

Supported or deported? Understanding the deportation
and detention data held on human trafficking and slavery
JULY 2019

AFTER 
EXPLOITATION.

SUPPORTED OR DEPORTED?

Understanding the deportation and detention data
held on human trafficking and slavery

Author: Maya Esslemont

Contact: afterexploitation@gmail.com

After Exploitation is a data project seeking to map what happens to victims of exploitation, which includes human trafficking and slavery, after their initial abuse ends. Despite the risk of further exploitation, homelessness, deportation and detention amongst exploited people, little is known about these outcomes. Our goal is to understand the realities facing victims After Exploitation, to facilitate fairer policymaking.

1. Executive summary

INTRODUCTION

The UK government has spent considerable resource, both financial and political, addressing human trafficking and modern slavery as serious criminal acts (Home Office 2014). Conversely, policies intending to deter undocumented immigrants from settling in the UK have been implemented at a comparable rate¹, undermining attempts to support victims of exploitation who lack residency entitlements or documentary proof of their country of origin²³.

The preliminary findings within this report concern themselves with the tension between immigration enforcement, encompassing both deportation and detention, and the government's statutory responsibility to protect victims of slavery and trafficking under both domestic and international law.

SUMMARISED FINDINGS

Data provided by the Home Office, in response to After Exploitation's Freedom of Information (FOI) requests, reveal that both confirmed and potential victims of human trafficking have been subject to deportation and detention since 2016.

The UK's framework for recognising victims of slavery, the National Referral Mechanism (NRM), includes two determination stages. Firstly, decision makers decide if an individual is a 'potential victim of trafficking' (PVoT) by issuing a positive or negative Reasonable Grounds decision. A positive Reasonable Grounds decision indicates that there are "reasonable grounds to believe" someone has been trafficked (Home Office, 2019), and entitled them to a minimum of 45 days support including psychological, medical, legal and accommodation assistance. However, a High Court ruling in March 2019 provoked a commitment by the Home Office to replace the current statutory minimum period of support with a "needs-based system" with no set minimum (Duncan Lewis, 2019). Under the old system, victims faced a support 'cliff edge' after discharge from the NRM⁴. We do not yet know what criteria will be applied to decide which victims attain more or less support than under the current system.

¹ Tyler, I., (2018) *Deportation Nation: Theresa May's Hostile Environment*, Lancaster University. Last accessed 6 July 2019: <https://eprints.lancs.ac.uk/id/eprint/125439/>

² Labour Exploitation Advisory Group (2019). *Submission to the Independent Chief Inspector of Borders and Immigration*, FLEX

³ Hiam, L., Steele, S., & McKee, M. (2018). Creating a 'hostile environment for migrants': The British government's use of health service data to restrict immigration is a very bad idea in *Health Economics in Policy and Law*, 13(2).

⁴ British Red Cross (2018). *After the National Referral Mechanism: what next for survivors of trafficking?*, STEP Project: Sustainable integration of Trafficked human beings through proactive identification and Enhanced Protection. Last accessed 2 July 2019: <https://www.redcross.org.uk/about-us/what-we-do/we-speak-up-for-change/human-trafficking-and-slavery/after-the-national-referral-mechanism-report>

The Home Office correspondence within this report discloses that 507 individuals believed to have Reasonable Grounds in their trafficking case were detained under immigration powers in 2018, either before or after receiving this NRM decision.

This finding must be situated within the context of the Home Office's deportation data, obtained by After Exploitation, which reveals that in a longer period encompassing 2016, 2017 and 2018, comparatively low number of individuals with positive Reasonable Grounds (n=30), or a final Conclusive Grounds decisions (n=75), were enforcedly removed. Immigration detention is frequently framed as a 'last resort', reserved for individuals for whom there is a "realistic prospect of removal within a reasonable timeframe"⁵. The fact that potential victims are significantly less likely to be deported than they are detained gives serious cause for concern, as this demonstrates that detention is being used on vulnerable individuals for whom deportation is not a realistic outcome.

Firstly, After Exploitation is concerned that Detention Gatekeeping is systematically detaining vulnerable individuals at such pace that even those with trafficking indicators strong enough to be identified by the same agency at a later date are not accounted for in the screening process.

Secondly, we are concerned by the possibility that individuals who are already recognised as a potential victim are knowingly held in immigration detention for any length of time despite prior evidence of vulnerability secured via the NRM. Once in detention, insufficient access to legal and medical support prevent disclosure.

Thirdly, we are concerned by the possibility that detention is being used as an immigration deterrent amongst vulnerable people in order to facilitate voluntary return, which potentially accounts for the surprising discrepancy between voluntary and enforced removals of potential trafficking victims in 2018.

Finally, we are concerned by the impenetrable data regime which prevents non-profits, lawyers, and policy makers from understanding what happens to slavery and trafficking victims after they are released from both the NRM and detention. In the absence of immigration outcomes, it is impossible to understand whether recognised victims who are not deported are lost from the system and face destitution, are supported in the community, or re-trafficked. Of particular concern is an FOI asking for immigration outcomes of trafficking victims (see Appendix A) rejected on cost grounds, despite a subsequent FOI response outlining the presence of highly specific immigration outcome categories of trafficking victim on the CID database⁶. Additionally, we are concerned that the current Immigration Minister has denied the existence of a cross-

⁵ Home Office (2019). *Adults at Risk in Immigration Detention, Version 5*. Last accessed 1 July 2019: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/784634/adults-at-risk-policy-v5.0ext.pdf

⁶ Case ref 56394, asking for data on the number of Failed Asylum Seekers with NRM decisions who have been held in detention (See Appendix B), the Home Office outlines highly detailed category inclusions: 'VOT DL Granted' (presumably victim of trafficking discretionary leave granted), 'VOT No Leave to be Granted' and 'VOT DL Granted (personal circumstances)'. After Exploitation has triggered an internal review and anticipated a response on the 17th July 2019

referenceable database capable of outlining the number of confirmed victims of trafficking in detention, after we were able to secure data by petitioning to a database of this exact nature.

Further fact finding and commitment to transparency is needed before we can truly understand the reality and risks facing exploitation survivors leaving immigration settings. It is hoped that these preliminary but much-needed figures act as a catalyst for improved data reporting by the Home Office and the exploration of policy reform for vulnerable migrants, including potential and recognised victims of trafficking.

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATIONS

- Interaction with the UK's slavery determination process, the National Referral Mechanism, must trigger **automatic release from detention**
- Support for victims of slavery, including human trafficking, must include a minimum of 12 months **in which time protection from detention or deportation is granted**
- Transparent reporting around outcomes after victims come into contact with authorities, including **rates of support access, immigration decisions, detention and deportation**
- **Fatalities and harm amongst victims**, returning to the country in which trafficking or exploitation first occurred, must be monitored

2. Areas of focus

NATIONAL REFERRAL MECHANISM

The National Referral Mechanism is the UK's framework for recognising and supporting victims of slavery, including human trafficking. Official recognition by the NRM is ordinarily needed before victims can access the support associated with their potential trafficking or slavery status⁷.

Entering, or bypassing, the NRM

Numerous charities providing research functions or front-line service provision have highlighted barriers to interacting with the NRM. These deterrents include the psychological impact of trying to 'prove' past trauma, the need to trust authorities unknown to the victim, and pressure to help prosecute powerful perpetrators as part of criminal proceedings⁸. In order to understand the extent to which potential victims of trafficking, already known to First Responders, decide not to engage with the NRM, After Exploitation submitted an FOI asking for the number of MS1 forms submitted in 2016 and

⁷ ATHUB, (2019). *How do I refer a client into the NRM and what happens next?*, Anti Trafficking Hub, Last accessed 1 July 2019: <https://athub.org.uk/knowledge-base/how-do-i-refer-a-client-into-the-nrm-and-what-happens-next/>

⁸ Gozdiak, E., Collett, E., (2005). *Data and Research on Human Trafficking: A Global Survey*, IOM

2017. The data showed that the number of potential victims bypassing the National Referral Mechanism entirely, despite coming into contact with front-line staff, had more than doubled by 2017. In 2016, 776 cases were notified through MS1 forms compared to 1670 at year end 2017 (see Appendix C).

There is currently no reporting mechanism to track the outcome of potential victims represented by MS1 notifications. These reports are lodged anonymously and ask notifiers to provide skeletal details of an unnamed PVoT. Potential victims who are represented in MS1 figures, and therefore bypass the NRM, are not entitled to support relating to their potential trafficking status, nor are they represented in government reporting of trafficking (See Appendix D). The results of our FOIs suggest that MS1 notifications account for a significant number of potential victims missing from official Government reporting. Including duties to notify, the number of potential victims in 2016 and 2017 would be 20% and 32% higher respectively^{9,10}.

Across the two-year period, a majority of MS1 notifications were completed by Home Office staff (n=1167) and the police (n=1098). In order to understand whether potential victims of trafficking inside detention were more likely to bypass the NRM, After Exploitation requested disaggregated departmental figures for Home Office MS1 notifications. This request was rejected on cost grounds (See Appendix E). As a result, we do not know how many detainees recognised as potential victims of trafficking engage or do not engage with the NRM.

Reasonable Grounds stage

If a potential victim enters into the NRM, the Home Office is the Single Competent Authority responsible for deciding whether an individual has been trafficked. Guidance states that this initial decision should be made with five days.

A positive Reasonable Grounds decision indicates that there are reasonable grounds to believe someone has been trafficked, and entitled them to a minimum of 45 days support including psychological, medical, legal and accommodation assistance. However, our findings suggest that a significant proportion of victims at this stage in the recognition process are held under immigration powers and must therefore make their case for victimhood within prison-like settings for at least some period of time.

A High Court ruling in March 2019 provoked a commitment by the Home Office to replace the current statutory minimum period of support with a needs-based system with no set minimum. We will be investigating the support outcomes of recognised victims to understand if individuals are supported for longer under the reformed system.

⁹ UK Government (2017). *2017 UK Annual Report on Modern Slavery*, Last accessed 3 July 2019: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/652366/2017_uk_annual_report_on_modern_slavery.pdf

¹⁰ UK Government (2018). *2018 UK Annual Report on Modern Slavery*, Last accessed 3 July 2019: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/749346/2018_UK_Annual_Report_on_Modern_Slavery.pdf

Conclusive Grounds stage

At the Conclusive Grounds stage, potential victims of trafficking receive a definitive decision on their claim, either negative or positive.

Once a negative decision is issued at Conclusive or Reasonable Grounds stage, even if new evidence comes to light, there is no formal appeals process to question a rejection unless made by the same First Responder who originally submitted the referral¹¹. Further data is needed to understand which First Responders most frequently, and successfully, appeal negative Conclusive and Reasonable Grounds decisions in order to understand whether the nature of the First Responder can impact the likelihood of appealing unfavourable decisions within the NRM.

DETENTION

Individuals awaiting the outcome of their immigration claim, or deportation, can be held under immigration powers in detention. Immigration detention refers to the practice of holding individuals in prison-like settings including Immigration Removal Centres (IRCs), Short-Term Holding Facilities, and prisons themselves.

Research by charities providing day-to-day support to vulnerable detainees report that poor access to healthcare, insufficient mental health interventions among suicidal detainees and patchy legal support are serious causes of harm¹²¹³¹⁴¹⁵. The mental and physical health risk factors associated with detention pose significant threats to the wellbeing of exploited people more generally, who are already more likely to suffer from suicidal ideation, substance withdrawal due to drugging by perpetrators, physical injuries and sexually transmitted diseases in the case of sex trafficking¹⁶.

The UK Government stipulates that immigration detention should only be used “in extreme circumstances, where someone must be detained due to wider immigration concerns”.

¹¹ <https://atleu.org.uk/cases/2018/3/27/ms-v-secretary-of-state-for-the-home-department>

¹² Lousley, G., Coop, S., (2017). *We are still here: The continued detention of women seeking asylum in Yarl's Wood*, Women for Refugee Women

¹³ McGinley, A., Trude, A., (2012). *Positive duty of care? The mental health crisis in immigration detention*, AVID and BID

¹⁴ Helen Bamber Foundation (2017). *Submission to the 2017 stephen shaw review of welfare in Detention of vulnerable persons*, Helen Bamber Foundation. Last accessed 12 June 2019: <http://www.helenbamber.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/Shaw-Review-II-HBF-SUBMISSION-11.12.17.pdf>

¹⁵ Sceats, S., (2015). *Freedom From Torture submission to the Shaw Review*, Freedom From Torture. Last accessed 12 June 2019: [https://www.freedomfromtorture.org/sites/default/files/2019-02/Freedom from Torture submission to the Shaw Review \(June 2015\).pdf](https://www.freedomfromtorture.org/sites/default/files/2019-02/Freedom%20from%20Torture%20submission%20to%20the%20Shaw%20Review%20(June%202015).pdf)

¹⁶ World Health Organisation (2012). *Understanding and addressing violence against women*, WHO. Last accessed 12 June 2019: https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/77394/WHO_RHR_12.42_eng.pdf;jsessionid=523BCE8010AA0D28C40249C487BDFBC8?sequence=1

Gatekeeping

Home Office Detention Gatekeepers decide whether someone is too vulnerable for detention on the basis of “available evidence” weighed against immigration control factors¹⁷. Confusion exists as to what burden of proof, or what immigration control factors, govern the decision-making process. Numerous charities have reported the detention of individuals including pregnant women, torture survivors and trafficking victims¹⁸¹⁹.

In order to understand how frequently potential and recognised victims of trafficking are identified at the Detention Gatekeeper stage, After Exploitation’s FOI petitioned the Home Office to release the number of trafficking referrals handled by this department across all 12 operational IRCs in the UK. This FOI was rejected on cost grounds (See Appendix F). We note that a lack of data transparency around this stage of decision-making is concerning, and the exploration of new reporting methods around vulnerability in detention, beyond but including trafficking and slavery indicators, is needed.

Support within detention

Once within detention, there are potential ‘touchpoints’ with front-line staff and charities which could theoretically facilitate the identification of trafficking survivors. These interactions include medical examinations by detention doctors, legal advice sessions, and interactions with Home Office staff such as those working within Detained Asylum Casework.

However, numerous charities have positioned themselves as being opposed to the quality of reporting by detention doctors, given the high rate of missing or incomplete medico-legal records (Rule 35 reports), assigned to victims of torture and abuse to support their claims. In 2017, charity Medical Justice noted a decline in Rule 35 reports submitted by detention doctors²⁰²¹ after the implementation of the Adults at Risk policy in 2016. Accounting for the same period, the Helen Bamber Foundation reported a rise in the number of potential victims of trafficking or torture referred to their services (Letters of Concern)²².

¹⁷ <https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-01-16/122926>

¹⁸ Medical Justice (2018). *Putting Adults at Risk: A guide to understanding the Adults At Risk policy and its history*. Last accessed 12 June 2019: <http://www.medicaljustice.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/Putting-Adults-at-Risk-CONCISE-WEB.pdf>

¹⁹ Amnesty International (2017). *A matter of routine: The use of immigration detention in the UK*. Last accessed 21 June 2019: <https://www.amnesty.org.uk/files/2017-12/A%20Matter%20of%20Routine%20ADVANCE%20COPY.PDF?ya06n1Z2uH6J0bP8HmO7R2Pn7nabDymO>

²⁰ Medical Justice (2017). *Briefing for Westminster Hall Debate 14th March 2017*. Medical Justice. Last accessed 12 June 2019: <http://www.medicaljustice.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/Briefing-for-Westminster-Hall-debate-14th-March-2017.pdf>

²¹ Medical Justice (2017). *Submission to Shaw Review II*. Last accessed 12 June 2019: <http://www.medicaljustice.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/MJ-submission-to-Shaw-II-30.11.2017-final-edited.pdf>

²² Helen Bamber Foundation (2017). *Submission to the 2017 Stephen Shaw review of welfare in Detention of vulnerable persons*, Helen Bamber Foundation. Last accessed 12 June 2019: <http://www.helenbamber.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/Shaw-Review-II-HBF-SUBMISSION-11.12.17.pdf>

Equally, the traumatic and stigmatised nature of trafficking and slavery often results in delayed disclosure²³, meaning that lawyers working within very tight time restraints must ascertain the extent and relevance of a potential client's trauma within the statutory 30 minute appointment under the Detention Duty Advice scheme²⁴.

Detained Asylum Casework (DAC) teams are governed by guidance on trafficking and modern slavery, but bespoke directions for NRM referrals are absent from their guidance²⁵. Little research explores practice within DAC in regards to trafficking cases, but we believe a greater understanding of these teams is vital to map the scale of trafficking referrals made from within detention. A request for the number of human trafficking cases handled by DAC, made by After Exploitation, was rejected on cost grounds.

3. Results

DETENTION DATA

Using FOIs, we sought to understand the extent to which recognised and potential victims of trafficking are detained under immigration powers. (See Appendix G and H).

The below data was provided in response to FOI requests asking for the total number of trafficking victims held in immigration removal centres (IRCs) in 2018 (from January 1st - December 31st).

Demographic <i>(as per the Home Office's wording)</i>	
Number of individuals in detention at an Immigration Removal Centre (IRC) between 1st-Jan-2018 and 31st-Dec-2018, who had a positive Reasonable Grounds (RG) decision as their latest case outcome before entering detention, or received a positive RG decision during their detention period.	507
Number of individuals who were detained between 01-Jan-18 and 31-Dec-18, and were given a positive Conclusive Grounds (CG) decision either before entering detention or during a detention period, where detention was continued	29

²³ Anison, R., (2013). *Hidden in plain sight, Three years on: updated analysis of UK measures to protect trafficked persons*, Anti Trafficking Monitoring Group. Last accessed 12 June 2019: http://www.antislavery.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/hidden_in_plain_sight.pdf

²⁴ BID (2019). *Spring 2019 Legal Advice Survey*, Bail for Immigration Detainees. Last accessed 30 June 2019: http://hubble-live-assets.s3.amazonaws.com/biduk/redactor2_assets/files/890/190523_legal_advice_survey_spring_2019.pdf

²⁵ Home Office (2019). *Detained Asylum Casework (DAC) – asylum process, Version 5*. Home Office. Last accessed 6 June 2019: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/788720/detained-asylum-process-v5.0.pdf

Detention of potential victims of trafficking

Although these findings are preliminary, they demonstrate that a significant number (n=507) of individuals entitled to support due to their status as a 'potential victim' are detained after or whilst undergoing this stage of decision-making. This figure is deemed significant in the context of the total number of individuals who occupy the Reasonable Grounds which was 2,726 at last report²⁶. If this figure is true at year end 2018 as it was in June of the same year, this means that nearly one in five (19%) individuals at Reasonable Grounds stage in 2018 were held in Immigration Removal Centres.

It should be noted that, further exploration is needed to understand how many PVoTs were detained before and during the support period. Equally, further exploration is needed to secure an understanding of the Detention Gatekeeping screening process itself, which has either allowed known potential victims to be detained or failed to recognise the signs of trafficking in victims with indicators strong enough to later be identified by the same agency.

Detention of confirmed victims of trafficking

Those who attain a positive Conclusive Grounds decision are no longer potential victims of trafficking, and are instead considered victims of trafficking by the UK Government. At this stage, individuals must make a fresh and unrelated immigration claim in order to secure the right to stay in the UK and protect against further instances of detention.

The data provided reveals that 29 individuals with positive Conclusive Grounds decisions were held in Immigration Removal Centres in 2018. Numerous ministers have denied the possibility of securing data on trafficking and detention. This raises serious concerns over the quality of information on detention available to decision makers. On 24 June 2019, in answer to Frank Field MP, Immigration Minister Caroline Nokes said:

"As NRM referrals, Reasonable Grounds and Conclusive Grounds decisions are considered separately from immigration enforcement action, there is no central record of those who have received a positive Conclusive Grounds decision and are detained under immigration powers. The Home Office therefore does not collate or publish the data requested."

- Caroline Nokes MP, Minister of State (Home Office)²⁷

Additionally, the number of individuals with positive Conclusive Grounds decisions, detained in spite of state recognition of trafficking, should prompt further investigation into the vulnerability thresholds which detainees are expected to meet in order to trigger release.

²⁶ UK Government (2018). *2018 UK Annual Report on Modern Slavery*, Last accessed 3 July 2019:

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/749346/2018_UK_Annual_Report_on_Modern_Slavery.pdf

²⁷ The Minister of Immigration (Home Office) (HC Deb 24 June 2019 c 266715W). Last accessed 3 July 2019:

<https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2019-06-19/266715/>

DEPORTATION DATA

In order to understand the scale with which potential and confirmed victims of human trafficking are deported, After Exploitation requested the number of individuals returned after receiving positive Conclusive and Reasonable Grounds decisions since 2016. Both requests asked for disaggregated figures for enforced and voluntary return (see Appendix J and K).

Demographic <i>(as per the Home Office's wording)</i>	Enforced removal	Voluntary removal
Number of individuals who had a positive Conclusive Grounds (CG) decision before return 01/01/2016 – 31/12/2018	30	25
Returns of Potential Victims of Trafficking from 01/01/2016 to 31/12/2018	8	73

Firstly, we are concerned that a high proportion of individuals during the reflection period are opting for voluntary removal. Although we anticipated a number of voluntary removals as a result of the nature of the reflection period itself, which encourages claimants to consider whether they would like to rebuild their life in their country of origin, disaggregated annual figures show a 133% increase in voluntary removals in the year 2018 (n=43) compared to both 2017 and 2016 which shared a stagnated number of voluntary removals (n=18).

As referenced under our detention data, we extrapolated that in 2018 a fifth of potential victims were held in immigration detention whilst undergoing this reflection period. We are gravely concerned that detention is therefore being used inadvertently or knowingly as an immigration deterrent on potential victims of trafficking. After Exploitation will continue to ask for data accounting for detention in the years prior to 2018 in order to find or disprove a correlative relationship between the use of detention and voluntary removals. An FOI by After Exploitation, petitioning for the number of voluntary removals made after immigration detention, is pending.

Secondly the number of enforced removals is of concern given the finality of deportation. Currently, no mechanism exists by which to monitor the outcomes of individuals, including victims of trafficking, returned to high-risk countries of origin.

Lastly, we note that 8 individuals were enforcedly removed during the reflection period promised by NRM compliance at the Reasonable Grounds stage. The reprieve from deportation afforded to potential victims of trafficking is the result of the UK's ratification of the Council of Europe Convention on Action Against Trafficking 2009. Investigation is therefore needed to understand what immigrations concerns led to these contraventions, and in order to understand if the UK is adhering to its obligations to victims of trafficking under international and European law.

DATA LIMITATIONS

The data regarding victims and potential victims of trafficking held in detention only refers to individuals detained in Immigration Removal Centres and not those held under the same Immigration Powers in Short-Term Holding Facilities (STHFs) or Her Majesty's Prisons (HMPs). For this reason, the actual number of confirmed and potential victims of human trafficking held under Immigration Powers is likely higher than figures outlined within this briefing.

All data is provided by the Home Office, retrieved from a centralised database called the CID. All data referenced within the report, including detention data, is not assured to the standard of Official Statistics. It is hoped that preliminary findings can form the basis for a serious review of the omission of trafficking victims in Official Statistics on deportation, detention and immigration outcomes which are publicly released on a quarterly basis.

4. Recommendations

Potential victims of trafficking must not be detained

Without exception, people awaiting a trafficking decision via the National Referral Mechanism must be recognised as vulnerable, as must those considered vulnerable enough to reach the 'reasonable grounds' stage at any point.

Interaction with the NRM must trigger automatic release from detention.

Guaranteed support and immigration protection

Case-by-case support for survivors of exploitation, trafficking and slavery beyond 45 days is a positive step, but ***all recognised trafficking victims must be entitled to a statutory minimum of at least 12 months of protection from detention and deportation*** in order to avoid discrepancies in support.

Transparency on victims' outcomes

The current reporting structure around recovery after exploitation is opaque. NRM figures do not reflect what happens to victims after they come into contact with the authorities. ***We ask the government to report immigration (including leave, asylum and humanitarian protection) and support outcomes (including housing, health and interaction with planned 'drop-in' services) for potential and recognised victims.***

Protection after return

Following both voluntary and forced return, individuals are at risk of re-trafficking for the same reasons, or by the same people, responsible for their exploitation in the first place. Despite this danger, no attempts are made to track outcomes amongst survivors who leave the UK. ***Serious and urgent efforts must be made to monitor outcomes after removal.***

Appendix A



Home Office

Serious & Organised Crime Group Tel: 020 7035 4848
2 Marsham Street Fax: 020 7035 4745
London
SW1P 4DF

www.gov.uk/home-office

M Esslemont
request-572226-5ce4edaf@whatdotheyknow.com

31 May 2019

Dear Ms Esslemont

Freedom of Information Request reference: 53533

Thank you for your e-mail of 1st May 2019, in which you asked the following:

Please provide the total number applications and rejections (represented as separate figures) for the following immigration outcomes amongst recognised victims of trafficking since 2016:

- Discretionary leave
- Limited leave to remain
- Humanitarian protection

Your request has been handled as a request for information under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA).

Under section 12 of the Act, the Home Office is not obliged to comply with an information request where to do so would exceed the cost limit.

We have looked at your request and have estimated that the cost of meeting your request would exceed the cost limit of £600 specified in the Freedom of Information and Data Protection (Appropriate Limit and Fees) Regulations 2004. The cost of extracting the data would exceed the cost limit. To provide the data would require work by several teams, collating and matching the data and to assess whether the information meets the request. We are therefore unable to comply with it.

The £600 limit is based on work being carried out at a rate of £25 per hour, which equates to 24 hours of work per request. The cost of locating, retrieving and extracting information can be included in the costs for these purposes. The costs do not include considering whether any information is exempt from disclosure, overheads such as heating or lighting, or items such as photocopying or postage.

If you refine your request, so that it is more likely to fall under the cost limit, we will consider it again. Please note that if you simply break your request down into a series of similar smaller requests, we might still decline to answer it if the total cost exceeds £600.

Appendix B



**UK Visas
& Immigration**

Maya Esslemont
Email: [request-563964-
641ca5fd@whatdotheyknow.com](mailto:request-563964-641ca5fd@whatdotheyknow.com)

Freedom of Information
Central Correspondence Team
Central Operations
PO Box 3468
Sheffield
S3 8WA

Email:
FOIRequests@homeoffice.gsi.gov
.uk

www.gov.uk/ukvi

FOI Reference: 52979

14 May 2019

Dear Ms Esslemont,

Thank you for your enquiry of 24 March in which you requested information on the National Referral Mechanism. Your request has been handled as a request for information under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

Information Requested

Please provide the following information regarding the Home Office's Case Information Database:

- Does the database include information on individuals who have entered the National Referral Mechanism (NRM)?
- Does the database include information on Failed Asylum Seekers who have at some point entered the NRM?

Additionally, please provide the number of FASs with NRM decisions who have been released and removed from detention during 2018.

Response

The Home Office's Case Information Database includes information on individuals, including Failed Asylum Seekers, who have entered the National Referral Mechanism.

Briefing: Supported or deported? Understanding deportation
and detention data on human trafficking and slavery

JULY 2019



The information you have requested in your third question can be found in the Annex attached. These statistics have been taken from a live operational database. As such, numbers may change as information on that system is updated.

If you are dissatisfied with this response you may request an independent internal review of our handling of your request by submitting a complaint within two months to foirequests@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk, quoting reference 52979. If you ask for an internal review, it would be helpful if you could say why you are dissatisfied with the response.

As part of any internal review the Department's handling of your information request will be reassessed by staff not involved in providing you with this response. If you remain dissatisfied after this internal review, you would have a right of complaint to the Information Commissioner as established by section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act.

Yours sincerely

J Rushton
Central Operations

Our records indicate that...

Table 1 - Number of Failed Asylum Seekers (FAS) who received a National Referral Mechanism (NRM) decision and were subsequently released from detention during 2018

Outcome Type	Negative	Positive	Other
Reasonable Grounds	90	65	2
Conclusive Grounds	29	13	2

Notes

- 1 These statistics have been taken from a live operational database. As such, numbers may change as information on that system is updated.
- 2 Data relates to individuals who:
 - a) Have previously made an application for Asylum which was refused.
 - b) Received any NRM decision prior to release from detention during 1 January 2018 and 31 December 2018
 - c) Immigration status on release from detention was 'Failed Asylum Seeker' (i.e. Appeal Rights Exhausted and no extant grant of leave on the Asylum case)
 - d) Are non-EEA Nationals
- 3 Data is broken down by the individual's latest NRM decision before or on the day of their detention release date
- 4 NRM decision date is at any time before their detention release date
- 5 Cases with a Conclusive Grounds outcome of: 'VOT DL Granted', 'VOT No Leave to be Granted' or 'VOT DL Granted (Personal Circumstances)' have been categorised as 'positive'
- 6 Cases with a Reasonable Grounds outcome of: 'PVoT Outcome Accepted' have been categorised as 'positive'
- 7 Detention data extracted 2 April 2019 and Asylum data extracted 9 January 2019
- 8 Other' outcome is where there is no positive or negative decision, such as administrative outcomes. The case may be suspended/void or currently under review

Briefing: Supported or deported? Understanding deportation
and detention data on human trafficking and slavery

JULY 2019



Appendix C

Annex A

Freedom of Information request from M Esslemont - reference 51323

Information requested

How many MS1 forms were received by the Home Office between 1st January - 31st December 2016, and how many were received over the same period in 2017?

Of the above MS1 'notifications' received by the Home Office between 1st January 2016 - 31st December 2017, please provide the following statistical clarification:

Number of MS1 notifications issued by any of the following Government Agencies:

- Gangmasters and Labour Abuse Authority?
- Home Office Immigration Enforcement?
- National Crime Agency?
- UK Border Force?
- UK Visa and Immigration?

How many MS1 notifications were issued by Local Authorities?

How many MS1 notifications were issued by NGO/third sector?

How many MS1 notifications were issued by police?

Disclosed information

Between 1st January 2016 to 31st December 2016, there were 788 MS1 forms received by the Home Office. Between 1st January 2017 to 31st December 2017, there were 1696 MS1 forms received by the Home Office.

Below is the breakdown by organisation.

Organisation	2016	2017
Gangmasters and Labour Abuse Authority	8	59
*Home Office	378	789
National Crime Agency		8
Local Authorities	18	58
NGO	10	27
Police	362	729

* Request was for UKBA entries. UKBA was dissolved prior to the Modern Slavery Act receiving Royal Assent. Figures are provided for the three superseding organisations: Border Force, Immigration Enforcement and UK Visas and Immigration.

Disclaimer

Every effort is made to ensure that the figures presented are accurate and complete. However, it should be noted that human error may be responsible for minor variances in the data. Care is taken to ensure data collection processes and their inevitable limitations are taken into account.

Appendix D



Home Office

Crime, Policing and Fire Group
2 Marsham Street
London
SW1P 4DF

Tel: 020 7035 4848

Fax: 020 7035 4745

www.gov.uk/home-office

Maya Esslemont

request-564945-17ef5810@whatdotheyknow.com

17 April 2019

Dear Ms Esslemont

Freedom of Information Request reference: 53065

Thank you for your e-mail of 28th March 2019, in which you ask for information on Potential Victims of Trafficking' and MS1 forms. Your request has been handled as a request for information under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. Your full request can be found in the attached **Annex A**.

I am able to disclose the following information.

The term 'Potential Victims of Trafficking' (PVoTs) tends to be used solely in relation to National Referral Mechanism (NRM) and refers to those who are referred into the NRM. We do not include MS1 forms in the figures for PVoTs as sometimes the person identified through a MS1 form will not give their nationality or this is unknown by the first responder. In the example provided on press reporting on Vietnam, the figure did not include MS1 forms.

If you are dissatisfied with this response you may request an independent internal review of our handling of your request by submitting a complaint within two months to foirequests@homeoffice.gov.uk, quoting reference **53065**. If you ask for an internal review, it would be helpful if you could say why you are dissatisfied with the response.

As part of any internal review the Department's handling of your information request would be reassessed by staff who were not involved in providing you with this response. If you were to remain dissatisfied after an internal review, you would have a right of complaint to the Information Commissioner as established by section 50 of the FOIA.

Yours sincerely

Modern Slavery Unit

Appendix E



Home Office

Crime, Policing and Fire Group
2 Marsham Street
London
SW1P 4DF

Tel: 020 7035 4848

Fax: 020 7035 4745

www.gov.uk/home-office

Maya Esslemont
mayaesslemont@gmail.com

8 February 2019

Dear Ms Esslemont

Freedom of Information Request reference: 51991

Thank you for your e-mail of 19th January 2019, in which you asked the following:

Please provide the following information on the number of MS1 forms submitted by Detained Asylum Casework or equivalent teams within Immigration Detention Centres in the years 2016, 2017, and 2018. Please present this data as an annual figure in all three instances.

Your request has been handled as a request for information under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA).

Under section 12 of the Act, the Home Office is not obliged to comply with an information request where to do so would exceed the cost limit.

We hold the information which you have requested but we have estimated that the cost of meeting your request would exceed the cost limit of £600 specified in the Freedom of Information and Data Protection (Appropriate Limit and Fees) Regulations 2004. We are therefore unable to comply with it.

In order to provide you with the number of MS1 received from Detained Asylum Casework or equivalent teams, we would have to conduct a case by case search through every MS1 form received. This is due to the way the first responders identify themselves; a first responder may identify themselves as a Home Office employee rather than as part of the DAC team.

The £600 limit is based on work being carried out at a rate of £25 per hour, which equates to 24 hours of work per request. The cost of locating, retrieving and extracting information can be included in the costs for these purposes. The costs do not include considering whether any information is exempt from disclosure, overheads such as heating or lighting, or items such as photocopying or postage.

If you refine your request, so that it is more likely to fall under the cost limit, we will consider it again. However, any request involving a manual search as stated above is likely to exceed the cost limit.

Please note that if you simply break your request down into a series of similar smaller requests, we might still decline to answer it if the total cost exceeds £600.

Even if a revised request were to fall within the cost limit, it is possible that other exemptions in the Act might apply.

The link below may provide you with some useful information on Modern Slavery.

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/749346/2018_UK_Annual_Report_on_Modern_Slavery.pdf

If you are dissatisfied with this response you may request an independent internal review of our handling of your request by submitting a complaint within two months to foirequests@homeoffice.gov.uk, quoting reference **51991**. If you ask for an internal review, it would be helpful if you could say why you are dissatisfied with the response.

As part of any internal review the Department's handling of your information request would be reassessed by staff who were not involved in providing you with this response. If you were to remain dissatisfied after an internal review, you would have a right of complaint to the Information Commissioner as established by section 50 of the FOIA.

Yours sincerely

Modern Slavery Unit

Appendix F



UK Visas
& Immigration

Maya Esslemont
Email: mayaesslemont@gmail.com

Freedom of Information
Central Correspondence Team
Central Operations
PO Box 3468
Sheffield
S3 8WA

Email:
FOIRequests@homeoffice.gov.uk

www.gov.uk/ukvi

FOI Reference: 51813

4 February 2019

Dear Ms Esslemont

Thank you for your enquiry of 7 January in which you requested information on trafficking referrals. Your request is being handled as a request for information under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

Information Requested

Please kindly provide the number of Human Trafficking referrals dealt with by Detained Asylum Casework (or the departmental equivalent) within the below IRCs, between the periods of January 1st - December 31st in 2016, and in the same periods in 2017 and 2018:

- *Brook House Immigration Removal Centre*
- *Campsfield House*
- *Colnbrook Immigration Removal Centre*
- *Dover Immigration Removal Centre*
- *Dungavel*
- *Harmondsworth Immigration Removal Centre*
- *Larne House Immigration Reception Centre*
- *Morton Hall Immigration Removal Centre*
- *Pennine House Immigration Reception Centre*
- *Tinsley House Immigration Removal Centre*
- *HM Prison The Verne*
- *Yarl's Wood Immigration Removal Centre*

Alongside totals, please also provide the number of referrals resulting in Conclusive Grounds decisions being granted and rejected within the stipulated period. Please note that I am aware that CG outcomes may not reflect referrals of any given year, owing to the NRM process potentially spanning across a calendar year. Equally, if 2018 data is subject to change, clarification is appreciated.

Response

Under section 12 of the Act, the Home Office is not obliged to comply with an information request where to do so would exceed the cost limit.

To produce a report or data relating in anyway to the numbers of referrals dealt with in any Immigration Removal Centre. We would have to manual trawl through every individual case record to obtain this data as it is not recorded in reportable field on our case management system.

Therefore we do hold the information which you have requested but we have estimated that the cost of meeting your request would exceed the cost limit of £600 specified in the Freedom of Information and Data Protection (Appropriate Limit and Fees) Regulations 2004. We are therefore unable to comply with it. The £600 limit is based on work being carried out at a rate of £25 per hour, which equates to 24 hours of work per request. The cost of locating, retrieving and extracting information can be included in the costs for these purposes. The costs do not include considering whether any information is exempt from disclosure, overheads such as heating or lighting, or items such as photocopying or postage.

If you refine your request, so that it is more likely to fall under the cost limit, we will consider it again.

Please note that if you simply break your request down into a series of similar smaller requests, we might still decline to answer it if the total cost exceeds £600.

Even if a revised request were to fall within the cost limit, it is possible that other exemptions in the Act might apply.

If you are dissatisfied with this response you may request an independent internal review of our handling of your request by submitting a complaint within two months to foirequests@homeoffice.gov.uk, quoting reference 51813. If you ask for an internal review, it would be helpful if you could say why you are dissatisfied with the response.

As part of any internal review the Department's handling of your information request will be reassessed by staff not involved in providing you with this response. If you remain dissatisfied after this internal review, you would have a right of complaint to the Information Commissioner as established by section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act.

Yours sincerely

C Heap
Central Operations

Appendix G



Immigration
Enforcement

Immigration Enforcement
Secretariat
Sandford House
41 Homer Road
Solihull
B91 3QJ

M Esslemont

[request-572222-
03b9883f@whatdotheyknow.com](mailto:03b9883f@whatdotheyknow.com)

www.gov.uk/home-office

24 June 2019

Dear M Esslemont

Re: Freedom of Information request – 53958

Thank you for your e-mail of 1st May 2019 and subsequent clarification of 3 June 2019 in which you ask for the number of number of voluntary and enforced removals (deportation) of potential victims of trafficking since 2016.

The data you have requested is set out in Annex A below. This is provisional management information that is subject to change and has not been assured to the standard of Official Statistics.

We have additionally reviewed the eight cases subject to enforced return that have been identified as a result of your request and I can confirm that in seven of those cases, data quality issues have resulted in the records being incorrectly flagged as having been returned prior to a conclusive grounds decision being made. In all seven of those instances, conclusive grounds decisions were made prior to return.

In the one remaining cases, the individual concerned left the UK of their own volition prior to the conclusive grounds decision being made and the removal record reflects their attempt to return to the UK via a European transport hub.

If you are dissatisfied with this response you may request an independent internal review of our handling of your request by submitting a complaint within two months to foirequests@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk, quoting reference 53958. If you ask for an internal review, it would be helpful if you could say why you are dissatisfied with the response.

As part of any internal review the Department's handling of your information request would be reassessed by staff who were not involved in providing you with this response. If you were to remain dissatisfied after an internal review, you would have a right of complaint to the Information Commissioner as established by section 50 of the FOIA.

Yours sincerely

Immigration Enforcement Secretariat
ImmigrationEnforcementFOIPQ@HomeOffice.gov.uk



Immigration Enforcement

Annex A

FOI Number 53958

Please provide the number of voluntary and forced removals (deportation) of potential victims of trafficking since 2016. Please present the figures for individuals with positive conclusive and reasonable grounds decisions as two separate figures. My use of the term "confirmed victims of trafficking" refers to those who have received positive conclusive grounds decisions via the NRM. However, as this has already been answered in a previous request, please simply provide the second figure alone (for "potential victims of trafficking" - those who have received positive reasonable grounds decisions).

Our records indicate that...

Table 1 - Number of Voluntary and Enforced Returns of Potential Victims of Trafficking from 01/01/2016 to 31/12/2018

Year of Return	2016	2017	2018
Enforced Returns	3	1	4
Voluntary Returns	18	18	49

Notes

- 1 These statistics have been taken from a live operational database. As such, numbers may change as information on that system is updated.
- 2 Data extracted on 10/5/2019
- 3 The National Referral Mechanism (NRM) is the process by which people who may have been victims of modern slavery are identified, referred, assessed and supported in the United Kingdom. ("Modern slavery" is a term that covers slavery, servitude and forced or compulsory labour and human trafficking.) The initial referral goes through a two stage process: a reasonable grounds stage (where it is considered that the person is a potential victim of trafficking/slavery) and then, for those with a positive reasonable grounds outcome, a conclusive grounds stage (where a definitive decision is made as to whether the person is considered to be a victim of trafficking/slavery).
- 4 The latest case outcome/status before the Return date has been used to assess if an individual was returned as Potential Victim of Trafficking
- 5 Either a positive Reasonable Grounds outcome, an outcome of 'PVoT Suspended Absconder', or cases awaiting a Conclusive Grounds outcome have been considered as Potential Victims of Trafficking (PVoTs)
- 6 Table 1 shows the number of returns in the timeframe requested. A person may have returned multiple times within the period, if so, each return has been included.

Appendix H



Immigration
Enforcement

M Esslemont
[request-571035-
c7aac6bc@whatdotheyknow.com](mailto:request-571035-c7aac6bc@whatdotheyknow.com)

Immigration Enforcement
Secretariat
Sandford House
41 Homer Road
Solihull
B91 3QJ

www.gov.uk/home-office

Thursday 30 May 2019

Dear M Esslemont

Re: Freedom of Information request – 53448

Thank you for your email of 24 April which asks for data in respect of the total number of human trafficking victims subject to voluntary and forced removals (deportation) since 2016. Your request has been handled as a request under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. The full request can be found below:

Please provide the total number of human trafficking victims subject to voluntary and forced removals (deportation) since 2016?

I am able to disclose the information set out in the enclosed Annex A.

If you are dissatisfied with this response you may request an independent internal review of our handling of your request by submitting a complaint within two months to foirequests@homeoffice.gov.uk, quoting reference 53448. If you ask for an internal review, it would be helpful if you could say why you are dissatisfied with the response.

As part of any internal review the Department's handling of your information request would be reassessed by staff who were not involved in providing you with this response. If you were to remain dissatisfied after an internal review, you would have a right of complaint to the Information Commissioner as established by section 50 of the FOIA.

Yours sincerely,

Immigration Enforcement Secretariat
ImmigrationEnforcementFOIPQ@HomeOffice.gov.uk



Immigration Enforcement

Annex A

FOI Number

53448

M Esslemont: Please provide the total number of human trafficking victims subject to voluntary and forced removals (deportation) since 2016.

Our records indicate that...

Table 1 - Number of individuals who had a positive Conclusive Grounds (CG) decision before being a subject of voluntary or enforced removal between 01/01/2016 to 31/12/2018

Number of individuals who had a positive Conclusive Grounds (CG) decision before being a subject of:	
Enforced Return	30
Voluntary Return	25
Total	55

Notes

- 1 **These statistics have been taken from a live operational database. As such, numbers may change as information on that system is updated.**
- 2 Data extracted on 28/04/2019
- 3 Data shown gives the total number of individuals who had a positive CG decision at any time before a voluntary or enforced removal outcome, where the removal outcome was between 01/01/2016 and 31/12/2018
- 4 Where an individual has multiple positive CG outcomes, the earliest outcome date is used
- 5 Cases with an outcome of 'VOT DL Granted', 'VOT No Leave to be Granted' or 'VOT DL Granted (Personal Circumstances)' have been categorised as 'positive'
- 6 Where an individual has multiple removals within the requested period, only one instance has been counted

Appendix J



Immigration
Enforcement

M Esslemont
[request-571035-
c7aac6bc@whatdotheyknow.com](mailto:request-571035-c7aac6bc@whatdotheyknow.com)

Immigration Enforcement
Secretariat
Sandford House
41 Homer Road
Solihull
B91 3QJ

www.gov.uk/home-office

Thursday 30 May 2019

Dear M Esslemont

Re: Freedom of Information request – 53448

Thank you for your email of 24 April which asks for data in respect of the total number of human trafficking victims subject to voluntary and forced removals (deportation) since 2016. Your request has been handled as a request under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. The full request can be found below:

Please provide the total number of human trafficking victims subject to voluntary and forced removals (deportation) since 2016?

I am able to disclose the information set out in the enclosed Annex A.

If you are dissatisfied with this response you may request an independent internal review of our handling of your request by submitting a complaint within two months to foirequests@homeoffice.gov.uk, quoting reference 53448. If you ask for an internal review, it would be helpful if you could say why you are dissatisfied with the response.

As part of any internal review the Department's handling of your information request would be reassessed by staff who were not involved in providing you with this response. If you were to remain dissatisfied after an internal review, you would have a right of complaint to the Information Commissioner as established by section 50 of the FOIA.

Yours sincerely,

Immigration Enforcement Secretariat
ImmigrationEnforcementFOIPQ@HomeOffice.gov.uk

Annex A

FOI Number 53448

M Esslemont: Please provide the total number of human trafficking victims subject to voluntary and forced removals (deportation) since 2016.

Our records indicate that...

Table 1 - Number of individuals who had a positive Conclusive Grounds (CG) decision before being a subject of voluntary or enforced removal between 01/01/2016 to 31/12/2018

Number of individuals who had a positive Conclusive Grounds (CG) decision before being a subject of:	
Enforced Return	30
Voluntary Return	25
Total	55

Notes

- 1 These statistics have been taken from a live operational database. As such, numbers may change as information on that system is updated.
- 2 Data extracted on 26/04/2019
- 3 Data shown gives the total number of individuals who had a positive CG decision at any time before a voluntary or enforced removal outcome, where the removal outcome was between 01/01/2016 and 31/12/2018
- 4 Where an individual has multiple positive CG outcomes, the earliest outcome date is used
- 5 Cases with an outcome of 'VOT DL Granted', 'VOT No Leave to be Granted' or 'VOT DL Granted (Personal Circumstances)' have been categorised as 'positive'
- 6 Where an individual has multiple removals within the requested period, only one instance has been counted

Appendix K



Immigration Enforcement
Secretariat
Sandford House
41 Homer Road
Solihull
B91 3QJ

M Esslemont

[request-572222-
03b9883f@whatdotheyknow.com](mailto:03b9883f@whatdotheyknow.com)

www.gov.uk/home-office

24 June 2019

Dear M Esslemont

Re: Freedom of Information request – 53958

Thank you for your e-mail of 1st May 2019 and subsequent clarification of 3 June 2019 in which you ask for the number of number of voluntary and enforced removals (deportation) of potential victims of trafficking since 2016.

The data you have requested is set out in Annex A below. This is provisional management information that is subject to change and has not been assured to the standard of Official Statistics.

We have additionally reviewed the eight cases subject to enforced return that have been identified as a result of your request and I can confirm that in seven of those cases, data quality issues have resulted in the records being incorrectly flagged as having been returned prior to a conclusive grounds decision being made. In all seven of those instances, conclusive grounds decisions were made prior to return.

In the one remaining cases, the individual concerned left the UK of their own volition prior to the conclusive grounds decision being made and the removal record reflects their attempt to return to the UK via a European transport hub.

If you are dissatisfied with this response you may request an independent internal review of our handling of your request by submitting a complaint within two months to foirequests@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk, quoting reference 53958. If you ask for an internal review, it would be helpful if you could say why you are dissatisfied with the response.

As part of any internal review the Department's handling of your information request would be reassessed by staff who were not involved in providing you with this response. If you were to remain dissatisfied after an internal review, you would have a right of complaint to the Information Commissioner as established by section 50 of the FOIA.

Yours sincerely

Immigration Enforcement Secretariat
ImmigrationEnforcementFOIPQ@HomeOffice.gov.uk



Annex A

FOI Number 53958

Please provide the number of voluntary and forced removals (deportation) of potential victims of trafficking since 2016. Please present the figures for individuals with positive conclusive and reasonable grounds decisions as two separate figures. My use of the term "confirmed victims of trafficking" refers to those who have received positive conclusive grounds decisions via the NRM. However, as this has already been answered in a previous request, please simply provide the second figure alone for "potential victims of trafficking" - those who have received positive reasonable grounds decisions).

Our records indicate that...

Table 1 - Number of Voluntary and Enforced Returns of Potential Victims of Trafficking from 01/01/2016 to 31/12/2018

Year of Return	2016	2017	2018
Enforced Returns	3	1	4
Voluntary Returns	18	18	43

Notes

- 1 These statistics have been taken from a live operational database. As such, numbers may change as information on that system is updated.
- 2 Data extracted on 10/5/2019
- 3 The National Referral Mechanism (NRM) is the process by which people who may have been victims of modern slavery are identified, referred, assessed and supported in the United Kingdom. ("Modern slavery" is a term that covers slavery, servitude and forced or compulsory labour and human trafficking.) The initial referral goes through a two stage process: a reasonable grounds stage (where it is considered that the person is a potential victim of trafficking/slavery) and then, for those with a positive reasonable grounds outcome, a conclusive grounds stage (where a definitive decision is made as to whether the person is considered to be a victim of trafficking/slavery).
- 4 The latest case outcome/status before the Return date has been used to assess if an individual was returned as Potential Victim of Trafficking (PVoTs)
- 5 Either a positive Reasonable Grounds outcome, an outcome of "PVoT Suspended Absconder", or cases awaiting a Conclusive Grounds outcome have been considered as Potential Victims of Trafficking (PVoTs)
- 6 Table 1 shows the number of returns in the timeframe requested. A person may have returned multiple times within the period, if so, each return has been included.