



Isle of Man
Government

Reiltys Ellan Vannin



DEPARTMENT OF HOME AFFAIRS

Consultation, in principle, on the introduction of
greater identification verification measures at
harbours

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO THE CONSULTATION

January 2017

Department of Home Affairs

Consultation, in principle, on the introduction of greater identification verification measures at harbours
Summary of responses

1. Publishing the Consultation

- 1.1. The Department published the document, Consultation, in principle, on the introduction of greater identification verification measures at harbours, for consultation between 23rd December 2015, and Friday 12th February, 2016.
- 1.2. The consultation document, in line with the Isle of Man Government's Code of Practice on Consultation, was sent directly to various persons or organisations, including the following—
 - Tynwald Members;
 - Acting Attorney General;
 - Local Authorities;
 - Chief Officers;
 - Isle of Man Law Society;
 - Liberal Vannin;
 - Mec Vannin;
 - Positive Action Group;
 - Chief Constable;
 - Chamber of Commerce;
 - Isle of Man Employers Federation;
 - Isle of Man Law Society;
 - Isle of Man Constabulary;
 - Isle of Man Police Federation;
 - The Police Advisory Group;
 - The Police Consultative Forum;
 - Victim Support;
 - Isle of Man Trades Council; and
 - the Social Affairs Policy Review Committee of Tynwald.
- 1.3. A press release was issued and details of the consultation were widely publicised in the media. This document was also published on the Isle of Man Government's consultation website.

2. Submission of responses to the consultation

- 2.1. The Department received 2 phone calls, 23 letters and 92 emails as submissions with regard to the consultation, of which -
- 94 were from individuals;
 - 8 were from Local Authorities;
 - 4 were from Government Departments, Boards or Offices;
 - 4 were from organisations;
 - 3 were from members of Tynwald;
 - 3 were from local businesses; and
 - 1 was from a Trade Union.
- 2.2. The Department also received 973 responses to an online Survey Monkey questionnaire, along with a range of comments on the feasibility, or otherwise, of the proposals set out in the consultation.

3. Summary of responses to the Consultation questions

Question 1:

In paragraph 2 the consultation paper highlights that people may be travelling to the Island under a false name in order to evade detection for criminal offences. Do you agree this is of sufficient concern to justify the introduction of a measure, or measures, to verify the identity of persons travelling?

- 3.1. Results from the online survey revealed –
- 57.9% (563) of the respondents said YES;
 - 38.4% (374) of the respondents said NO; and
 - 3.7% (36) of the respondents selected the OTHER option.
- 3.2. Many written submissions to the consultation did not answer this question directly, but the views expressed by these submissions were in similar proportion to those identified by the survey results.
- 3.3. The persons who supported the principle of the verification of ID checks typically did so on the grounds that increased border security was needed to prevent the reoccurrence of criminal events, such as the 2015 burglaries. Broader concerns were also expressed about prevention of terrorism; detecting the movement of sex offenders; detecting the movement of illegal workers (e.g. cold callers); and ensuring persons who are banned from the Island do not return.
- 3.4. The persons who were not in favour of having new measures were typically of the view that the proposed measures would be disproportionate in comparison to the potential harm caused at present.

Department of Home Affairs

Consultation, in principle, on the introduction of greater identification verification measures at harbours
Summary of responses

- 3.5. There were also strong concerns that the introduction of these measures would be too costly and would result in long delays in processing passengers that could deter visitors and result in a reduction of ships visiting the Island due to the increased turnaround time.
- 3.6. A large number of concerns were expressed about the broad range of identity documents that could be used and the potential ease these could be forged.
- 3.7. Finally, concerns were also submitted as the feasibility of these measures within the Common Travel Area on the grounds of legality and likelihood of co-operation (or retaliation) from neighbouring jurisdictions.

Question 2:

In Section 3 the consultation paper gives a brief outline as to the possible measures that may be introduced. Do you agree these proposed measures are suitable and, if not, what would be your preferred alternative?

- 3.8. Results from the online survey indicated –
 - 55.3% (538) of the respondents said YES;
 - 40.8% (397) of the respondents said NO; and
 - 3.9% (38) of the respondents skipped the question;
- 3.9. Many written submissions to the consultation did not answer this question directly, but the views expressed by these submissions were in similar proportion to those identified by the survey results.
- 3.10. Of those in favour of these possible measures some concerns were raised with regard to how they would be implemented with regard to vehicle passengers, particularly those who are in coaches or are disabled. Many persons who supported the measures were also concerned that the costs should not be too high, or borne by either the passengers or the Isle of Man Steam Packet Company (IoMSPC).
- 3.11. Of those against the proposed measures, in addition to the concerns raised in responding to question 1, specific concerns were raised about the practicality of segregating checked and unchecked passengers, particularly in Liverpool. Some persons also raised specific concerns as to how these measures could apply to cruise ships and non-IoMSPC vessels.
- 3.12. A small number of respondents also expressed concern about the feasibility of applying these measures to small private vessels (e.g. yachts) given difficulties with planning voyages and suggested notification procedures.
- 3.13. A number of persons were supportive of introducing requirements for identity documents to be carried and be made available for spot checks by the Police on request.

Question 3:

In Section 7, given the issues raised in this consultation paper, do you believe the introduction of these measures would either have or not have a significant negative impact on passenger numbers?

- 3.14. Results from the online survey indicated –
- 35.0% (341) of the respondents said YES;
 - 55.1% (536) of the respondents said NO;
 - 5.8% (56) of the respondents selected OTHER; and
 - 4.1% (40) of the respondents skipped the question.
- 3.15. Many written submissions to the consultation did not answer this question directly, but the views expressed by these submissions were in similar proportion to those identified by the survey results.
- 3.16. The persons who responded YES, in addition to the concerns already noted, expressed concerns that the measures would discourage casual travellers and those who lacked any of the suggested identity documents, particularly when travel elsewhere in the UK did not require identity documents. It was highlighted many businesses operate under a small margin and any reduction in passenger numbers would have severe consequences.
- 3.17. Those who responded NO, felt that these measures should have already been introduced.

Question 4:

In Section 8 the consultation paper states that the introduction of these measures is not likely to have a significant negative impact on the Island's businesses. Do you agree with this view, and if not, why?

- 3.18. Results from the online survey indicated –
- 56.7% (551) of the respondents said YES;
 - 37.2% (362) of the respondents said NO;
 - 6.2% (60) of the respondents skipped the question.
- 3.19. Many written submissions to the consultation did not answer this question directly, but the views expressed by these submissions were in similar proportion to those identified by the survey results.
- 3.20. Those who agreed with this view typically suggested these measures would not have a significant negative impact upon the Island's businesses. Consequently, as long as the measures were effectively implemented, there would be no reason for significant adverse effects on businesses.
- 3.21. Of those disagreeing with this view, two of the respondents suggested that, due to the potential delays caused by these measures, losses of between £5 million and £10 million (as a minimum) would be incurred as a consequence of reduced passenger numbers due

Department of Home Affairs

Consultation, in principle, on the introduction of greater identification verification measures at harbours

Summary of responses

to reduced sailings and increased freight costs, which would then have a broader knock-on impact to the economy, particularly in busy periods.

- 3.22. Many of the other respondents expressed similar concerns to those in paragraph 3.21, albeit without quoting costs. Respondents also expressed the view there would be longer check-in times as a result of these measures, which would then further discourage travel to the Island. One respondent observed these measures were unlikely to increase passenger numbers and could only reduce passenger numbers.

Question 5

What additional measures, if any, do you believe should be introduced to protect the Island and its residents from the dangers outlined in this consultation document?

- 3.23. Approximately 60% of the survey responses and written submissions expressed a view on this question.
- 3.24. Many of the views expressed focussed on intelligence led operations; the use of CCTV; the use of Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR); using passenger booking details; and accessing UK databases based upon the gathered information.
- 3.25. A re-occurring suggestion was that more police should be deployed around the Island's ports, specifically increasing the number of sniffer dogs present, in order to better combat the smuggling of illegal drugs and other goods.

Question 6:

Has this consultation document changed your mind, if so, how?

- 3.26. Roughly 4% of the survey responses and written submissions indicated that this consultation has caused them to change their views on this issue. Typically those who responded observed that they supported the measures in principle, but that on further consideration they could not support these proposals upon reflection.

4. Conclusion:

- 4.1. In issuing the document for public consultation the Department anticipated it would receive a wide variety of strong views on the principle of the proposed measures, as well as concerns as to issues of practicality that would require resolution if these measures were to be implemented. The Department is pleased with the number, breadth and quality of the submissions and responses to the consultation and associated online survey.
- 4.2. Of those in support of the proposed measures, many respondents cited the increasing insecurity and threat levels that the world at large is facing.
- 4.3. In opposition to the proposed measures, respondents gave varied responses. These included concerns over legal issues; the relative ease of obtaining false identity documents for criminals and the difficulty producing suitable identity documents for the

Department of Home Affairs

Consultation, in principle, on the introduction of greater identification verification measures at harbours

Summary of responses

public; the potential impact upon the Island's business economy, and businesses more generally; the potential increase in ferry fares and check-in/waiting times; and opposition to the perceived curbing of the civil liberty of freedom of movement.

5. Outcome of the consultation

- 5.1. The Department carefully considered the responses to the matters referred to in the consultation document and is grateful to all those persons who have taken the time to consider the matter and either submit their views or take part in the survey.
- 5.2. The Department has taken into account that in the answer to all the questions posed there was a majority in favour of the introduction of ID checks and that this was balanced with concerns of respondents, over the proportionality of these measures; the cost, the perceived difficulty of their introduction; and the potential impact on the Island's economy.
- 5.3. In this connection the Department has determined that further consideration needs to be given, with its partner agencies and with businesses involved in the transport of passenger to and from the Island, as to whether or not ID checks should be introduced and an examination of whether there are alternative actions that could be taken to protect the Island.

In addition the Department will continue to monitor developments locally and further afield that may need to be considered as part of its additional consideration of this important matter.

January 2017

Department of Home Affairs



**Isle of Man
Government**

Reiljys Ellan Vannin



Copies of this document can be supplied
in a large print format on request

Department of Home Affairs
Headquarters Building, Tromode Road, Douglas, IM2 5PA
Tel.: 694300 Email: dhaconsultation@gov.im
www.gov.im/dha/consultations.gov