulted on and support local delivery of Prevent.
- Communications and engagement activity is tailored to different sectors – for example, specific products for designated safeguarding leads.
- Where Prevent projects are funded, there is an effective monitoring and evaluation of project delivery.

Not met

- There is very limited communications and engagement activity taking place relative to the risk and threat in the area.
- Updates to information about Prevent is out of date or incorrect.
- Communications and engagement activity is not detailed in the partnership plan.
- Activity within the partnership plan or communications and engagement strategy is not undertaken.