

Annex A

Draft expanded explanations for factors in offence specific guidelines

STEP TWO

Band Ranges

	Starting point	Range
Fine Band A	50% of relevant weekly income	25 – 75% of relevant weekly income
Fine Band B	100% of relevant weekly income	75 – 125% of relevant weekly income
Fine Band C	150% of relevant weekly income	125 – 175% of relevant weekly income
Fine Band D	250% of relevant weekly income	200 – 300% of relevant weekly income
Fine Band E	400% of relevant weekly income	300 – 500% of relevant weekly income
Fine Band F	600% of relevant weekly income	500 – 700% of relevant weekly income

- The court should determine the appropriate level of fine in accordance with this guideline and section 164 of the Criminal Justice Act 2003, which requires that the fine must reflect the seriousness of the offence and that the court must take into account the financial circumstances of the offender.

Question 2

- Where possible, if a financial penalty is imposed, it should remove any economic benefit the offender has derived through the commission of the offence including:
 - avoided costs;
 - operating savings;
 - any gain made as a direct result of the offence.
- The fine should meet, in a fair and proportionate way, the objectives of punishment, deterrence and the removal of gain derived through the commission of the offence; **it should not be cheaper to offend than to comply with the law.**
- In considering economic benefit, the court should avoid double recovery.

Question 2

2 Consultation on Expanded Explanations - Annex A

- Where the means of the offender are limited, priority should be given to compensation (where applicable) over payment of any other financial penalty (see further step eight below).
- Where it is not possible to calculate or estimate the economic benefit, the court may wish to draw on information from the enforcing authorities about the general costs of operating within the law.
- When sentencing **organisations** the fine must be sufficiently substantial to have a real economic impact which will bring home to both management and shareholders the need to comply with the law. Whether the fine will have the effect of putting the offender out of business will be a relevant consideration; in some bad cases this may be an acceptable consequence.

Question 2

- Obtaining financial information: It is for the offender to disclose to the court such data relevant to their financial position as will enable it to assess what they can reasonably afford to pay. If necessary, the court may compel the disclosure of an individual offender's financial circumstances pursuant to section 162 of the Criminal Justice Act 2003. In the absence of such disclosure, or where the court is not satisfied that it has been given sufficient reliable information, the court will be entitled to draw reasonable inferences as to the offender's means from evidence it has heard and from all the circumstances of the case. In setting a fine, the court may conclude that the offender is able to pay any fine imposed unless the offender has supplied financial information to the contrary.

Community orders table

For further information see the [Imposition of Community and Custodial Sentences guideline](#)

- The seriousness of the offence should be the **initial** factor in determining which requirements to include in a community order. Offence specific guidelines refer to three sentencing levels within the community order band based on offence seriousness (low, medium and high). The culpability and harm present in the offence(s) should be considered to identify which of the three sentencing levels within the community order band is appropriate. See below for **non-exhaustive** examples of requirements that might be appropriate in each.
- At least one requirement **MUST** be imposed for the purpose of punishment and/or a fine imposed in addition to the community order unless there are exceptional circumstances which relate to the offence or the offender that would make it unjust in all the circumstances to do so.
- A suspended sentence **MUST NOT** be imposed as a more severe form of community order. A suspended sentence is a custodial sentence.
- Community orders can fulfil all of the purposes of sentencing. In particular, they can have the effect of restricting the offender's liberty while providing punishment in the community, rehabilitation for the offender, and/or ensuring that the offender engages in reparative activities.

- A community order must not be imposed unless the offence is 'serious enough to warrant such a sentence'. Where an offender is being sentenced for a non-imprisonable offence, there is no power to make a community order.
- Sentencers must consider all available disposals at the time of sentence; even where the threshold for a community sentence has been passed, a fine or discharge may be an appropriate penalty. In particular, a Band D fine may be an appropriate alternative to a community order.
- The court must ensure that the restriction on the offender's liberty is commensurate with the seriousness of the offence and that the requirements imposed are the most suitable for the offender.
- Sentences should not necessarily escalate from one community order range to the next on each sentencing occasion. The decision as to the appropriate range of community order should be based upon the seriousness of the new offence(s) (which will take into account any previous convictions).
- In many cases, a pre-sentence report will be pivotal in helping the court decide whether to impose a community order and, if so, whether particular requirements or combinations of requirements are suitable for an individual offender. Whenever the court reaches the provisional view that a community order may be appropriate, it should request a pre-sentence report (whether written or verbal) unless the court is of the opinion that a report is unnecessary in all the circumstances of the case.
- For further guidance on when a PSR may be unnecessary see [Criminal Practice Direction]

Question 3

- It may be helpful to indicate to the National Probation Service the court's preliminary opinion as to which of the three sentencing ranges is relevant and the purpose(s) of sentencing that the package of requirements is expected to fulfil. Ideally a pre-sentence report should be completed on the same day to avoid adjourning the case. If an adjournment cannot be avoided, the information should be provided to the National Probation Service in written form and a copy retained on the court file for the benefit of the sentencing court. However, the court must make clear to the offender that all sentencing options remain open including, in appropriate cases, committal for sentence to the Crown Court.
- ~~For further guidance on when a PSR may be unnecessary see [Criminal Practice Direction]~~

Low	Medium	High
<p>Offences only just cross community order threshold, where the seriousness of the offence or the nature of the offender's record means that a discharge or fine is inappropriate</p> <p>In general, only one requirement will be</p>	<p>Offences that obviously fall within the community order band</p>	<p>Offences only just fall below the custody threshold or the custody threshold is crossed but a community order is more appropriate in the circumstances</p>

appropriate and the length may be curtailed if additional requirements are necessary

- Suitable requirements might include:
- Any appropriate rehabilitative requirement(s)
- 40 – 80 hours of unpaid work
- Curfew requirement for example up to 16 hours per day for a few weeks
- Exclusion requirement, for a few months
- Prohibited activity requirement
- Attendance centre requirement (where available)

- Suitable requirements might include:
- Any appropriate rehabilitative requirement(s)
- 80 – 150 hours of unpaid work
- Curfew requirement for example up to 16 hours for 2 – 3 months
- Exclusion requirement lasting in the region of 6 months
- Prohibited activity requirement

More intensive sentences which combine two or more requirements may be appropriate

- Suitable requirements might include:
- Any appropriate rehabilitative requirement(s)
- 150 – 300 hours of unpaid work
- Curfew requirement for example up to 16 hours per day for 4 – 12 months
- Exclusion requirement lasting in the region of 12 months

If order does not contain a punitive requirement, suggested fine levels are indicated below:

BAND A FINE

BAND B FINE

BAND C FINE

Custodial sentences

Sentencing flowcharts are available at [Imposition of Community and Custodial Sentences guideline](#)

The approach to the imposition of a custodial sentence should be as follows:

1) Has the custody threshold been passed?

- A custodial sentence must not be imposed unless the offence or the combination of the offence and one or more offences associated with it was so serious that neither a fine alone nor a community sentence can be justified for the offence.
- There is no general definition of where the custody threshold lies. The circumstances of the individual offence and the factors assessed by offence-specific guidelines will determine whether an offence is so serious that neither a fine alone nor a community sentence can be justified. Where no offence specific guideline is available to determine seriousness, the harm caused by the offence, the culpability of the offender and any previous convictions will be relevant to the assessment.

- The clear intention of the threshold test is to reserve prison as a punishment for the most serious offences.

2) Is it unavoidable that a sentence of imprisonment be imposed?

- Passing the custody threshold does not mean that a custodial sentence should be deemed inevitable. Custody should not be imposed where a community order could provide sufficient restriction on an offender’s liberty (by way of punishment) while addressing the rehabilitation of the offender to prevent future crime.
- For offenders on the cusp of custody, imprisonment should not be imposed where there would be an impact on dependants which would make a custodial sentence disproportionate to achieving the aims of sentencing.

3) What is the shortest term commensurate with the seriousness of the offence?

- In considering this the court must NOT consider any licence or post sentence supervision requirements which may subsequently be imposed upon the offender’s release.

4) Can the sentence be suspended?

- A suspended sentence **MUST NOT** be imposed as a more severe form of community order. A suspended sentence is a custodial sentence. **Sentencers should be clear that they would impose an immediate custodial sentence if the power to suspend were not available.** If not, a non-custodial sentence should be imposed.
- The following factors should be weighed in considering whether it is possible to suspend the sentence:

Factors indicating that it would not be appropriate to suspend a custodial sentence

- Offender presents a risk/danger to the public
- Appropriate punishment can only be achieved by immediate custody
- History of poor compliance with court orders

Factors indicating that it may be appropriate to suspend a custodial sentence

- Realistic prospect of rehabilitation
- Strong personal mitigation
- Immediate custody will result in significant harmful impact upon others

The imposition of a custodial sentence is both punishment and a deterrent. To ensure that the overall terms of the suspended sentence are commensurate with offence seriousness, care must be taken to ensure requirements imposed are not excessive. A court wishing to impose onerous or intensive requirements should reconsider whether a community sentence might be more appropriate.

Pre-sentence report

Whenever the court reaches the provisional view that:

- the custody threshold has been passed; and, if so

- the length of imprisonment which represents the shortest term commensurate with the seriousness of the offence;

the court should obtain a pre-sentence report, whether verbal or written, **unless** the court considers a report to be unnecessary. Ideally a pre-sentence report should be completed on the same day to avoid adjourning the case.

For further guidance on when a PSR may be unnecessary see [Criminal Practice Direction]

Question 3

Magistrates: Consult your legal adviser before deciding to sentence to custody without a pre-sentence report.

Suspended Sentences: General Guidance

- i) The guidance regarding pre-sentence reports applies if suspending custody.
- ii) If the court imposes a term of imprisonment of between 14 days and 2 years (subject to magistrates' courts sentencing powers), it may suspend the sentence for between 6 months and 2 years (the 'operational period'). The time for which a sentence is suspended should reflect the length of the sentence; up to 12 months might normally be appropriate for a suspended sentence of up to 6 months.
- iii) Where the court imposes two or more sentences to be served consecutively, the court may suspend the sentence where the aggregate of the terms is between 14 days and 2 years (subject to magistrates' courts sentencing powers).
- iv) When the court suspends a sentence, it may impose one or more requirements for the offender to undertake in the community. The requirements are identical to those available for community orders, see the guideline on [Imposition of Community and Custodial Sentences](#).
- v) A custodial sentence that is suspended should be for the same term that would have applied if the sentence was to be served immediately.

For sentencing flowcharts see the guideline on [Imposition of Community and Custodial Sentences](#).

Statutory aggravating factors

SA1. Previous convictions, having regard to a) the **nature** of the offence to which the conviction relates and its **relevance** to the current offence; and b) the **time** that has elapsed since the conviction

Care should be taken to avoid double counting factors including those already taken into account in assessing culpability or harm or those inherent in the offence

Guidance on the Use of Previous Convictions

The following guidance should be considered when seeking to determine the degree to which previous convictions should aggravate sentence:

Section 143 of the Criminal Justice Act states that:

In considering the seriousness of an offence (“the current offence”) committed by an offender who has one or more previous convictions, the court must treat each previous conviction as an aggravating factor if (in the case of that conviction) the court considers that it can reasonably be so treated having regard, in particular, to—

(a) the nature of the offence to which the conviction relates and its relevance to the current offence, and

(b) the time that has elapsed since the conviction.

1. Previous convictions are considered at step two in the Council’s offence specific guidelines.
2. The primary significance of previous convictions (including convictions in other jurisdictions) is the extent to which they indicate trends in offending behaviour and possibly the offender’s response to earlier sentences;
3. Previous convictions are normally **relevant** to the current offence when they are of a similar type;
4. Previous convictions of a type different from the current offence **may** be relevant where they are an indication of persistent offending or escalation and/or a failure to comply with previous court orders;
5. Numerous and frequent previous convictions might indicate an underlying problem (for example, an addiction) that could be addressed more effectively in the community and will not necessarily indicate that a custodial sentence is necessary;
6. If the offender received a non-custodial disposal for the previous offence, a court should not necessarily move to a custodial sentence for the fresh offence;
7. In cases involving significant persistent offending, the community and custody thresholds may be crossed even though the current offence normally warrants a lesser sentence. If a custodial sentence is it should be proportionate and kept to the necessary minimum.
8. The aggravating effect of relevant previous convictions reduces with the passage of time; **older convictions are less relevant** to the offender’s culpability for the current offence and less likely to be predictive of future offending.
9. Where the previous offence is particularly old it will normally have little relevance for the current sentencing exercise;
10. The court should consider the time gap since the previous conviction and the reason for it. Where there has been a significant gap between previous and current convictions or a reduction in the frequency of offending this may indicate that the offender has made attempts to desist from offending in which case the aggravating effect of the previous offending will diminish.
11. Where the current offence is significantly less serious than the previous conviction (suggesting a decline in the gravity of offending), the previous conviction may carry less weight.
12. When considering the totality of previous offending a court should take a rounded view of the previous crimes and not simply aggregate the individual offences.
13. Where information is available on the context of previous offending this may assist the court in assessing the relevance of that prior offending to the current offence.

SA2. Offence committed whilst on bail

Care should be taken to avoid double counting factors including those already taken into account in assessing culpability or harm or those inherent in the offence

S143 (3) Criminal Justice Act 2003 states:

In considering the seriousness of any offence committed while the offender was on bail, the court must treat the fact that it was committed in those circumstances as an aggravating factor.

SA3. Offence motivated by, or demonstrating hostility based on any of the following characteristics or presumed characteristics of the victim: religion, race, disability, sexual orientation or transgender identity.

Care should be taken to avoid double counting factors including those already taken into account in assessing culpability or harm or those inherent in the offence

See below for the statutory provisions.

- **Note the requirement for the court to state that the offence has been aggravated by the relevant hostility.**
- **Where the element of hostility is core to the offending, the aggravation will be higher than where it plays a lesser role.**

Increase in sentences for racial or religious aggravation

s145(2) of the Criminal Justice Act 2003 states:

If the offence was racially or religiously aggravated, the court—

- (a) must treat that fact as an aggravating factor, and*
- (b) must state in open court that the offence was so aggravated.*

An offence is racially or religiously aggravated for these purposes if—

- at the time of committing the offence, or immediately before or after doing so, the offender demonstrates towards the victim of the offence, hostility based on the victim's membership (or presumed membership) of a racial or religious group; **or**
- the offence is motivated (wholly or partly) by hostility towards members of a racial or religious group based on their membership of that group.

“membership”, in relation to a racial or religious group, includes association with members of that group;

“presumed” means presumed by the offender.

It is immaterial whether or not the offender's hostility is also based, to any extent, on any other factor not mentioned above.

“racial group” means a group of persons defined by reference to race, colour, nationality (including citizenship) or ethnic or national origins.

“*religious group*” means a group of persons defined by reference to religious belief or lack of religious belief.

Increase in sentences for aggravation related to disability, sexual orientation or transgender identity

s146 of the Criminal Justice Act 2003 states:

(1) This section applies where the court is considering the seriousness of an offence committed in any of the circumstances mentioned in subsection (2).

(2) Those circumstances are—

(a) that, at the time of committing the offence, or immediately before or after doing so, the offender demonstrated towards the victim of the offence hostility based on—

- (i) the sexual orientation (or presumed sexual orientation) of the victim,
- (ii) a disability (or presumed disability) of the victim, or
- (iii) the victim being (or being presumed to be) transgender, or

(b) that the offence is motivated (wholly or partly)—

- (i) by hostility towards persons who are of a particular sexual orientation,
- (ii) by hostility towards persons who have a disability or a particular disability or
- (iii) by hostility towards persons who are transgender.

(3) The court—

(a) must treat the fact that the offence was committed in any of those circumstances as an aggravating factor, and

(b) must state in open court that the offence was committed in such circumstances.

(4) It is immaterial for the purposes of paragraph (a) or (b) of subsection (2) whether or not the offender's hostility is also based, to any extent, on any other factor not mentioned in that paragraph.

(5) In this section “disability” means any physical or mental impairment.

(6) In this section references to being transgender include references to being transsexual, or undergoing, proposing to undergo or having undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment.

SA4. Offence was committed against an emergency worker acting in the exercise of functions as such a worker.

Care should be taken to avoid double counting factors including those already taken into account in assessing culpability or harm or those inherent in the offence

See below for the statutory provisions.

- **Note the requirement for the court to state that the offence has been so aggravated.**

- **Note this statutory factor only applies to certain violent or sexual offences as listed below which were committed on or after 13 November 2018.**
- **For other offences the factor ‘Victim was providing a public service or performing a public duty at the time of the offence’ can be applied where relevant.**

The Assaults on Emergency Worker (Offences) Act 2018 states:

2 Aggravating factor

(1) This section applies where—

- (a) the court is considering for the purposes of sentencing the seriousness of an offence listed in subsection (3), and
- (b) the offence was committed against an emergency worker acting in the exercise of functions as such a worker.

(2) The court—

- (a) must treat the fact mentioned in subsection (1)(b) as an aggravating factor (that is to say, a factor that increases the seriousness of the offence), and
- (b) must state in open court that the offence is so aggravated.

(3) The offences referred to in subsection (1)(a) are—

- (a) an offence under any of the following provisions of the Offences against the Person Act 1861—
 - (i) section 16 (threats to kill);
 - (ii) section 18 (wounding with intent to cause grievous bodily harm);
 - (iii) section 20 (malicious wounding);
 - (iv) section 23 (administering poison etc);
 - (v) section 28 (causing bodily injury by gunpowder etc);
 - (vi) section 29 (using explosive substances etc with intent to cause grievous bodily harm);
 - (vii) section 47 (assault occasioning actual bodily harm);
- (b) an offence under section 3 of the Sexual Offences Act 2003 (sexual assault);
- (c) manslaughter;
- (d) kidnapping;
- (e) an ancillary offence in relation to any of the preceding offences.

(4) For the purposes of subsection (1)(b), the circumstances in which an offence is to be taken as committed against a person acting in the exercise of functions as an emergency worker include circumstances where the offence takes place at a time when the person is not at work but is carrying out functions which, if done in work time, would have been in the exercise of functions as an emergency worker.

(5) In this section—

- “ancillary offence”, in relation to an offence, means any of the following—
 - (a) aiding, abetting, counselling or procuring the commission of the offence;
 - (b) an offence under Part 2 of the Serious Crime Act 2007 (encouraging or assisting crime) in relation to the offence;
 - (c) attempting or conspiring to commit the offence;
- “emergency worker” has the meaning given by section 3.

(6) Nothing in this section prevents a court from treating the fact mentioned in subsection (1)(b) as an aggravating factor in relation to offences not listed in subsection (3).

(7) This section applies only in relation to offences committed on or after the day it comes into force.

3 Meaning of “emergency worker”

(1) In sections 1 and 2, “emergency worker” means—

- (a) a constable;
- (b) a person (other than a constable) who has the powers of a constable or is otherwise employed for police purposes or is engaged to provide services for police purposes;
- (c) a National Crime Agency officer;
- (d) a prison officer;
- (e) a person (other than a prison officer) employed or engaged to carry out functions in a custodial institution of a corresponding kind to those carried out by a prison officer;
- (f) a prisoner custody officer, so far as relating to the exercise of escort functions;
- (g) a custody officer, so far as relating to the exercise of escort functions;
- (h) a person employed for the purposes of providing, or engaged to provide, fire services or fire and rescue services;
- (i) a person employed for the purposes of providing, or engaged to provide, search services or rescue services (or both);
- (j) a person employed for the purposes of providing, or engaged to provide—
 - (i) NHS health services, or
 - (ii) services in the support of the provision of NHS health services, and whose general activities in doing so involve face to face interaction with individuals receiving the services or with other members of the public.

(2) It is immaterial for the purposes of subsection (1) whether the employment or engagement is paid or unpaid.

(3) In this section—

“custodial institution” means any of the following—

- (a) a prison;
- (b) a young offender institution, secure training centre, secure college or remand centre;
- (c) a removal centre, a short-term holding facility or pre-departure accommodation, as defined by section 147 of the Immigration and Asylum Act 1999;
- (d) services custody premises, as defined by section 300(7) of the Armed Forces Act 2006;

“custody officer” has the meaning given by section 12(3) of the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994;

“escort functions”—

- (a) in the case of a prisoner custody officer, means the functions specified in section 80(1) of the Criminal Justice Act 1991;
- (b) in the case of a custody officer, means the functions specified in paragraph 1 of Schedule 1 to the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994;

“NHS health services” means any kind of health services provided as part of the health service continued under section 1(1) of the National Health Service Act 2006 and under section 1(1) of the National Health Service (Wales) Act 2006;

“prisoner custody officer” has the meaning given by section 89(1) of the Criminal Justice Act 1991.

Other aggravating factors:

A1. Commission of offence whilst under the influence of alcohol or drugs

Care should be taken to avoid double counting factors including those already taken into account in assessing culpability or harm or those inherent in the offence

- The fact that an offender is **voluntarily** intoxicated at the time of the offence will tend to increase the seriousness of the offence provided that the intoxication has **contributed to the offending**.
- This applies regardless of whether the offender is under the influence of legal or illegal substance(s).
- In the case of a person addicted to drugs or alcohol the intoxication may be considered not to be voluntary, but the court should have regard to the extent to which the offender has engaged with any assistance they have been given in dealing with the addiction in making that assessment.
- An offender who has voluntarily consumed drugs and/or alcohol must accept the consequences of the behaviour that results, even if it is out of character.

Question 5

A2. Offence was committed as part of a group

Care should be taken to avoid double counting factors including those already taken into account in assessing culpability or harm or those inherent in the offence

The mere membership of a group (two or more persons) should not be used to increase the sentence, but where the **offence was committed as part** of a group this will normally make it more serious because:

- the **harm** caused (both physical or psychological) or the potential for harm may be greater and/or
- the **culpability** of the offender may be higher (the role of the offender within the group will be a relevant consideration).

Culpability based on role in group offending could range from:

Higher culpability indicated by a leading role in the group and/or the involvement by the offender of others through coercion, intimidation or exploitation, to

Lower culpability indicated by a lesser or subordinate role under direction and/or involvement of the offender through coercion, intimidation or exploitation.

Courts should be alert to factors that suggest that an offender may have been the subject of coercion, intimidation or exploitation (including as a result of domestic abuse, trafficking or modern slavery) which the offender may find difficult to articulate, and where appropriate ask for this to be addressed in a PSR.

Question 6

Where the offending is part of an organised criminal network, this will make it more serious, and the role of the offender in the organisation will also be relevant.

When sentencing young adult offenders (typically aged 18-25), consideration should also be given to the guidance on the mitigating factor relating to age and/or lack of maturity when considering the significance of group offending.

A3. Offence involved use or threat of use of a weapon

Care should be taken to avoid double counting factors including those already taken into account in assessing culpability or harm or those inherent in the offence

- A 'weapon' can take many forms and may include a shod foot
- The use or production of a weapon has relevance
 - to the **culpability** of the offender where it indicates planning or intention to cause harm; and
 - to the **harm** caused (both physical or psychological) or the potential for harm.
- Relevant considerations will include:
 - the dangerousness of the weapon;
 - whether the offender brought the weapon to the scene, or just used what was available on impulse;
 - whether the offender made or adapted something for use as a weapon;
 - the context in which the weapon was threatened, used or produced.

Question 11

A4. Planning of an offence

Care should be taken to avoid double counting factors including those already taken into account in assessing culpability or harm or those inherent in the offence

- Evidence of planning normally indicates a higher level of intention and pre-meditation which increases the level of culpability.
- Planning may be inferred from the scale and sophistication of the offending and the role of the offender in the offending.
- The greater the degree of planning the greater the culpability

Question 7

A5. Commission of the offence for financial gain

Care should be taken to avoid double counting factors including those already taken into account in assessing culpability or harm or those inherent in the offence

- Where an offence (which is not one which by its nature is an acquisitive offence) has been committed wholly or in part for financial gain or the avoidance of cost, this will increase the seriousness.
- Where the offending is committed in a commercial context for financial gain or the avoidance of costs, this will normally indicate a higher level of culpability.
 - examples would include, but are not limited to, dealing in unlawful goods, failing to disclose relevant matters to an authority or regulator, failing to comply with a regulation or failing to obtain the necessary licence or permission in order to avoid costs.
 - offending of this type can undermine legitimate businesses.
- See the guidance on fines if considering a financial penalty

A6. High level of profit from the offence

Care should be taken to avoid double counting factors including those already taken into account in assessing culpability or harm or those inherent in the offence

- A high level of profit is likely to indicate:
 - high culpability in terms of planning and
 - a high level of harm in terms of loss caused to victims or the undermining of legitimate businesses
- In most situations a high level of gain will be a factor taken in to account at step one – care should be taken to avoid double counting.
- See the guidance on fines if considering a financial penalty

A7. Abuse of trust or dominant position

Care should be taken to avoid double counting factors including those already taken into account in assessing culpability or harm or those inherent in the offence

- In order for an abuse of trust to make an offence more serious the relationship between the offender and victim(s) must be one that would give rise to the offender having a significant level of responsibility towards the victim(s) on which the victim(s) would be entitled to rely.
 - Abuse of trust may occur in many factual situations. Examples may include relationships such as teacher and pupil, parent and child, professional adviser and client, or carer (whether paid or unpaid) and dependant. It may also include ad hoc situations such as a late-night taxi driver and a lone passenger. These examples are not exhaustive and do not necessarily indicate that abuse of trust is present.
 - Additionally an offence may be made more serious where an offender has used a position of power or trust to facilitate and/or conceal offending. Examples may include a public servant using access to confidential information or an employee using access to company communication systems in their offending.
- Question 8**
- Where an offender has been given an inappropriate level of responsibility, abuse of trust is unlikely to apply.
 - A close examination of the facts is necessary and a clear justification should be given if abuse of trust is to be found.

A8. Gratuitous degradation of victim / maximising distress to victim

Care should be taken to avoid double counting factors including those already taken into account in assessing culpability or harm or those inherent in the offence

Where an offender deliberately causes **additional** harm to a victim over and above that which is an essential element of the offence - this will increase seriousness. Examples may include, but are not limited to, posts of images on social media designed to cause additional distress to the victim (~~where not separately charged~~).

Where any such actions are the subject of separate charges, this should be taken into account when assessing totality.

Question 8

A9. Vulnerable victim

Care should be taken to avoid double counting factors including those already taken into account in assessing culpability or harm or those inherent in the offence

- An offence is more serious if the victim is vulnerable because of personal circumstances such as (but not limited to) age, illness or disability (unless the vulnerability of the victim is an element of the offence).
- Other factors such as the victim being isolated, incapacitated through drink or being in an unfamiliar situation **may** lead to a court considering that the offence is more serious.
- The extent to which any vulnerability may impact on the sentence is a matter for the court to weigh up in each case.
- Culpability will be increased if the offender **targeted** a victim because of an actual or perceived vulnerability.
- Culpability will be increased if the victim is made vulnerable by the actions of the offender (such as a victim who has been intimidated or isolated by the offender).
- Culpability is increased if an offender persisted in the offending once it was obvious that the victim was vulnerable (for example continuing to attack an injured victim).
- The level of harm (physical, psychological or financial) is likely to be increased if the victim is vulnerable.

A10. Victim was providing a public service or performing a public duty at the time of the offence

Care should be taken to avoid double counting factors including those already taken into account in assessing culpability or harm or those inherent in the offence

This reflects:

- the fact that people in public facing roles are more exposed to the possibility of harm and consequently more vulnerable and/or
- the fact that someone is working for the public good merits the additional protection of the courts.

This applies whether the victim is a public or private employee or acting in a voluntary capacity.

Question 9

Care should be taken to avoid double counting where the statutory aggravating factor relating to emergency workers applies.

A11. Other(s) put at risk of harm by the offending

Care should be taken to avoid double counting factors including those already taken into account in assessing culpability or harm or those inherent in the offence

- Where there is risk of harm to other(s) not taken in account at step one ~~and not subject to a separate charge~~, this makes the offence more serious.
- Dealing with a risk of harm involves consideration of both the likelihood of harm occurring and the extent of it if it does.

Where any such risk of harm is the subject of separate charges, this should be taken into account when assessing totality

Question 9

A12. Offence committed in the presence of other(s) (especially children)

Care should be taken to avoid double counting factors including those already taken into account in assessing culpability or harm or those inherent in the offence

- This reflects the psychological harm that may be caused to those who witnessed the offence.
- The presence of one or more children may in some situations make the primary victim more vulnerable – for example an adult may be less able to resist the offender if concerned about the safety or welfare of children present.

A13. Actions after the event including but not limited to attempts to cover up/ conceal evidence

Care should be taken to avoid double counting factors including those already taken into account in assessing culpability or harm or those inherent in the offence

The more sophisticated, extensive or persistent the actions after the event, the more likely they are to increase the seriousness of the offence.

When sentencing young adult offenders (typically aged 18-25), consideration should also be given to the guidance on the mitigating factor relating to age and lack of maturity when considering the significance of such conduct.

Where any such actions are the subject of separate charges, they should be taken into account when assessing totality at step seven.

A14. Blame wrongly placed on other(s)

Care should be taken to avoid double counting factors including those already taken into account in assessing culpability or harm or those inherent in the offence

- Where the investigation has been hindered and/or other(s) have suffered as a result of being wrongly blamed by the offender, this will make the offence more serious.
- This factor will **not** be engaged where an offender has simply exercised his or her right not to assist the investigation or accept responsibility for the offending.
- When sentencing young adult offenders (typically aged 18-25), consideration should also be given to the guidance on the mitigating factor relating to age and lack of maturity when considering the significance of such conduct.

Question 11

A15. Failure to respond to warnings or concerns expressed by others about the offender's behaviour

Care should be taken to avoid double counting factors including those already taken into account in assessing culpability or harm or those inherent in the offence

Where an offender has had the benefit of warnings or advice about their conduct but has failed to heed it, this would make the offender more blameworthy.

This may particularly be the case when:

- such warning(s) or advice were of an official nature or from a professional source and/or
- the warning(s) were made at the time of or shortly before the commission of the offence.

Question 10

A16. Offence committed on licence or post sentence supervision or while subject to court order(s)

Care should be taken to avoid double counting factors including those already taken into account in assessing culpability or harm or those inherent in the offence

- An offender who is subject to licence or post sentence supervision is under a particular obligation to desist from further offending.
- Commission of an offence while subject to a **relevant** court order makes the offence more serious.
- The extent to which the offender has complied with the conditions of a licence or order (including the time that has elapsed since its commencement) will be a relevant consideration.
- Where the offender is dealt with separately for a breach of a licence or order regard should be had to totality (see step seven)
- Care should be taken to avoid double counting matters taken into account when considering previous convictions.

Question 12

A17. Offence committed in custody

Care should be taken to avoid double counting factors including those already taken into account in assessing culpability or harm or those inherent in the offence

- Offences committed in custody are more serious because they undermine the fundamental need for control and order which is necessary for the running of prisons and maintaining safety.
- Generally the sentence for the new offence will be consecutive to the sentence being served as it will have arisen out of an unrelated incident. The court must have regard to the totality of the offender's criminality when passing the second sentence, to ensure that the total sentence to be served is just and proportionate. Refer to the [Totality guideline](#) for detailed guidance.
- Care should be taken to avoid double counting matters taken into account when considering previous convictions.

A18. Offences taken into consideration

Care should be taken to avoid double counting factors including those already taken into account in assessing culpability or harm or those inherent in the offence

Taken from the [Offences Taken into Consideration Definitive Guideline](#):

General principles

When sentencing an offender who requests offences to be taken into consideration (TICs), courts should pass a total sentence which reflects all the offending behaviour. The sentence must be just and proportionate and must not exceed the statutory maximum for the conviction offence.

Offences to be Taken into Consideration

The court has discretion as to whether or not to take TICs into account. In exercising its discretion the court should take into account that TICs are capable of reflecting the offender's overall criminality. The court is likely to consider that the fact that the offender has assisted the police (particularly if the offences would not otherwise have been detected) and avoided the need for further proceedings demonstrates a genuine determination by the offender to 'wipe the slate clean'.

It is generally **undesirable** for TICs to be accepted in the following circumstances:

- where the TIC is likely to attract a greater sentence than the conviction offence;
- where it is in the public interest that the TIC should be the subject of a separate charge;
- where the offender would avoid a prohibition, ancillary order or similar consequence which it would have been desirable to impose on conviction. For example:
 - where the TIC attracts mandatory disqualification or endorsement and the offence(s) for which the defendant is to be sentenced do not;
- where the TIC constitutes a breach of an earlier sentence;
- where the TIC is a specified offence for the purposes of section 224 of the Criminal Justice Act 2003, but the conviction offence is non-specified; or
- where the TIC is not founded on the same facts or evidence or part of a series of offences of the same or similar character (unless the court is satisfied that it is in the interests of justice to do so).

Jurisdiction

The magistrates' court cannot take into consideration an indictable only offence. The Crown Court can take into account summary only offences provided the TICs are founded on the same facts or evidence as the indictable charge, or are part of a series of offences of the same or similar character as the indictable conviction offence

Procedural safeguards

A court should generally only take offences into consideration if the following procedural provisions have been satisfied:

- the police or prosecuting authorities have prepared a schedule of offences (TIC schedule) that they consider suitable to be taken into consideration. The TIC schedule should set out the nature of each offence, the date of the offence(s), relevant detail about the offence(s) (including, for example, monetary values of items) and any other brief details that the court should be aware of;

- a copy of the TIC schedule must be provided to the defendant and his representative (if he has one) before the sentence hearing. The defendant should sign the TIC schedule to provisionally admit the offences;
- at the sentence hearing, the court should ask the defendant in open court whether he admits each of the offences on the TIC schedule and whether he wishes to have them taken into consideration;
- if there is any doubt about the admission of a particular offence, it should not be accepted as a TIC. Special care should be taken with vulnerable and/or unrepresented defendants;
- if the defendant is committed to the Crown Court for sentence, this procedure must take place again at the Crown Court even if the defendant has agreed to the schedule in the magistrates' court.

Application

The sentence imposed on an offender should, in most circumstances, be increased to reflect the fact that other offences have been taken into consideration. The court should:

1. Determine the sentencing starting point for the conviction offence, referring to the relevant definitive sentencing guidelines. No regard should be had to the presence of TICs at this stage.
2. Consider whether there are any aggravating or mitigating factors that justify an upward or downward adjustment from the starting point.

The presence of TICs should generally be treated as an aggravating feature that justifies an adjustment from the starting point. Where there is a large number of TICs, it may be appropriate to move outside the category range, although this must be considered in the context of the case and subject to the principle of totality. The court is limited to the statutory maximum for the conviction offence.

3. Continue through the sentencing process including:
 - consider whether the frank admission of a number of offences is an indication of a defendant's remorse or determination and/ or demonstration of steps taken to address addiction or offending behaviour;
 - any reduction for a guilty plea should be applied to the overall sentence;
 - the principle of totality;
 - when considering ancillary orders these can be considered in relation to any or all of the TICs, specifically:
 - compensation orders;
 - restitution orders

A19. Offence committed in a domestic context

Care should be taken to avoid double counting factors including those already taken into account in assessing culpability or harm or those inherent in the offence

Refer to the [Overarching Principles: Domestic Abuse Definitive Guideline](#)

Question 13

A20. Offence committed in a terrorist context

Care should be taken to avoid double counting factors including those already taken into account in assessing culpability or harm or those inherent in the offence

Where there is a terrorist element to the offence, refer also to the [Terrorism Offences Definitive Guideline](#)

Question 13

A21. Location and/or timing of offence

Care should be taken to avoid double counting factors including those already taken into account in assessing culpability or harm or those inherent in the offence

- In general, an offence is not made more serious by the location and/or timing of the offence except in ways taken into account by other factors in this guideline (such as planning, vulnerable victim, offence committed in a domestic context, maximising distress to victim, others put at risk of harm by the offending, offence committed in the presence of others). Care should be taken to avoid double counting.
- Courts should be cautious about aggravating an offence by reason of it being committed for example at night, or in broad daylight, in a crowded place or in an isolated place unless it also indicates increased harm or culpability not already accounted for.
- An offence may be more serious when it is committed in places in which there is a particular need for discipline or safety such as prisons, courts, schools or hospitals.

A22. Established evidence of community/ wider impact

Care should be taken to avoid double counting factors including those already taken into account in assessing culpability or harm or those inherent in the offence

- This factor should increase the sentence only where there is clear evidence of wider harm not already taken into account elsewhere. A community impact statement will assist the court in assessing the level of impact.
- For issues of prevalence see the separate guidance.

Prevalence

- Sentencing levels in offence specific guidelines take account of collective social harm. Accordingly offenders should normally be sentenced by straightforward application of the guidelines without aggravation for the fact that their activity contributed to a harmful social effect upon a neighbourhood or community.
- It is not open to a sentencer to increase a sentence for prevalence in ordinary circumstances or in response to a personal view that there is 'too much of this sort of thing going on in this area'.
- First, there must be evidence provided to the court by a responsible body or by a senior police officer.
- Secondly, that evidence must be before the court in the specific case being considered with the relevant statements or reports having been made available to the Crown and defence in good time so that meaningful representations about that material can be made.
- Even if such material is provided, a sentencer will only be entitled to treat prevalence as an aggravating factor if satisfied

- that the level of harm caused in a particular locality is significantly higher than that caused elsewhere (and thus already inherent in the guideline levels);
- that the circumstances can properly be described as exceptional; **and**
- that it is just and proportionate to increase the sentence for such a factor in the particular case being sentenced.

Factors reducing seriousness or reflecting personal mitigation (factors are not listed in any particular order and are not exhaustive)

M1. No previous convictions or no relevant/recent convictions

Care should be taken to avoid double counting factors including those already taken into account in assessing culpability or harm

- First time offenders usually represent a lower risk of re-offending. Re-offending rates for first offenders are significantly lower than rates for repeat offenders. In addition, first offenders are normally regarded as less blameworthy than offenders who have committed the same crime several times already. For these reasons first offenders receive a mitigated sentence.
- Where there are previous offences but these are old and /or are for offending of a different nature, the sentence will normally be reduced to reflect that the new offence is not part of a pattern of offending and there is therefore a lower likelihood of reoffending.
- When assessing whether a previous conviction is 'recent' the court should consider the time gap since the previous conviction and the reason for it.
- Previous convictions are likely to be 'relevant' when they share characteristics with the current offence (examples of such characteristics include, but are not limited to: dishonesty, violence, abuse of position or trust, use or possession of weapons, disobedience of court orders). In general the more serious the previous offending the longer it will retain relevance.

M2. Good character and/or exemplary conduct

Care should be taken to avoid double counting factors including those already taken into account in assessing culpability or harm

This factor may apply whether or not the offender has previous convictions. Evidence that an offender has demonstrated positive good character through, for example, charitable works may reduce the sentence.

However, this factor is less likely to be relevant where the offending is very serious. Where an offender has used their good character or status to facilitate or conceal the offending it could be treated as an aggravating factor.

M3. Remorse

Care should be taken to avoid double counting factors including those already taken into account in assessing culpability or harm

The court will need to be satisfied that the offender is genuinely remorseful for the offending behaviour in order to reduce the sentence (separate from any guilty plea reduction at step four).

Lack of remorse should never be treated as an aggravating factor.

Question 14

M4. Self-reporting

Care should be taken to avoid double counting factors including those already taken into account in assessing culpability or harm

Where an offender has self-reported to the authorities, particularly in circumstances where the offence may otherwise have gone undetected, this should reduce the sentence (separate from any guilty plea reduction at step four).

M5. Cooperation with the investigation/ early admissions

Care should be taken to avoid double counting factors including those already taken into account in assessing culpability or harm

Assisting or cooperating with the investigation and /or making pre-court admissions may ease the effect on victims and witnesses and save valuable police time justifying a reduction in sentence (separate from any guilty plea reduction at step four).

Question 15

M6. Little or no planning

Care should be taken to avoid double counting factors including those already taken into account in assessing culpability or harm

Where an offender has committed the offence with little or no prior thought, this is likely to indicate a lower level of culpability and therefore justify a reduction in sentence.

However, impulsive acts of unprovoked violence or other types of offending may indicate a propensity to behave in a manner that would not normally justify a reduction in sentence.

M7. The offender was in a lesser or subordinate role if acting with others / performed limited role under direction

Care should be taken to avoid double counting factors including those already taken into account in assessing culpability or harm

Whereas acting as part of a group may make an offence more serious, if the offender's role was minor this may indicate lower culpability and justify a reduction in sentence.

M8. Involved through coercion, intimidation or exploitation

Care should be taken to avoid double counting factors including those already taken into account in assessing culpability or harm

- Where this applies it will reduce the culpability of the offender.
- This factor may be of particular relevance where the offender has been the victim of domestic abuse, trafficking or modern slavery, but may also apply in other contexts.
- Courts should be alert to factors that suggest that an offender may have been the subject of coercion, intimidation or exploitation which the offender may find difficult to articulate, and where appropriate ask for this to be addressed in a PSR.
- This factor **may** indicate that the offender is vulnerable and would find it more difficult to cope with custody or to complete a community order.

Question 16

M9. Limited awareness or understanding of the offence

Care should be taken to avoid double counting factors including those already taken into account in assessing culpability or harm

The factor may apply to reduce the culpability of an offender

- acting alone who has not appreciated the seriousness of the offence **or**
- where an offender is acting with others and does not appreciate the extent of the overall offending.

If the offender had genuinely failed to understand or appreciate the seriousness of the offence, the sentence may be reduced from that which would have applied if the offender had understood the full extent of the offence and the likely harm that would be caused.

Where an offender lacks capacity to understand the full extent of the offending see the guidance under 'Mental disorder or learning disability' below.

M10. Little or no financial gain

Care should be taken to avoid double counting factors including those already taken into account in assessing culpability or harm

Where an offence (which is not one which by its nature is an acquisitive offence) is committed in a context where financial gain could arise, the culpability of the offender may be reduced where it can be shown that the offender **did not seek to gain financially** from the conduct and did not in fact do so.

M11. Delay since apprehension

Care should be taken to avoid double counting factors including those already taken into account in assessing culpability or harm

Where there has been an **unreasonable** delay in proceedings since apprehension which **is not the fault of the offender**, and which has had a detrimental effect on the offender, the court may take this into account by reducing the sentence.

Note: No fault should attach to an offender for not admitting an offence and/or putting the prosecution to proof of its case.

Question 17

M12. Activity originally legitimate

Care should be taken to avoid double counting factors including those already taken into account in assessing culpability or harm

Where the offending arose from an activity which was originally legitimate, but became unlawful (for example because of a change in the offender's circumstances or a change in regulations), this **may** indicate lower culpability and thereby a reduction in sentence.

This factor will not apply where the offender has used a legitimate activity to mask a criminal activity.

M13. Age and/or lack of maturity

Care should be taken to avoid double counting factors including those already taken into account in assessing culpability or harm

Age and/or lack of maturity can affect:

- the offender's responsibility for the offence and
- the effect of the sentence on the offender.

Either or both of these considerations may justify a reduction in the sentence.

The emotional and developmental age of an offender is of at least equal importance to their chronological age (if not greater).

In particular young adults (typically aged 18-25) are still developing neurologically and consequently may be less able to:

- evaluate the consequences of their actions
- limit impulsivity
- limit risk taking

Young adults are likely to be susceptible to peer pressure and are more likely to take risks or behave impulsively when in company with their peers.

Environment plays a role in neurological development and factors such as childhood adversity including deprivation and/or abuse will affect development.

An immature offender may find it particularly difficult to cope with custody and therefore may be more susceptible to self-harm in custody.

An immature offender may find it particularly difficult to cope with the requirements of a community order without appropriate support.

There is a greater capacity for change in immature offenders and they may be receptive to opportunities to address their offending behaviour and change their conduct.

Research shows that the vast majority of young people begin the process of desistance in their later teens. Therefore young adults' previous convictions may not be as indicative of a tendency for further offending by comparison with older adults.

Question 18

Where the offender is a care leaver the court should enquire as to any effect a sentence may have on the offender's ability to make use of support from the local authority. (Young adult care leavers are entitled to time limited support. Leaving care services may change at the age of 21 and cease at the age of 25, unless the young adult is in education at that point). See also the Sentencing Children and Young People Guideline (paragraphs 1.16 and 1.17).

Where an offender has turned 18 between the commission of the offence and conviction the court should take as its starting point the sentence likely to have been imposed on the date at which the offence was committed, but taking into account the purposes of sentencing adult offenders. See also the Sentencing Children and Young People Guideline (paragraphs 6.1 to 6.3).

When considering a custodial or community sentence for a young adult the National Probation Service should address these issues in a PSR.

M14. Sole or primary carer for dependent relatives

Care should be taken to avoid double counting factors including those already taken into account in assessing culpability or harm

This factor is particularly relevant where an offender is on the cusp of custody or where the suitability of a community order is being considered. See also the [Imposition of community and custodial sentences guideline](#).

For offenders on the cusp of custody, imprisonment should not be imposed where there would be an impact on dependants which would make a custodial sentence disproportionate to achieving the aims of sentencing.

Where custody is unavoidable consideration of the impact on dependants may be relevant to the length of the sentence imposed and whether the sentence can be suspended.

For more serious offences where a substantial period of custody is appropriate, this factor will carry less weight.

When imposing a community sentence on an offender with primary caring responsibilities the effect on dependants should be a consideration in determining suitable requirements.

In addition when sentencing an offender who is pregnant relevant considerations may include:

- any effect of the sentence on the health of the offender and
- any effect of the sentence on the unborn child

The court should ensure that it has all relevant information about dependent children before deciding on sentence.

When an immediate custodial sentence is necessary, the court must consider whether proper arrangements have been made for the care of any dependent children and if necessary consider deferring sentence for this to be done.

~~In such situations~~ When considering a community or custodial sentence for an offender who has, or may have, caring responsibilities the court should ask the Probation Service to address these issues in a PSR.

Question 18

M15. Physical disability or serious medical conditions requiring urgent, intensive or long-term treatment

Care should be taken to avoid double counting factors including those already taken into account in assessing culpability or harm

- The court can take account of physical disability or a serious medical condition by way of mitigation as a reason for reducing the length of the sentence, either on the ground of the greater impact which imprisonment will have on the offender, or as a matter of generally expressed mercy in the individual circumstances of the case.
- However, such a condition, even when it is difficult to treat in prison, will not automatically entitle the offender to a lesser sentence than would otherwise be appropriate.
- There will always be a need to balance issues personal to an offender against the gravity of the offending (including the harm done to victims), and the public interest in imposing appropriate punishment for serious offending;
- A terminal prognosis is not in itself a reason to reduce the sentence even further. The court must impose a sentence that properly meets the aims of sentencing even if it will carry the clear prospect that the offender will die in custody. The prospect of death in the near future will be a matter considered by the prison authorities and the Secretary of State under the early release on compassionate grounds procedure (ERCG).
- But, an offender's knowledge that he will likely face the prospect of death in prison, subject only to the ERCG provisions, is a factor that can be considered by the sentencing Judge when determining the sentence that it would be just to impose.

M16. Mental disorder or learning disability

Care should be taken to avoid double counting factors including those already taken into account in assessing culpability or harm

Mental disorders and learning disabilities are different things, although an individual may suffer from both. A **learning disability** is a permanent condition developing in childhood, whereas **mental illness** (or a mental health problem) can develop at any time, and is not necessarily permanent; people can get better and resolve mental health problems with help and treatment.

In the context of sentencing a broad interpretation of the terms 'mental disorder' and learning disabilities' should be adopted to include:

- Offenders with an intellectual impairment (low IQ);
- Offenders with a cognitive impairment such as (but not limited to) dyslexia, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD);
- Offenders with an autistic spectrum disorder (ASD) including Asperger's syndrome;
- Offenders with a personality disorder;
- Offenders with a mental illness.

Offenders may have a combination of the above conditions.

Sentencers should be alert to the fact that not all mental disorders or learning disabilities are visible or obvious.

A mental disorder or learning disability can affect both:

1. the offender's responsibility for the offence and
2. the impact of the sentence on the offender.

The court will be assisted by a PSR and, where appropriate, medical reports (including from court mental health teams) in assessing:

1. the degree to which a mental disorder or learning disability has reduced the offender's responsibility for the offence. This may be because the condition had an impact on the offender's ability to understand the consequences of their actions, to limit impulsivity and/or to exercise self-control.
 - a relevant factor will be the degree to which a mental disorder or learning disability has been exacerbated by the actions of the offender (for example by the **voluntary** abuse of drugs or alcohol or by **voluntarily** failing to follow medical advice);
 - in considering the extent to which the offender's actions were voluntary, the extent to which a mental disorder or learning disability has an impact on the offender's ability to exercise self-control or to engage with medical services will be a relevant consideration.
2. any effect of the mental disorder or learning disability on the impact of the sentence on the offender; a mental disorder or learning disability may make it more difficult for the offender to cope with custody or comply with a community order.

M17. Determination and /or demonstration of steps having been taken to address addiction or offending behaviour

Care should be taken to avoid double counting factors including those already taken into account in assessing culpability or harm

Where offending is driven by or closely associated with drug or alcohol abuse (for example stealing to feed a habit, or committing acts of disorder or violence whilst drunk) a commitment to address the underlying issue may justify a reduction in sentence. This will be particularly relevant where the court is considering whether to impose a sentence that focuses on rehabilitation.

Similarly, a commitment to address other underlying issues that may influence the offender's behaviour may justify the imposition of a sentence that focusses on rehabilitation.

The court will be assisted by a PSR in making this assessment.

Question 19