

**Vol. 781
No. 8**



**Thursday
23 February 2017**

**PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES
(HANSARD)**

HOUSE OF LORDS

WRITTEN STATEMENTS AND WRITTEN ANSWERS

Written Statements 1

Written Answers.....7

[I] indicates that the member concerned has a relevant registered interest. The full register of interests can be found at <http://www.parliament.uk/mps-lords-and-offices/standards-and-interests/register-of-lords-interests/>

Members who want a printed copy of Written Answers and Written Statements should notify the Printed Paper Office.

This printed edition is a reproduction of the original text of Answers and Statements, which can be found on the internet at <http://www.parliament.uk/writtenanswers/>.

Ministers and others who make Statements or answer Questions are referred to only by name, not their ministerial or other title. The current list of ministerial and other responsibilities is as follows.

<i>Minister</i>	<i>Responsibilities</i>
Baroness Evans of Bowes Park	Leader of the House of Lords and Lord Privy Seal
Earl Howe	Minister of State, Ministry of Defence and Deputy Leader of the House of Lords
Lord Ahmad of Wimbledon	Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State, Department for Transport
Baroness Anelay of St Johns	Minister of State, Foreign and Commonwealth Office
Lord Ashton of Hyde	Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State, Department for Culture, Media and Sport, Whip
Lord Bates	Minister of State, Department for International Development
Lord Bourne of Aberystwyth	Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State, Department for Communities and Local Government, Wales Office
Lord Bridges of Headley	Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State, Department for Exiting the European Union
Baroness Buscombe	Whip
Earl of Courtown	Deputy Chief Whip
Lord Dunlop	Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State, Scotland Office and Northern Ireland Office
Lord Gardiner of Kimble	Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
Baroness Goldie	Whip
Lord Henley	Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State, Department for Work and Pensions
Lord Keen of Elie	Advocate-General for Scotland and Ministry of Justice Spokesperson
Baroness Mobarik	Whip
Lord Nash	Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State, Department for Education
Baroness Neville-Rolfe	Commercial Secretary to the Treasury
Lord O'Shaughnessy	Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State, Department of Health
Lord Price	Minister of State, Department for International Trade
Lord Prior of Brampton	Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State, Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy
Baroness Shields	Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State, Home Office
Lord Taylor of Holbeach	Chief Whip
Baroness Vere of Norbiton	Whip
Baroness Williams of Trafford	Minister of State, Home Office
Lord Young of Cookham	Whip
Viscount Younger of Leckie	Whip

© Parliamentary Copyright House of Lords 2017

This publication may be reproduced under the terms of the Open Parliament licence, which is published at www.parliament.uk/site-information/copyright/

Written Statements

Thursday, 23 February 2017

EU Resettlement Framework

[HLWS490]

Baroness Williams of Trafford: My hon Friend the Minister of State for Immigration (Robert Goodwill) has today made the following Written Ministerial Statement:

The Government has decided not to opt in to the EU proposal for a Regulation establishing a common European Union Resettlement Framework.

Under the proposed EU Resettlement Framework, the total number of people to be resettled to the EU in a given year and the countries to be resettled from would be decided by the Council following a proposal from the Commission and set out in annual Union Resettlement Plans. The Framework would also establish certain common elements for the resettlement process, including: rules on admission, including eligibility criteria and exclusion grounds; the standard procedures governing all stages of the resettlement process; the status to be accorded to resettled people; and, the decision-making procedures for implementing the Framework.

The UK is of the view that resettlement schemes are best operated at the national level. This allows for greater control and flexibility over both the source countries to be resettled from and the resettlement process. The Government is of the view that the stated reasons for action at EU-level, such as alleviating pressures on countries hosting a disproportionate number of displaced individuals, gaining influence in policy dialogues with third countries, and improving the resettlement process, can equally be achieved through close cooperation between international partners operating national resettlement schemes. National schemes also allow resettlement efforts to be aligned with the domestic and international priorities of individual Member States, including maintaining full control over the numbers to be resettled.

The UK has committed to resettling 20,000 Syrians to the UK under our Syrian Vulnerable Person's Resettlement Scheme (VPRS), and 3,000 vulnerable children and their families to the UK under the Vulnerable Children's Resettlement Scheme, by the end of this Parliament. In the year ending September 2016, 4,162 people were resettled under the Syrian VPRS, across 175 different local authorities. These commitments are in addition to our longstanding Gateway Protection Programme and Mandate resettlement scheme.

Until the UK leaves the EU, it remains a full member, and the Government will continue to consider the application of the UK's right to opt in to forthcoming EU legislation in the area of justice and home affairs on a case by case basis, with a view to maximising our country's security, protecting our civil liberties and enhancing our ability to control immigration.

Government Transparency

[HLWS493]

Baroness Williams of Trafford: My rt hon Friend the Secretary of State for the Home Department (Amber Rudd) has today made the following Written Ministerial Statement:

I have today laid before the House the second iteration of the Government Transparency Report on the use of disruptive and investigatory powers (CM 9420). Copies of the Report will be made available in the Vote Office.

In view of the ongoing threat from terrorism, which remains at SEVERE, meaning an attack is highly likely, and the persistent threats from organised crime and hostile state activity, it is vital that our law enforcement, and security and intelligence agencies can use disruptive and investigatory powers to counter those threats and to keep the public safe. This Report sets out the way in which those powers are used by the agencies and the independent oversight which governs their use.

This Government remains committed to increasing the transparency of the work of our security and intelligence and law enforcement agencies, and this next iteration of the Transparency Report is a key part of that commitment. Since the last Report was published, the Government has published extensive material on the use of investigatory powers. And the passage through Parliament of the Investigatory Powers Act 2016 saw more information about the work of the agencies put in to the public domain than ever before. The Transparency Report builds on that.

It is split into two main sections. The first includes statistics on the use of disruptive and investigatory powers, explains their utility, and outlines the legal frameworks that ensure they can only be used when necessary and proportionate.

The second section explains the roles of the Commissioners, and other bodies, that provide independent oversight and scrutiny of the use of the powers. The Report also provides an overview of the Investigatory Powers Act 2016 and points to changes which will occur once the Act is implemented.

Publishing this Report ensures that the public are able to access, in one place, a guide to the range of powers used to combat threats to the security of the United Kingdom, the extent of their use and the safeguards and oversight in place to ensure they are used properly. It is designed to be read in conjunction with the Annual Reports on the counter-terrorism (CONTEST) and serious and organised crime strategies.

Of course, there remain limits to what can be said publicly about the use of certain sensitive techniques, because to go too far could aid criminals and terrorists, encouraging them to change their behaviour in order to evade detection. However, it is vital the public are confident that the security and intelligence, and law enforcement agencies have the powers they need to protect the public, and the knowledge that those powers are used proportionately.

International Court of Justice: Optional Clause Declaration

[HLWS489]

Baroness Anelay of St Johns: My right Honourable Friend, the Minister of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs (Sir Alan Duncan), has made the following written Ministerial statement:

The Government has informed the UN Secretary-General of an amendment to the United Kingdom's Optional Clause Declaration (Declaration) accepting the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice (Court / ICJ). The Declaration accepts the jurisdiction of the Court in contentious cases that come within its scope.

The Government keeps its Declaration under review. The ICJ case on nuclear disarmament filed by the Marshall Islands against the United Kingdom in 2014 concluded with a judgment of 5 October 2016 that upheld the United Kingdom's preliminary objections to jurisdiction. We have now decided to build into our Declaration two key elements that underpinned the principal arguments that the Government made in those preliminary objections.

The revised Declaration requires other States to give six months notice of a claim or dispute against the UK that they propose to submit to the ICJ. This would provide an opportunity for diplomatic engagement with the State concerned. The prior notification of a claim is an established part of domestic dispute resolution in the United Kingdom, as well as being a feature of the dispute settlement provisions in many international treaties. The judgment of the ICJ in the nuclear disarmament case accepted that a State must be made aware that litigants have opposing views, otherwise a respondent State does not have the opportunity to react to those opposing views before the institution of proceedings against it. The revised Declaration incorporates the UK position that was advanced in the proceedings that prior notification of the kind described is an appropriate step before an application instituting proceedings, seising the Court, can be submitted.

The United Kingdom would be held to the terms of the new Declaration in respect of any proceedings that it may wish to institute. The Government is content to be held to this standard.

In addition, the revised Declaration also includes a reservation excluding from the Court's jurisdiction any cases related to nuclear weapons and/or nuclear disarmament unless the other four Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) nuclear-weapons States also accept the Court's jurisdiction with respect to the case. The Government does not believe the United Kingdom's actions in respect of such weapons and nuclear disarmament can meaningfully be judged in isolation. This amendment to our Declaration provides that the ICJ will only have jurisdiction over nuclear weapons or

nuclear disarmament disputes when the proceedings involve all five of the NPT nuclear-weapons States.

We have also made changes to advance the cut-off date for historical cases to 1987, keeping it at thirty years, and to make clear that a repeated claim, as well as a dispute, is also excluded.

The Government is firm in our commitment to a rules based international order. We continue to accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the ICJ and believe that the Court has a valuable role to play in resolving international disputes peacefully.

Investigatory Powers Act 2016

[HLWS492]

Baroness Williams of Trafford: My hon Friend the Minister of State for Security (Ben Wallace) has today made the following Written Ministerial Statement:

I am today announcing the publication of the Government's consultation on five new codes of practice under the Investigatory Powers Act 2016.

The Investigatory Powers Act does three key things:

1) It brings together powers already available to law enforcement and the security and intelligence agencies to obtain communications and data about communications. It makes these powers – and the safeguards that apply to them – clear and understandable.

2) It radically overhauls the way these powers are authorised and overseen. It introduces a 'double-lock' for the most intrusive powers, including interception and all of the bulk capabilities, so that these warrants cannot be issued until the decision to do so has been approved by a Judicial Commissioner. And it creates a powerful new Investigatory Powers Commissioner to oversee how these powers are used.

3) It ensures powers are fit for the digital age. The Act makes a new provision for the retention of internet connection records in order for law enforcement to identify the communications service to which a device has connected. This will restore capabilities that have been lost as a result of changes in the way people communicate.

This Act provides world-leading transparency and privacy protection. It received unprecedented and exceptional scrutiny in Parliament and was passed with cross-party support. There should be no doubt about the necessity of the powers that it contains or the strength of the safeguards that it includes.

All of these draft Codes of Practice set out the processes and safeguards governing the use of investigatory powers. They give detail on how the relevant powers should be used, including examples of best practice. They are intended to provide additional clarity and to ensure the highest standards of professionalism and compliance with this important legislation.

The consultation will last six weeks. Copies of the consultation document and draft codes will be placed in the House Library. Online versions will be available on the www.gov.uk website.

Local Growth

[HLWS494]

Lord Bourne of Aberystwyth: My rt Hon Friend the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (Sajid Javid) has today made the following Written Ministerial Statement.

Further to my statements of 23 January 2017 and 2 February 2017 regarding the Growth Deal awards to the Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) in the Northern Powerhouse, East of England, South East and London, I am today announcing the six individual awards to LEPs in the South West of England.

Between them they will benefit from £191 million of Government support from the Local Growth Fund, on top of the £780 million committed in previous Growth Deals.

Table A: Growth Deal 3 Funding Awards for LEPs in the South West of England

LEP	Funding Award (£m)
Cornwall and Isles of Scilly	18.03
Dorset	19.46
Gloucestershire	29.13
Heart of the South West	43.57
Swindon and Wiltshire	28.09
West of England	52.80

We have now awarded over £9 billion to LEPs from the Local Growth Fund. With the Home Building Fund and Local Transport Majors launched in 2016 we have fulfilled our manifesto commitment to a £12 billion Local Growth Fund. It is a crucial part of the Government's agenda to drive growth and devolve power to local areas, with decisions being made by those who know their local area best, and supporting the Government's commitment to build an economy that works for everyone.

This was the most competitive round yet, and awards were made based on a bidding round that took place last year.

The expanded deals will provide LEPs in the South West with the power and funding to support local businesses, unlock housing where it is most needed and develop vital infrastructure to allow places to thrive. The funding will also be used to create jobs, equip a new generation with the skills they need for the future and attract billions of pounds of private sector investment. This investment is Government stepping up, not stepping back, building on our strengths to boost national productivity and growth.

I will announce the awards in the Midlands shortly.

National DNA Database Strategy Board

[HLWS491]

Baroness Williams of Trafford: My rt hon Friend the Minister of State for Fire and Policing (Brandon Lewis) has today made the following Written Ministerial Statement:

I am pleased to announce that I am, today, publishing the Annual Report of the National DNA Database (NDNAD) Strategy Board for 2015/16.

Gary Pugh OBE, Chair of the National DNA Strategy Board, has presented the Annual Report of the National DNA Strategy Board to the Home Secretary. Publication of the Report is a statutory requirement under section 63AB(7) of the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 as inserted by 24 of the Protection of Freedoms Act 2012.

The Report demonstrates the important contribution of the NDNAD to the investigation of crimes. I am grateful to the Strategy Board for their commitment to fulfilling their statutory functions.

Copies of the Report will be available from the Vote Office.

National Heritage Memorial Fund

[HLWS496]

Lord Ashton of Hyde: My Hon Friend the Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Sport, Tourism and Heritage (Tracey Crouch) has made the following Statement:

I am today announcing the start of a tailored review of the National Heritage Memorial Fund (NHMF). As a Non-Departmental Public Body (NDPB), the NHMF, including its activities operating as the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF), is required to undergo a tailored review at least once in each parliament.

The review will consist of two stages. The first stage will provide a robust challenge for the continuing need for the functions performed by the NHMF and the HLF, and, if there is, whether some or all of these functions should be delivered by alternative delivery models or continued to be delivered by a NDPB.

If it is agreed that the functions should continue to be delivered as a NDPB, the second stage will review the organisational control and governance arrangements in place to ensure that they are compliant with the recognised principles of good corporate governance and delivering good value for money. The structure, efficiency and effectiveness of both the NHMF and the HLF will be considered as part of both stages.

The findings at both stages of the review will be examined by a Challenge Group, chaired by DCMS Non-Executive Director Charles Alexander. A separate steering group will consist of representatives from the Welsh Government, Scottish Government, Northern Ireland Executive and UK Government.

In conducting the review, officials will engage with a broad range of stakeholders across the UK from heritage,

culture and natural environment sectors. The review will follow guidance published in 2016 by the Cabinet Office: 'Tailored reviews: guidance on reviews of public bodies'. The Terms of Reference for the review and a survey seeking evidence about NHMF and HLF can be found on the DCMS website.

I will inform the House of the outcome of the review when it is completed and copies of the report of the review will be placed in the Libraries of both Houses.

Prison Governors

[HLWS495]

Lord Keen of Elie: My right honourable friend the Lord Chancellor and Secretary of State for Justice (Elizabeth Truss) has made the following Written Statement.

"I have today introduced the Prisons and Courts Bill, which will create a new statutory framework to support the Government's plans to make prisons places of safety and reform. The measures in the Bill are a vital part of the wider structural reforms announced in the Prison Safety and Reform white paper published on 3 November 2016.

The right framework and standards for improvement

In the white paper we committed to reforming how the prison system is structured in order to make lines of accountability clear and create sharper and more transparent scrutiny.

To deliver this, the Prisons and Courts Bill will enshrine in statute the purpose of prison, setting out for the first time that reform of offenders is a key aim for prisons. The Bill makes clear how the Secretary of State for Justice will account to Parliament for progress in reforming offenders.

The Bill also provides strengthened powers to Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons, including enabling the Chief Inspector to trigger an urgent response from the Secretary of State where they have significant concerns about a particular prison that need to be addressed as a matter of urgency. It puts the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman on a statutory footing, giving them greater permanence and powers.

The white paper set out how this new framework will be underpinned by new standards, a new commissioning structure and new powers for governors. This will create a more focused prison system where governors are clear what they need to deliver and are empowered to do so.

To deliver this, we will create new, 3 year performance agreements signed by the Secretary of State and the governor of each prison. The agreements will be phased in over the next two years: the first third of prisons will sign the new agreements on 1 April, with the other two thirds moving to this approach by 1 April 2019. The agreements will include the following standards, based on the aims for prisons set out in the Bill, which governors will be held to account for:

- Protecting the public. We will do this by measuring, from April 2017:

- o The number of escapes from closed prisons;
- o The number of absconds from open prisons; and
- o Compliance with key security processes such as searching.

- Reforming offenders. We will do this by measuring:

- o Time spent out of cell, starting from April 2017 in the prisons where the technology to track this has been introduced;

- o Progress made in getting offenders off drugs. Prisoners will be tested on entry and exit with a phased roll out beginning in 2017;

- o Progress made in health, starting with a measure of medical appointments attended by prisoners starting in England from April 2017;

- o Progress made in maths and English, starting with qualifications gained from April 2017 and introducing testing on entry and exit in the longer term; and

- o Progress in maintaining or developing family relationships. This will be a new measure which we are currently developing.

- Preparing prisoners for life on release. We will do this by measuring, from April 2017:

- o Rate of prisoners being released to suitable accommodation;

- o Rates of sustainable employment, including apprenticeships, and education in the period following release.

- Improving safety. We will do this by measuring, from April 2017:

- o Assaults on prison staff and prisoners;

- o Disorder and self-harm; and

- o Staff and prisoner perceptions of safety.

We want the public to understand what progress is being made in our prisons, so we will publish data setting out how prisons are performing. We will collect the data from April 2017 and begin publishing official statistics regularly from October 2017.

To support delivery of these reforms on the ground, on 1 April we are creating a new, operationally-focused executive agency, Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service, which will be responsible for all operations across prison and probation and will refocus headquarters on supporting, not micro-managing, governors. The Secretary of State will set standards, commission services, and hold them to account.

Empowering governors to deliver

If we are to hold governors to account for meeting this new standards, they must be given the power to deliver change. We are devolving key operational policies to give governors greater flexibility, and have already cancelled 101 policies to help reduce bureaucracy for prisons. We will also remove current restrictions so that from 1 April 2017, governors have the freedom to:

- Design their regime to meet local delivery needs and target training and work in prisons to match the local

labour market. Prisoners could, for example, work shift patterns to deliver new commercial contracts. This would help them to meet the standards to reform offenders and prepare prisoners for life on release.

- Decide their workforce strategy, including their staffing structure, to support meeting the standards. They could bring in specialists to work with particular types of prisoners, and tailor their staffing to support the prison regime they have designed.
- Control how they spend their resource budget. They could choose, for example, to pay for increased dedicated police officer time to reduce criminal activity in prison to improve safety and protect the public.
- Plan and take decisions about health services jointly with local health commissioners, through a co-commissioning framework.

Over the coming months, we will build on these essential freedoms even further by giving governors additional scope to:

- Decide what education opportunities they offer. Over 2017 and 2018, we will give governors control of the education budget, so that they can overhaul education and training to match the skills and qualifications prisoners need in the local labour market.
- Control how family support services work. From autumn 2017, governors will control budgets for family services, like visitors' centres and parenting skills classes, so they can choose the right way to support family relationships.
- Have more say on the goods and services in their prison. As each national contract ends, for example on food or equipment, we will determine how to devolve responsibility to governors.

This process of devolution and deregulation is being supported by learning from the work of the six reform prisons. These prisons will continue to explore and identify options for devolution across the estate as wider reforms are implemented. We have commissioned a formal evaluation to support this with regular feedback being provided to inform policy development ahead of the final report in early 2018.

These reforms are major changes that will result in sustained improvement over a decade. By the end of this Parliament this strategy will have delivered much needed new facilities, empowered governors and introduced modern technology to improve regimes, support reform and combat security threats."

Social Security

[HLWS497]

Lord Henley: My honourable Friend The Minister of State for Disabled People, Health and Work (Penny Mordaunt MP) has made the following Written Statement.

Today I am laying before Parliament amendments to the Personal Independence Payment (PIP) Regulations to

restore the original aim of the benefit, making sure we are giving support to those who need it most.

PIP is a modern and dynamic benefit which contributes to the extra costs faced by people with disabilities and health conditions. It replaces Disability Living Allowance (DLA), which no longer properly took into account the needs of disabled people. Since PIP's introduction, greater support is going to the most vulnerable; over a quarter of those on PIP receive the highest level of support compared to just 15% of DLA's working-age claimants.

At the core of PIP's design is the principle that non-physical conditions should be given the same recognition as physical ones. That is why we developed the assessment criteria in collaboration with disabled people and independent specialists in health, social care and disability. Now, over two thirds of PIP claimants with mental health conditions get the higher Daily Living award, worth £82.30 per week, compared to 22% under DLA.

The Government continually monitors the effectiveness of PIP to ensure it is delivering its original policy intent and supporting those who face the greatest barriers to leading independent lives. Two recent Upper Tribunal judgments have broadened the way the PIP assessment criteria should be interpreted, going beyond the original intention. In order to make sure the initial purpose of PIP is maintained, we are making drafting amendments to the criteria which provide greater clarity. This will not result in any claimants seeing a reduction in the amount of PIP previously awarded by DWP.

The first judgment held that needing support to take medication and monitor a health condition should be scored in the same way as needing support to manage therapy, like dialysis, undertaken at home. Until this ruling, the assessment made a distinction between these two groups, on the basis that people who need support to manage therapy of this kind are likely to have a higher level of need, and therefore face higher costs.

The second held that someone who cannot make a journey without assistance due to psychological distress should be scored in the same way as a person who needs assistance because they have difficulties navigating. By way of example, the first group might include some people with isolated social phobia or anxiety, whereas the second group might include some people who are blind. Until this ruling, the assessment made a distinction between these two groups, on the basis that people who cannot navigate, due to a visual or cognitive impairment, are likely to have a higher level of need, and therefore face higher costs.

If not urgently addressed, the operational complexities could undermine the consistency of assessments, leading to confusion for all those using the legislation, including claimants, assessors, and the courts. It is because of the urgency caused by these challenges, and the implications on public expenditure, that proposals for these amendments have not been referred to the Social Security Advisory Committee before making the regulations.

PIP is being devolved to the Scottish Government and I will continue to work closely with Scottish Ministers on the transfer of responsibilities.

The Social Security (Personal Independence Payment) (Amendment) Regulations 2017, Explanatory Memorandum and Equality Analysis will be available on legislation.gov.uk.

Written Answers

Thursday, 23 February 2017

Abortion

Asked by **Lord Shinkwin**

To ask Her Majesty's Government how many terminations have been performed under Ground E of the Abortion Act 1967 since it entered into force (1) in total, and (2) by year. [HL5410]

Asked by **Lord Shinkwin**

To ask Her Majesty's Government how many terminations post-24 weeks' gestation have been performed since the Human Fertilisation and Embryology Act 1990 entered into force (1) in total, and (2) by year. [HL5411]

Asked by **Lord Shinkwin**

To ask Her Majesty's Government how many terminations post-24 weeks' gestation have been performed under Ground E of the Abortion Act 1967 since the Human Fertilisation and Embryology Act 1990 entered into force (1) in total, and (2) by year. [HL5412]

Lord O'Shaughnessy: The Abortion Act 1967 requires that the Chief Medical Officer be legally notified of an abortion within 14 days of the termination. Statistical summaries of this data, which include the Grounds for the termination, are published annually. Statistics for years from 1968 to 1973 were published in the Registrar General's Statistical Review of England and Wales, Supplement on Abortion. Statistics for years from 1974 to 2001 were published by the Office for National Statistics in its *Abortion Statistics* Series AB, Numbers 1 to 28. Since 2002, the Department has published an annual series of Abortion Statistics for England and Wales. All are publicly available, but for ease of reference the first three reports identifying abortions from 1991 onwards are attached.

Prior to 1991 abortion on the ground of a substantial risk that if the child were born it would suffer from such physical or mental abnormalities as to be seriously handicapped was classified as Section 1(1)(b).

The classification of abortions as Ground E (section 1(1)(d) of the Act) was introduced in April 1991. Data on the number of abortions by Ground is included in Table 1 of each of the attached documents. Information on the distribution of all post-24 week abortions and those under Ground E is included in Table D and the supporting text in each of the documents.

The Answer includes the following attached material:

Abortion Statistics 1991 [HL5410 - 1991.pdf]

Abortion Statistics 1992 [HL5410 - 1992.pdf]

Abortion Statistics 1993 [HL5410 - 1993.pdf]

The material can be viewed online at:

<http://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Lords/2017-02-09/HL5410>

Asked by **Lord Shinkwin**

To ask Her Majesty's Government by which method the gestation of a foetus is determined before being recorded on the HSA4 abortion notification form. [HL5413]

Asked by **Lord Shinkwin**

To ask Her Majesty's Government how they ensure continuity of practice amongst doctors with respect to the method by which the gestation of a foetus is determined before being recorded on the HSA4 abortion notification form. [HL5414]

Asked by **Lord Shinkwin**

To ask Her Majesty's Government what proof of a foetus' gestation is provided alongside the submission of the HSA4 abortion notification form. [HL5415]

Lord O'Shaughnessy: Ultrasound scanning is commonly used to assess pregnancies in women before they undergo abortion to confirm gestation and identify abnormalities such as ectopic pregnancy or uterine anomalies. In addition, assessment of the date of onset of the last menstrual period, bimanual pelvic examination and abdominal examination may also be used. The Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists have issued guidance to doctors on termination of pregnancy, *The Care of Women Requesting Induced Abortion*, which makes recommendations around dating pregnancies, and *Termination of Pregnancy for Fetal Abnormality in England, Scotland and Wales*. Copies of both documents are attached.

Doctors are under a legal obligation to accurately complete the HSA4 form and send it to the Chief Medical Officer, either manually or electronically, within 14 days of the abortion taking place. The form requires information on the gestation of the pregnancy. No additional proof of gestation is required. All abortions and medical conditions over 23 weeks gestation are scrutinised by an independent medical practitioner contracted by the Department. In addition, forms are checked by the Department where there are inconsistencies in gestation and method of abortions and grounds and place of termination. A check is made for gestation by clinic, as some clinics are only authorised to perform abortions up to certain gestations.

The Answer includes the following attached material:

Termination of Pregnancy for Fetal Abnormality
[RCOGterminationpregnancyforfetalabnormality.pdf]

The Care of Women Requesting Induced Abortion
[RCOGcareofwomenrequestingabortionguideline.pdf]

The material can be viewed online at:

<http://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Lords/2017-02-09/HL5413>

Commonwealth Secretariat: Finance

Asked by Lord Chidgey

To ask Her Majesty's Government what UK contribution to the Commonwealth Secretariat budget they made for the years (1) 2010, (2) 2011, (3) 2012, (4) 2013, (5) 2014, (6) 2015, and (7) 2016; and, for each further year for which a budget has been set, what will be the contribution. [HL5384]

Baroness Anelay of St Johns: The Foreign and Commonwealth Office's assessed contributions to the Commonwealth Secretariat have been as follows:

2010/2011: £4,840,936

2011/2012: £5,168,586

2012/2013: £5,262,654

2013/2014: £5,326,331

2014/2015: £5,455,484

2015/2016: £5,469,640

Asked by Lord Chidgey

To ask Her Majesty's Government which Government departments are responsible for setting the UK contribution to the Commonwealth Secretariat; on what basis it is set; and what data are used to determine increases or decreases in that contribution. [HL5385]

Baroness Anelay of St Johns: The Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO) is responsible for the UK's assessed contribution to the Commonwealth. The UK remains the largest financial contributor to the Commonwealth Secretariat, providing around 32% of the total budget. Financial contributions to the Commonwealth Secretariat's general budget are based on scales agreed at the UN. Under existing Commonwealth guidelines, the budget is shared amongst the membership in accordance with three principles: capacity to pay, equitable burden sharing, and shared ownership and responsibility. This ensures that all members enjoy an equal voice within the organisation.

In addition to FCO assessed contributions, the Department for International Development also makes voluntary contributions to the Commonwealth Fund for Technical Cooperation, and a number of other Commonwealth programmes.

Asked by Lord Chidgey

To ask Her Majesty's Government what process of consultation is in place between them and the Commonwealth Secretariat (1) prior to, (2) during, and (3) after, the process of setting the UK budget contribution; and what other parties are consulted. [HL5386]

Baroness Anelay of St Johns: Member State contributions to the Commonwealth Secretariat's general budget are based on scales agreed at the UN, which are then agreed by the Commonwealth's Executive Committee and Board of Governors. The UK is a member

of both groups. All Commonwealth countries are represented at the Board of Governors. Through attendance at these meetings we ensure that UK funds are allocated and spent in an efficient and transparent manner.

Asked by Lord Chidgey

To ask Her Majesty's Government what assessment they have made of the impact of the latest adjustments to the UK contributions to the Commonwealth Secretariat budget, particularly in relation to the scope and staffing of the Commonwealth Health and Education Unit and the measurement of progress of its work across the Commonwealth. [HL5387]

Baroness Anelay of St Johns: Through projects and programmes, the Commonwealth Secretariat's general budget - to which the UK pays an assessed contribution - is used to deliver outcomes outlined in the Commonwealth Secretariat Strategic Plan. The Strategic Plan will be discussed and approved at the next Board of Governors meetings in March.

The UK's assessed contribution does not fund specific projects. The Department for International Development makes voluntary contributions to the Commonwealth Fund for Technical Cooperation and a number of Commonwealth programmes.

Food: Safety

Asked by Baroness Jones of Whitchurch

To ask Her Majesty's Government what discussions they have had with the Food Standards Agency concerning its plans to substitute regular food safety inspections with greater self-regulation by business. [HL5399]

Lord O'Shaughnessy: The Government continues to engage with the Food Standards Agency (FSA) in the development of its strategic regulatory transformation programme, *Regulating our Future*, which aims to design a tailored and proportionate system of regulation for food and feed in England, Wales and Northern Ireland by 2020 that reflects relative risk, reinforces accountability and delivers more for public health.

The FSA's cross-Government engagement includes working with the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, to ensure the future assurance model creates the right regulatory environment for business.

The FSA will set the system standards for the new assurance framework to ensure the very highest levels of consumer protection. Robust mechanisms will be in place to verify the integrity of data coming from regulated private assurance.

Heart Diseases

Asked by Lord Freyberg

To ask Her Majesty's Government, with respect to chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, what was the NHS's annual clinical negligence bill for the 2016-17

financial year and what it is projected to be for the 2017–18 financial year; whether any statistical correlations between negligence payments made by NHS Trusts and care quality indicators have been examined; and if so, what are those correlations. [HL5443]

Asked by Lord Freyberg

To ask Her Majesty's Government with respect to cardiac rhythm management devices, what was the NHS's annual clinical negligence bill for the 2016–17 financial year and what it is projected to be for the 2017–18 financial year; whether any statistical correlations between negligence payments made by NHS Trusts and care quality indicators have been examined; and if so, what are those correlations. [HL5446]

Lord O'Shaughnessy: Information to answer these questions is not held in this format by either the Department or the NHS Litigation Authority (NHS LA). The NHS LA records information on clinical negligence claims against the National Health Service but it does not record specific information on claims relating to chronic obstructive pulmonary disease or cardiac rhythm management devices. It is therefore not possible to provide information on clinical negligence costs relating to these conditions or to provide information on any statistical correlations between negligence payments made by NHS trusts in relation to these conditions and care quality indicators.

Islamic State

Asked by Lord Pearson of Rannoch

To ask Her Majesty's Government, further to the answer by Baroness Williams of Trafford on 24 January (HL Deb, col 53), and to her Written Answer on 3 February (HL5216), what assessment they have made of the comments made by the Archbishop of Canterbury in his lecture at the Catholic Institute of Paris on 17 November 2016, that religious people should move away from the argument that ISIS is nothing to do with Islam. [HL5406]

Baroness Williams of Trafford: The Archbishop of Canterbury rightly pointed out during his lecture at the Catholic Institute of Paris on 17 November 2016 that we cannot ignore the fact that Daesh claim their actions in the name of Islam.

Local Government Finance

Asked by Lord Ouseley

To ask Her Majesty's Government, in the light of the estimate made by the Local Government Association of a £5.8 billion funding gap for local authorities by 2020 in their briefing published on 23 November 2016, what steps they are taking to ensure that local authorities

remain able to finance essential public services. [HL5403]

Lord Bourne of Aberystwyth: To provide local government with greater certainty over their income in the medium term, the Government has offered a guaranteed budget for every year of the Parliament. 97 per cent of eligible local authorities have accepted this four year offer and the Government's settlement for local government provides councils with more than £200 billion over the lifetime of this Parliament to support local services.

Out-patients: Attendance

Asked by Lord Hunt of Kings Heath

To ask Her Majesty's Government what assessment they have made of the cost of missed appointments across the NHS, and of the impact of requiring two forms of ID from patients not resident in the UK on this cost. [HL5396]

Lord O'Shaughnessy: Information on the cost of missed National Health Service appointments is not collected centrally.

We welcome trusts piloting schemes whereby they ask NHS patients for two forms of identification to demonstrate their identity and residency status. We will consider further the impact that identification checks have, including the effect on costs identified and recovered from people not eligible for free NHS care.

Road Traffic

Asked by Lord Hunt of Chesterton

To ask Her Majesty's Government, in the light of the forecast impact of future road building in both rural and urban areas on traffic congestion, what plans they have to (1) control the number of passenger and goods vehicles over the next decade, and (2) co-ordinate their strategic approach to all aspects of traffic with other European countries and the automobile industry. [HL5392]

Lord Ahmad of Wimbledon: The Department for Transport is working towards developing scenarios using the National Transport Model (NTM), to support investment and policy decision-making in the context of the Roads Investment Strategy 2. The scenarios will test various uncertainties in some of the main drivers of road traffic, to ensure road investment decisions are robust against a range of possible futures.

However, the Government has no plans to restrict the number of goods vehicles over the next decade. The strategic approach to aspects of traffic does include co-ordination internationally and with the automobile industry, for example about vehicle standards. The Government's strategic approach to traffic does include how to influence some of the effects of vehicles and levels of traffic, for example as discussed in the recently published Freight Carbon Review.

Social Rented Housing: Rents

Asked by Lord Beecham

To ask Her Majesty's Government what they estimate the amount of lost income will be to (1) local authorities, and (2) housing associations, by 2020, as a result of the cumulative effect of the annual one per cent reduction in social housing rents. [HL5382]

Lord Bourne of Aberystwyth: The fiscal impact of the social rent reduction policy on public finances was included as part of the Office for Budget Responsibility's policy costings for Budget 2015 which can be found on page 53 of the attached annex, Summer Budget 2015: Policy Costings.

In September 2015 the Department for Communities and Local Government carried out an impact assessment of the effect of the social rent reduction policy on housing associations which can be found on page 4 of the attached annex, Welfare Reform and Work Bill: Impact Assessment of Social Rent Reductions.

The Answer includes the following attached material:

HL5382 - Impact Assessment [17223 Welfare Reform and Work Bill_ Impact Assessment of Social Rent Reductions - HL5382.pdf]

Summer budget [170223 Summer Budget 2015_ Policy Costings HL5382.pdf]

The material can be viewed online at:
<http://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Lords/2017-02-09/HL5382>

Social Services: Finance

Asked by Lord Ouseley

To ask Her Majesty's Government what assessment they have made of the impact of the increased social care precept on the ability of local authorities to provide adult social care. [HL5404]

Lord Bourne of Aberystwyth: If all councils make the maximum use of the additional flexibility the Government has offered, this will raise over £1 billion for adult social care in 2017-18. However the social care precept is only one stream of funding for local government which also includes unhypothecated central grant as well as other local taxes and, for 2017-18, the Adult Social Care Support Grant. It is for local government to determine how best to manage its own finances to ensure it delivers the appropriate level of services for its residents.

Tinsley House Immigration Removal Centre

Asked by Baroness Hamwee

To ask Her Majesty's Government what procurement process was undertaken by the Home Office before

awarding G4S the welfare services provider contract for Tinsley House pre-departure accommodation; whether it was an open tender exercise; what the duration of the contract is; and whether that contract is formally linked to G4S's contract as custodial provider. [HL5389]

Asked by Baroness Hamwee

To ask Her Majesty's Government what arrangements are in place to ensure that children staying at Tinsley House pre-departure accommodation are not affected by being held on the same site as a place of detention; and whether, when accessing outdoor play facilities, those children will be protected from seeing and hearing the detention site. [HL5390]

Asked by Baroness Hamwee

To ask Her Majesty's Government what training and experience G4S staff at Tinsley House pre-departure accommodation have in working with vulnerable children of various nationalities and backgrounds. [HL5391]

Baroness Williams of Trafford: The welfare services contract was awarded after a competitive tender process. On 21 September 2016 a notice was placed in the Official Journal of the European Union (OJEU) to advise any interested suppliers across Europe of the opportunity to bid for the contract for welfare services at Tinsley House.

The contract that was awarded to G4S will last for an initial 3 years and can be extended on any number of occasions up to a total of 24 months, subject to a minimum extension period of 3 months on any one occasion. An award notice was placed in the OJEU on 8 February 2017 providing detail on the award to G4S. The contract is not formally linked to G4S's contract as custodial provider at Tinsley House.

The new pre-departure accommodation (PDA) at Tinsley House will use the refurbished existing accommodation for families with children who fall outside the family returns process. It is a discrete unit with a separate entrance, with no interaction between the families accommodated in the PDA and the adult detention population. The outside play area will be screened, and the installation of external louvres and obscured glazing on windows in detainee accommodation will ensure the area is not overlooked.

The training requirements for G4S at Tinsley House PDA are equivalent to those for Cedars. As set out in Detention Services Order 19/2012 'Detention and Escorting Safeguarding Children policy', updated in May 2016, all staff working with children receive suitable training, which must be at least equivalent to Tier 1 of the Home Office 'Keeping Children Safe'..

Index to Statements and Answers

Written Statements.....1

EU Resettlement Framework	1
Government Transparency	1
International Court of Justice: Optional Clause Declaration	2
Investigatory Powers Act 2016	2
Local Growth.....	3
National DNA Database Strategy Board	3
National Heritage Memorial Fund.....	3
Prison Governors	4
Social Security.....	5

Written Answers.....7

Abortion.....	7
Commonwealth Secretariat: Finance.....	8
Food: Safety	8
Heart Diseases	8
Islamic State	9
Local Government Finance	9
Out-patients: Attendance	9
Road Traffic	9
Social Rented Housing: Rents	10
Social Services: Finance.....	10
Tinsley House Immigration Removal Centre	10