



Nimisha Green
Homeland Security
Group
Home Office
2 Marsham Street
London
SW1P 4DF
13th May 2025

Dylan Williams
Chief Executive
Cyngor Sir Ynys Môn
Council Offices
Llangefni
Anglesey
LL77 7TW

CC: Sian Peacock

Dear Dylan,

Annual Prevent duty Assurance Process 2024/2025

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 practice, policy and procedure that need to be in place 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.

Summary of Assurance Outcomes

Members of the Ynys Môn Prevent team continue to be active members of a regional Prevent Delivery Group (PDG) that works collaboratively in delivering Prevent. Of particular note for the current period, the Authority volunteered to test the new Prevent face to face training package and provided feedback on its content. The number of local authorities that volunteered was quite small and we are therefore grateful for your participation and the support provided by Sian Peacock and your training team. Sian also submitted a successful project bid to the Home Office Preventing Radicalisation Fund targeted at encouraging the 3rd sector on Ynys Môn to submit referrals to Prevent where appropriate.

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

1. Although the Prevent lead attends the Corporate Safeguarding Board, the management of the corporate risk of not delivering the Prevent duty, and a related risk register & action plan, should be a standing agenda item at that meeting. This would also provide some oversight/scrutiny of Prevent delivery by elected members.
2. The local authority should add a page on its public facing website to inform members of the public on how to seek advice should they have concerns that someone they know is in danger of being radicalised or drawn into terrorism. A check should also be made on the staff intranet to ensure that there is information on how to make a Prevent referral and how to access the National Referral Form (NRF).

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 Sian Peacock for engaging with this process, and for her time in discussing this with her 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
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.	EXCEEDING	Prevent matters are overseen by regular reporting to the Community Safety Manager and quarterly Community Safety Partnership meetings in which Prevent/Channel are now standing items. Strategic oversight is provided by the North Wales Contest Board and its Regional Prevent Delivery sub-group. Prevent and Channel are also reported into Safeguarding boards at various levels. IOACC secures opportunities to work with other local authorities – for example the joint regional bids to the Preventing Radicalisation Fund. A strategic officer (Safeguarding Service Manager) with senior authority is proactively involved in Prevent policy-setting, delivery, and communications.
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	A Prevent Situational Risk Assessment has been produced for the region. This document sets out the local context and includes key local aspects of the Counter Terrorism Local Profile and other sources to create a local risk and threat picture. The risk assessment is viewed as a living document and is updated in line with the annual CTLP and other local information that comes to the attention of the Prevent team. Relevant local partners of appropriate seniority and frontline staff are made aware of risks through the Corporate Safeguarding Board. IOACC have engaged with the police to develop and input into the CTLP through the annual survey which has recently been shared widely with staff. The risk assessment is discussed at the multi-agency partnership group (CSP) and regional Prevent Delivery Group. Corporate risks are managed on a regional basis within the Prevent Delivery Group. The Prevent Lead attends the Corporate Safeguarding Board.
Partnership Plan - The area has an agreed Prevent partnership plan.	MET	There is a Prevent partnership plan in place, tailored to local circumstances and developed using local risk assessments including the CTLP and situational risk assessments. The plan outlines the role of each local agency in delivering Prevent and sets out the actions planned to reduce the identified risk. Last year, the plan was shared with other local authorities in North Wales as an example of good practice. Following changes in circumstances due to sickness, maternity leave and changes in personnel, moving forward the Authority will ensure the plan is referenced in relevant corporate and service strategies through the Corporate Safeguarding Board.
Referral Pathway - There is an agreed pathway in place for the referral of those identified as susceptible to	EXCEEDING	There is a clear and agreed process in place for the referral of those identified as being at risk of radicalisation. The pathway is widely shared with staff, and relevant staff are trained to understand the pathway. All staff use the National Referral Form (NRF) and there is a link to this on the Authority's intranet. There is a dual pathway to ensure that other safeguarding risks are identified and managed

radicalisation into terrorism or supporting terrorism		
Channel Panel- not included in this process	N/A	
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 terrorism, and are aware of available support programmes. Designated safeguarding leads and those with Prevent responsibilities have more in-depth training.	MET	Following last year's benchmarking exercise, a training plan has been developed. At the time of this review, it was awaiting sign off by the Corporate Safeguarding Board.. Prevent training (e-learning) is mandatory and numbers are tracked. Since 1st April 2023, 263 members of staff have completed the training (71% of LA staff).
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 reasonably be linked to terrorism.	EXCEEDING	<p>Any local radicalising influences or local community cohesion concerns that come to the attention of the Prevent team are discussed at the CSP and the regional Prevent delivery group. Both groups have a clear understanding of radicalising influences and any decisions made would be evidenced in meeting minutes. Both groups have representation from partners. A multi-agency community tension meeting takes place weekly and is led by a Community Cohesion Co-ordinator. This group has capacity to instigate and disruptions activity. There is a local authority IT policy in place.</p> <p>There is a 'No Platform' 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. Prevent multi-agency partnership group members and Prevent leads maintain current knowledge of local issues and those who create or take advantage of permissive environments for radicalisation, and information is shared as appropriate.</p>

<p>Communications and Engagement- A</p> <p>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</p>	<p>MET</p>	<p>During the past year, Anglesey CC has continued to contribute to the development of the planned regional Prevent Communications and Engagement plan as part of the North Wales Prevent Delivery Group. The Strategy has now been produced, ratified, and shared. This work is ongoing on a regional basis. Easily accessible information about the Prevent programme is available through the local authority's internal and external platforms. The Prevent team has supported successful bids to the Home Office Preventing Radicalisation Fund with a view to raising awareness of radicalising threats across the area. Although the regional communications and engagement plan is in place, the Authority should consider how to implement it as 'business as usual' taking into account proportionality to the level of risk and threat in the area.</p> <p>There does not appear to be a page on the council's public facing website to inform members of the public on how to seek advice should they have concerns that someone they know is in danger of being radicalised or drawn into terrorism. If there is a page, it is not easily found.</p> <p>The Prevent team submitted a successful bid to the Home Office Preventing radicalisation Fund, targeted at encouraging the 3rd sector on Ynys Môn to submit referral to Prevent where appropriate. The Authority has also been exploring opportunities to deliver workshops to children in schools deemed to be at risk.</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.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<p>Met</p> <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	<p>Channel is assured via a separate process. For further information contact your Channel Quality Assurance Lead or email Channel@homeoffice.gov.uk</p>
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. <p>Exceeding - In addition to Met criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>Not met</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.