

I would be grateful for any information on **unusual or edge cases** where section 1 has been prosecuted, or was not prosecuted. Police officers, academics, court officials, lawyers in particular may have examples.

On **reluctance to prosecute**, I welcome any reflections from Northern Ireland in particular (especially, the glorification of proscribed organisations or previous terrorist attacks). Is there any evidence that qualifying conduct is not being prosecuted because of considerations of community tensions?

Thematically, I am aware of suggestions that certain statements at protests, and certain statements made in mosques (I have seen videos, but do not know authenticity) **should have been prosecuted** as encouragement to terrorism. Are there offline examples of encouragement/ glorification of extreme right wing terrorist attacks that arguably should have been prosecuted as encouragement (I believe the main issue for ERWT is online, especially glorification of Tarrant/Breivik)?

For **online**, the main blocker to use of s1 online is that it does not apply to private communications (unless it can be said that audience were members of the public). What are the implications for criminalising encouragement 1-2-1 online? (Technical question) Is there any gap given availability of s2 TA 2006 and s58 TA 2000?

More generally, is anyone aware of the introduction of s1 in 2006 creating a **'chilling effect'** (as was objected at time of its introduction)? Also more generally, grateful for thoughts on **harm from encouragement**: what is evidence of harm, e.g. encouragement/ glorification leading to attacks, joining proscribed orgs, sectarianism, marking of public territory (e.g. memorials to terrorists), impact on victims. Many thanks.

If easier, please DM me for my email address.