



Policy name: Case Transfers (including transfer as a result of escalation in risk of serious harm) for offenders subject to statutory supervision either pre-release or in the community

Reference: N/A

Re-Issue Date: 23 August 2022

Implementation Date: 26 June 2021

Replaces the following documents (e.g. PSIs, PSOs, Custodial Service Specs) which are hereby cancelled:

- PI 57/2014 - Process for Community Rehabilitation Companies to refer cases in custody or the community to National Probation Service for Risk Review, including escalation.
- PI 07/2014 - Case Transfers for Offenders Subject to Statutory Supervision Either Pre-Release From Custody or Whilst Completing an Order Or Licence

Action required by:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HMPPS HQ	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Governors
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Sector Prisons	<input type="checkbox"/>	Heads of Group
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Contracted Prisons	<input type="checkbox"/>	Contract Managers in Probation Trusts
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Probation Service (PS)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Under 18 Young Offender Institutions
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HMPPS Rehabilitation Contract Services Team	<input type="checkbox"/>	HMPPS-run Immigration Removal Centres (IRCs)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other providers of Probation and Community Services		

Mandatory Actions: All groups referenced above must adhere to the Requirements section of this Policy Framework, which contains all mandatory actions.

How will this Policy Framework be audited or monitored?

Audit/monitoring: Public Prisons - Prison Group Directors will monitor their prisons' compliance with the Framework's requirements.

Privately Managed Prisons - monitoring of compliance will be through the standard contract management processes.

Probation Service - compliance is monitored by Regional Probation Directors (RPDs) in their region and by senior contract managers.

Quality assurance is provided by the HMPPS Operational & System Assurance Group.

Context: This framework replaces the risk escalation requirements outlined in PI 57/2014. It also updates the requirements previously outlined by PI 07/2014 on Case Transfer, to support Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation (HMIP) recommendations from the review of the J McCann case 'to ensure the exchange of all risk information; establish an effective communication framework between transferring areas, including clarity about roles and responsibilities; and to ensure cases are prioritised and transfer is expedited.'

Additionally, this framework reflects the Probation Reform Programme re-design of operational processes. From 26 June 2021, all supervised individuals will be managed by one Probation

Service. This framework ensures that following Day 1 implementation, the processes described in operational policy will align to the new design models.

Associated documents

- PI 05/2014 - PSI 14/2014 Case Allocation
- Policy Framework - Enforcement of Community Orders, Suspended Sentence Orders and Post-sentence supervision
- PI 27/2014 – PSI 30/2014 – AI 22/2014 Recall Review & Re-Release of Recall Offenders
- PI 32/2014 Approved Premises
- PI 07 2015 PSI 08 2015 Permanent resettlement outside England and Wales of offender's subject to post-release supervision.

Replaces documents

- PI 07/2014 Case Transfer for offenders subject to statutory supervision
- PI 57/2014 Risk Escalation

Resource Impact: To ensure the continuity of processes required to transfer cases, this framework has been updated and the resources identified are included in the Probation Reform Programme business case.

Contact: ProbationPolicy.Enquiries@justice.gov.uk

Deputy/Group Director sign-off: Nick Poyntz

Approved by OPS for publication: Sarah Coccia and Ian Barrow, Joint Chairs Operational Policy Sub-Board, April 2021

CONTENTS

Section	Title	Page
1	Purpose	4
2	Constraints	4
3	Evidence	5
4	Outcomes	5
5	Key principles	6
6	Permanent Case Transfers	7
7	Transfers due to an escalation in risk of serious harm	9
8	Non-compliance	10
9	Specific cohorts	10
	High risk	11
	Youth transfers	11
	Referrals to Approved Premises / Accommodation Projects	11
	Pre-release transfer (OMiC)	11
	National Security Division	12
	Foreign Nationals	13
		12
10	Residence Requirements	13
11	Temporary moves	13
12	Guidance	15
	Annex A – transfers in and out of jurisdiction	16
	Annex B – transfers from youth to adult services	17

1. Purpose

- 1.1. This policy framework (PF) sets out the arrangements for:
 - The transfer of supervised individuals due to a geographical move, whether temporary or permanent, including between Probation Delivery Units within the same region.
 - Transfer of cases between officers and teams (including National Security Division cases) as a result of an assessed escalation in risk of serious harm.
- 1.2. It replaces the previous probation instructions relating to Case Transfer (PI 07/2014) and Risk Escalation and Risk Review (PI 57/2014).
- 1.3. Detailed information in relation to transfers in and out of jurisdiction (e.g. Scotland) can be found in Annex A of this document.
- 1.4. Youth to adult transition is out of scope for this framework, however national protocol and links to relevant guidance can be found in Annex B.
- 1.5. This document aims to ensure that there are key principles to inform decision-making; standard processes to give effect to decisions; and a consistent interpretation of the case transfer framework; and a more collaborative approach supporting supervised individuals when there is a change of responsible officer.
- 1.6. For the purposes of this PF the term 'Responsible Officer' (RO) is used to refer to a probation practitioner allocated to a named individual to be managed on a community sentence (as per sections 213 and 299 of the Sentencing Act 2020).
- 1.7. For those in custody, who will be managed through Offender Management in Custody (OMiC), distinction is made between OMiC roles (Prison Offender Manager - POM / Community Offender Manager - COM) to align with their agreed roles and responsibilities.
- 1.8. From 26 June 2021, all RO's will be part of the unified Probation Service. However, existing NPS and CRC team structures and operating models will in many respects continue for a transitional period after this date. This framework uses the terms 'legacy CRC' and 'legacy NPS' when referring to these structures and ways of working.

2. Constraints

- 2.1. There may be times when Exception Delivery Models are implemented for operational reasons. Any requirements outlined by those models are to be followed for the duration of their implementation.
- 2.2. Temporary case transfer and supervision should not routinely be used. Where it is being applied, it must be aligned to the guidance outlined by Section 11 of this PF.
- 2.3. Case transfers should not exceed 20 working days for completion, from initial contact between the home and receiving PDUs to formal acceptance of responsibility for supervising the offender by the receiving PDU. Where exceptional circumstances arise and this is not possible managerial oversight processes must be followed, as detailed by Section 6.5 of this PF. See touchpoints model for further guidance: Touchpoints Model (TPM).

3. Evidence

- 3.1 Changes of location and of supervising officer can be disruptive for supervised individuals and potentially impact on risk management and sentence planning. It is therefore vital that transfers are, wherever possible, planned and in every case managed to mitigate these risks as much as possible. Conversely, changes can provide an opportunity for refreshing engagement with the offender, and the strengths and benefits of any move must also be identified and encouraged.
- 3.2 Regular themes arise from findings from various Serious Case Reviews and inspection reports that are pertinent in consideration of the transfer of cases. These include:
- Sharing information – where information is not shared appropriately gaps in risk management arise
 - Handovers – clear lines of communication are needed to facilitate a good quality handover
 - Consistency – variation of approach in transferring of cases has created inconsistent practice in the management of case transfers across the regions
- 3.3 Assessment of suitability of proposed accommodation is essential to case transfer activity. We know that the undertaking of home visits enables practitioners to verify supervised individuals' circumstances, clarify who they are living with, understand their difficulties, and build rapport. This can aid a comprehensive assessment of safeguarding concerns in relation to children, vulnerable adults (including women, especially those with caring responsibilities; and young adults), and partners in cases of domestic abuse.
- 3.4 There is a strong evidence base in relation to the quality of the working relationship between the RO and the supervised individual, and how a positive relationship can have an impact on reducing recidivism. We also know people are more likely to desist from offending when they have strong links to community and family, as well as having a sense of purpose in their lives.¹ Ensuring a joint meeting between the supervised individual, the future and current ROs should be facilitated to ensure that contracting, boundaries and expectations can be clarified and progress, needs and strengths can be built upon. This is an important link to desistance.

4. Outcomes

- 4.1 Responsible Officers, case administrators and line managers are required to read this PF so that they are familiar with, and follow, the correct processes and mandatory actions relating to:
- Geographical transfer of individuals subject to statutory supervision either pre-release from custody or whilst completing a Licence or an Order.
 - The new, streamlined risk escalation process for transfer of cases from legacy CRC teams to legacy NPS teams.
 - Risk escalation cases in custody.
- 4.2 The streamlined risk escalation process between legacy CRC and legacy NPS teams will be in place for a transitional period from 26 June 2021 onwards. The length of that transition period will vary from region to region, depending on when structural alignment has been completed.

1

4.3 As some regions will complete training and digital migration sooner than others, it will be the decision of the Regional Probation Director (RPD) to identify the time to decommission the transitional escalation process; this will be informed by the approach to be adopted during the transition period.

5. Key Principles / Requirements

5.1 All staff involved in deciding case transfers must base decisions on the principles below:

- **There should be a presumption towards agreeing case transfer** - Permission to move is a requirement and should be given unless the move would bring with it specific and heightened risks, which could not reasonably be managed at the proposed address.
- **There should be a presumption towards agreeing case transfer where supervised individuals submit such requests and they are consistent with the terms of this framework** - Permission to move is a requirement and should be given unless the move would bring with it specific and heightened risks, which could not reasonably be managed at the proposed address.
- **Information should be gathered by the transferring area for assessment from all relevant sources and made available to the receiving area at the earliest opportunity** - It is critical to ensure the assessments supporting case transfer captures all relevant risks of serious harm, are accurate and up to date
- **Collaboration should underpin the approach to case transfer** - All parties should to work together for the best outcome for the public, victims and the supervised individual
- **When a case transfer is being made to a nearby PDU, the transferring officer should consider the benefits and feasibility of finishing any partially completed intervention in the transferring area after the transfer has taken place.** If such arrangements are made the case record must clearly detail how information about the supervised individual's progress will be exchanged between the Responsible Officer and key stakeholders in the transferring area and the Responsible Officer and key stakeholders in the receiving division. (NB – this does not apply to risk escalation arrangements).
- **Refusal of a case transfer should only be made where there is evidence that the risk of harm would increase in the receiving area and could not be managed in the new address-** Consideration may be given to sentence outcomes being potentially undermined by the absence of specified sentence, licence interventions or services in the receiving area. However, important as they are, issues such as no local connection, partner organisation objection with no evidenced rationale pertinent to risk, or temporary accommodation are not enough by themselves to refuse transfer.
- **Case transfer is considered complete when the management responsibility for a case passes from the transferring area to the receiving area** - It is formalised through the allocation process that records the transferred status with a named Responsible Officer. However, a collaborative approach may continue to be required, between the transferring and receiving area, even after the responsibility has initially transferred.

6. Permanent case transfers

6.1 This section relates to a permanent transfer of a case – for temporary transfer requirements, see section 11.

6.2 The reasons for transferring a case may be many and varied. The following is not intended to be an exhaustive list, but rather an illustration of the types of situations that ROs need to consider:

- Protective developments such as employment, family connections, treatment/interventions placements or new relationships; or
- Factors relating to risk concerns such as loss of accommodation or employment, relationship breakdown, avoiding peer contact or further restrictions being imposed.

6.3 Practitioners assessing any transfer request must give due consideration to all transfer requests received and keep in mind the principles outlined by Section 5 of this PF.

6.4 To ensure that case transfers are prioritised and expedited **the process should be completed in 20 working days.**

6.5 If this cannot be achieved (for example because 3rd party responses have not yet been obtained and are critical to risk assessing the suitability of the address) the reason for the delay and actions being undertaken to progress this must be recorded by the practitioner and SPO management oversight along with a revised estimated date for completion recorded.

- Where the transfer has not been completed within 30 working days further oversight by the Head of PDU in the home area is needed. If the delay in completing the transfer request is, in the professional judgement of the Head of PDU, unacceptable and their intervention has not been able to resolve the situation, further escalation to the Head of Operations must be considered.
- It is recognised that where pre-release transfer is being considered the assessment process and alignment to external processes such as parole hearings may mean that the above timescales cannot be upheld. In such cases it is imperative that clear recording of the decisions reached between the home and receiving areas continues, including the appropriate managerial oversight.
- Where the supervised individual is a high RoSH, subject to Life Sentence, a sentence for Indeterminate Public Protection, or is a MAPPA Level 2 or 3 case, the transfer can only be completed once agreed by a senior manager at Head of PDU level or above. For all other cases approval at SPO level of above must be given. All authorisation decisions for case transfer must be recorded on Delius.
- The Touch Points model should be used throughout the transfer process to ensure oversight and timeliness, with appropriate recording made on NDelius.

6.6 When transferring an individual subject to probation supervision the following actions must be undertaken.

6.7 **Initiating transfer (HOME AREA)**

Minimum Requirements:

- The RO in the home area must contact the SPO for the receiving area to initiate the transfer request and assessment process.
- The RO in the home area must complete an updated OASys assessment (ensuring it contains details of the changes resulting from transfer, as well as commentary in the Risk Management and Sentence Plans regarding restrictive and protective measures, or additional support available e.g. for women a referral to a Women's Centre or other specialist service) including when the move is only temporary.
- On all occasions where the proposed move involves the supervised individual living in a household where there are children or vulnerable adults present or there is potential for contact with children or vulnerable adults, local safeguarding policies and procedures must be followed in relation to children or vulnerable adults.

- When a transfer from one Local Justice Area (LJA) to another has been formally agreed, the RO in the home area should notify the relevant court in writing via application for variation of local justice area of the case transfer to amend the requirements of the Community Order or SSO where applicable.
- Review Discussions (transferring area) – should a case be identified by a Responsible Officer as requiring a transfer, Touchpoints Model (TPM) management oversight activity should be recorded as this represents a significant change. The following areas should be considered:
 - Is the current RMP & SP being implemented effectively;
 - Has the OASys been reviewed to reflect risk and mitigations as a result of the transfer;
 - Is there effective management of the case during this transition period;
 - What actions are required to facilitate the transfer.

6.8 Receiving transfer (NEW AREA)

Minimum Requirements:

- The SPO must allocate the address check to an appropriate practitioner in a timely manner.
- The suitability of the proposed home address of a supervised individual must be assessed as soon as possible by practitioners in the area where the address is situated, usually within 10 working days
- On all occasions where the proposed move involves the supervised individual living in a household where there are children or vulnerable adults present or there is potential for contact with children or vulnerable adults, local safeguarding policies and procedures must be followed in relation to children or vulnerable adults.
- *Initial Screening Case Discussion (receiving area)* –Touchpoints Model (TPM) management oversight activity in relation to an initial case discussion should be completed by the SPO to identify the following areas and ensure that the transfer is completed in a timely manner:
 - What is required to manage the case effectively;
 - What information is missing;
 - Has the OASys review detailed risks and mitigations resulting from the transfer;
 - What contingency is required;
 - MAPPA Level and why.

6.9 Formal acceptance of transfer

Minimum Requirements:

- The rationale for the approval of the transfer must be recorded in case records by the Home Area.
- A handover meeting must take place between the original RO holding the case and the allocated officer in the receiving area. This meeting is an important opportunity for both officers to discuss the case and ensure a full and consistent understanding of the individual and the presenting risks is maintained, including any outstanding questions raised by the OASys review or Touch Points considerations. Where necessary, consideration should also be given to the need for a professionals meeting to be held.
- The transfer is completed in a timely manner (see Sections 6.4 and 6.5, above).
- Approval of the transfer must be given at an appropriate level of seniority (see Section 6.5, above)

6.10 Dispute resolution

- If there is a dispute between transferring and receiving areas in relation to accepting the case, where it cannot be agreed at SPO level the case must be escalated to Head of PDUs for resolution.
- If a decision is reached not to approve the proposed move the supervised individual must be notified immediately by their responsible officer.
- The decision should be confirmed in writing. If they choose to appeal the decision via an application to court, the refusal of application letter will provide the court with the basis for the decision.
- The decision, the reasons for it and the individual's response to it must be recorded on the case records including the risk management plan

7. Transfer due to an escalation in risk of serious harm

7.1 **This PF replaces PI 57/14 risk escalation** and simplifies the process. Where legacy structures remain in place, legacy CRC staff will be required to continue with transfers to legacy NPS teams in the following circumstances:

- Where an individual subject to supervision receives either a Sexual Risk Order (SRO) or a Sexual Harm Prevention Order (SHPO).
- Cases where the prosecution of an individual has been brought by the National Crime Agency (NCA) and a Serious Crime Prevention Order (SCPO) is imposed, or where the case falls within the exceptional public interest case definition and therefore should be transferred to legacy NPS colleagues.
- Where the RoSH level of an individual that they are managing in custody during the last 12 weeks of custody has increased to high.
- Where the risk presented by the supervised individual increases to high Risk of Serious Harm (RoSH).

7.2 The revised requirements for risk escalation include:

- The current RO must contact the relevant Single Point of Contact (SPOC) in the Region covering the relevant legacy CRC area, so they are aware of a potential transfer and ensure staff availability to discuss the transfer once the request has been submitted.
- Where immediate public and child protection concerns arise, the RO must take immediate appropriate action to mitigate RoSH, including contacting the police or other relevant emergency service.
- An updated OASys assessment containing all relevant details of the increase in risk must be completed in place of previous risk escalation forms.
- The SPO in the legacy CRC team must review this assessment and make a Delius entry to confirm that management oversight has taken place. Due to restrictions on counter-signatory rights it will be the legacy NPS SPO who will hold responsibility for formally counter-signing the revised assessment after the risk escalation has been agreed.
- Transfer using NDelius should be initiated within one working day of a legacy NPS decision confirming that a case should be transferred.
- If there is a dispute between transferring and receiving teams in relation to accepting the case, where it cannot be agreed at SPO level the case must be escalated to the Heads of PDUs for resolution.

8. Non-Compliance

- 8.1 If the supervised individual persists with the change of address, without permission of the responsible officer (or court), then appropriate enforcement action must be initiated. (Please refer to 'Enforcement of Community Orders, Suspended Sentence Orders and Post-sentence supervision' Policy Framework).

9. Specific cohorts

High Risk

- 9.1 Individuals subject to life or IPP licence, MAPPA, National Security Division management, or a high risk of serious harm assessment, require senior manager agreement to transfer, at 'Head of PDU' level or above. Specific requirements for this cohort include:

- Where a MAPPA eligible supervised individual requires a case transfer the home area must review the MAPPA level and send the appropriate documents to the receiving area MAPPA co-ordinator or locally determined equivalent (for Level 1 cases this should be a MAPPA G form, and for Level 2/3 cases it should be the most recent set of MAPPA minutes). Practitioners should refer also to the MAPPA Level 1 Policy Framework, once published, for further guidance on Level 1 cases.
- As a general rule, the receiving MAPPA Area should accept in good faith the existing level of management of the transferred in case. The lead agency in the receiving area should review and consider the level of management following the transfer.
- ViSOR records must also be fully updated including relevant transfer details. It is the responsibility of the transferring area to arrange transfer of the ViSOR record and to notify the receiving area if any parties wish to remain as a partner to the record (ViSOR standards 3.0).
- Where the home area is managing the case at levels 2 or 3, a MAPPA meeting must be held involving the transferring and receiving area, along with all the relevant agencies to ensure that effective information sharing takes place to address the transfer issues. This meeting may be held before or after the transfer, as the timing and scheduling of MAPP meetings should not cause delay in the receiving area's management of the offender and should be arranged by the area in the best position to do so. Due regard must be given to the timings of meetings as set out in the National MAPPA Guidance, but where the first joint meeting involving both the home and receiving areas is being held *after* transfer has taken place, the Probation Service must seek to arrange this within the first four weeks.

Youth Transfers

- 9.2 Individuals transitioning from Youth Justice Services will sometimes be supervised by the Probation Service outside of the local geographical area. In such instances, Chapter 10 of the Joint National Protocol for Transition (England and Wales versions) provides additional guidance on how this process should be managed to ensure that the principles of good transition are applied and smooth case transfer to the receiving area is achieved. (See also Annex B for additional guidance)

Referrals to Approved Premises / Accommodation Projects

- 9.3 When a RO refers an individual to an Approved Premises or privately managed accommodation project in different geographical areas, where possible consultation with the relevant area should be undertaken before the placement is made to share relevant risk

and needs information. Supervised individuals must not be routed directly to the accommodation provider, unless exceptional circumstances arise which have managerial oversight and approval.

Pre-release transfer (OMiC)

- 9.4 Pre-release transfer requests should be made at the earliest opportunity. Responsible Officers should use professional judgement when considering the merits and timing of case transfers. However, certain processes such as HDC, ROTL and Parole may trigger a request or decision to transfer, especially where an address in an alternative geographical area is being proposed. In such circumstances, the transferring team should not seek to transfer before these processes are completed but should seek to involve the receiving area in the process decisions. The prison should continue to communicate with the transferring team with responsibility for completing these assessments until a transfer decision is made.
- 9.5 If the prisoner's release is subject to a parole decision, then the home area will retain responsibility for preparing the PAROM 1 and liaising with the prison to ensure the parole dossier is completed and on time. The parole hearing also provides the opportunity to ensure there is no gap in the management of the case on release, via good communication between the transferring and receiving agencies. Once the reason for requesting transfer has been established and the release address confirmed, then the earliest point of transfer should always be the aim of both receiving and transferring agencies. Following completion of the parole hearing this should not exceed 20 working days, except under exceptional circumstances that are supported by managerial oversight (see Section 6.5 for further details).
- 9.6 Touch Point in Custody – if a case has been identified within a PAROM or during a pre - release discussion as requiring a pre-release transfer, a management oversight activity should be added to NDelius to confirm release arrangements, MAPPA Level and actions outlined for the RO in relation to transferring the case at the earliest opportunity.
- 9.7 Under the Offender Management in Custody (OMiC) model cases meeting the legacy NPS allocation criteria are allocated to a Community Offender Manager (COM) seven-and-a-half months prior to release, unless they have ten-months or less to serve at the point of sentence, when they will be allocated a COM at the start of sentence. Cases meeting the legacy CRC allocation criteria are transferred from a Prison Offender Manager (POM) to a COM when they have 12-weeks left to serve on their sentence, or receive an immediate COM allocation if they have 12 weeks or less left to serve at the point of sentence. Where a COM has already been allocated to a case it is that person's responsibility to take forward any action needed should an escalation in risk concern be identified.
- 9.8 Where the POM continues to hold the allocation for a case, it is that person's responsibility to take the appropriate steps where the need for possible risk escalation is identified (all practitioners involved in custodial risk escalation should refer to the Equip Process Map: POM Custodial Risk Escalation Process). The re-allocation of a case may also become necessary if other legacy NPS allocation criteria are subsequently met. Where the hand-over point to the COM has not yet been reached for such cases the case transfer will be between Prison and Probation POMs.
- 9.9 Where a custody case was allocated according to legacy CRC case criteria (as recorded in CAS), and the prison subsequently identify the prisoner as a Foreign National who should be auto allocated to legacy NPS, the POM must commence risk escalation process to ensure the case is correctly reallocated to legacy NPS staff.

- 9.10 For the purpose of custodial allocations the OMiC model will continue to require distinction between legacy CRC and legacy NPS allocation criteria until OMiC has completed the process of fully aligning to the Unified Model.

National Security Division (NSD) cases

- 9.11 **Until the allocation to NSD is completed, responsibility for the management of the case will remain in the region. i.e. held by those that know the case best at this time.**
- 9.12 Practitioners should consult Equip for details of the process for transferring a case to the National Security Division. It is important to note that any planning for a transfer of this cohort will need to include sufficient time for effective handover; with the expectation of joint working a case for a period, up to one month to facilitate 3-way meetings, joint attendance at MAPPA or other partner agency engagement – before case allocation moves from the region to the NSD unit.
- 9.13 There may be some exceptions to this e.g. if there is a natural change in RO in the region and that can be agreed between the NSD unit and HoPP/PDU head on a case by case basis.
- 9.14 Additional guidance in relation to management of NSD cases can be found in annex A of National Standards 2021. (National Standards)

Foreign Nationals

- 9.15 Foreign National Offenders must not be transferred to another area if the individual is in custody or in immigration detention and subject to deportation proceedings, (if at any stage the proceedings for deportation are discontinued then a transfer request can be considered on its merits). Where Immigration Bail is being considered address check requests should be completed.
- 9.16 If the supervised individual awaiting deportation is on licence or supervision in the community, a transfer may be undertaken. The responsible officer must discuss the case with Home Office Criminal Casework before transfer to understand what impact this would have on their efforts to deport.
- 9.17 If an individual is identified as a Foreign National after the point of sentence and allocation, they must be moved to legacy NPS teams until such time as full structural alignment has been made within regions. By following the risk escalation process (section 9.8) the prison POM will also prompt the reallocation of the case to a probation POM.

10. Residence requirements

- 10.1 Supervised individuals on licence or subject to a community sentence with a residence requirement, or electronic monitoring requirement must seek the prior approval of the RO before they change address. The duty to obtain permission from the responsible officer or court before changing residence is only applicable to those convicted of offences committed on or after the commencement of the Offender Rehabilitation Act (ORA) 2014. These are now contained in section 216 of the Sentencing Act 2020.
- 10.2 Section 216(6) of the Sentencing Act 2020 stipulates that the grounds on which the Responsible Officer or court can refuse an application for permission are that, in the opinion of the Officer or court, the change in residence is (a) likely to prevent the individual complying with a requirement imposed by the relevant order, or (b) would hinder the individual's

rehabilitation. It should be noted that an appropriate court may, on an application by the offender, give permission in a case in which the Officer has refused permission.

- 10.3 In line with Section 6.8, an assessment of the suitability of the proposed transfer address should be made within 10 working days.
- 10.4 Any potential change of address has to be carefully considered for cases with the Alcohol Abstinence and Monitoring Requirement (AAMR), and GPS monitoring requirement. The RO must clarify if this requirement can continue in the proposed transfer area before any agreement can be made.

11. **Temporary moves**

- 11.1 A supervised individual may be released or allowed to live for a short period at an address other than their normal home address. Situations where this is likely to occur are:
- a period of residence at an Approved Premises
 - a residential drug treatment programme
 - a mental health treatment programme
 - a verified temporary period of employment
 - any other residential facility
 - section 47 transfers/hospital orders into private secure mental health facilities.

Please note that this list is not exhaustive and there may be other situations for example where a supervised individual is escaping domestic abuse or other adverse domestic related circumstances.

- 11.2 The decision as to the timeframe that constitutes a temporary move will be down to the professional judgement of the RO, agreed by the line manager in the transfer-in and receiving area and recorded in a management oversight entry. Where the reasons for a temporary transfer relate to a residential placement (Approved Premises, Residential Treatment), the temporary transfer arrangement should usually be limited to no more than twelve weeks. Other transfer reasons should usually be limited to no more than eight weeks, in alignment with the assessment duty under the Homelessness Reduction Act. In exceptional circumstances further extensions may be granted, but these will be subject to management oversight recording.
- 11.3 Where the supervised Individual is at a temporary address/placement and there is no imminent likelihood of it changing, consideration should be given to a formal case transfer request being completed. This applies also to cases where professional judgement has been exercised in approving a temporary address (for example, move on accommodation at the end of an AP residency despite some concerns being noted, or where an address has been approved in order to prevent street homelessness due to an emerging crisis). In such cases it is imperative that a strong working relationship is capable of being developed, in order to both assist with supporting the supervised individual secure a stable alternative outcome, as well as enabling effective monitoring and management of risk.
- 11.4 Where a supervised individual moves area on a temporary basis and the provisions of 11.3 (above) do not apply, the RO will continue to provide management of the case. This will reduce the risks associated with the transfer of a case, such as failure to share information and confusion of where responsibility lies. This also ensures continuity of support and maintenance of the working relationship.
- 11.5 The responsible officer must undertake an assessment of modes and frequency of contact available to maintain effective sentence management. During the temporary transfer there may be an increase in telephone contacts or video calls.

- 11.6 Minimum monthly face to face contact must be maintained in line with National Standards. Where geography means it is not feasible for the supervised individual and RO (Home Area) to do this, or where the risk assessment indicates greater frequency of direct contact is required, the RO should make arrangements with the office closest to the supervised individual's temporary residence to outline the supervised individuals risks and needs to secure a practitioner to facilitate the minimum contact requirement via a three way video call between them, the responsible officer and the supervised individual.
- 11.7 As well as facilitating the three-way meeting, the practitioner, when physically in the office with the supervised individual, will be able to make a sensory assessment of the individual, including noticing who they may be attending the office with, whether there is a change in physical appearance, suggestion of alcohol use etc and relay and record observations or concerns to the RO.
- 11.8 Where a case is subject to MAPPA management at level 2 or 3 and a temporary move is being considered, advice and support should be sought from all agencies attending the meeting (home and receiving areas). MAPPA management would usually move to the new area unless both areas agreed it was more appropriate for the original area to retain responsibility. This would be most likely in the case of a short-term temporary move.
- 11.9 When a temporary period of time away from residence is agreed, records and sentence plan should be updated to reflect:
- the planned period of time the supervised individual will be away from their regular address
 - the agreed frequency and modes of contact to be maintained between responsible officer and supervised individual – including frequency of face to face three-way meetings
 - Agreed MAPPA management arrangements for eligible cases

12. **Guidance**

- 12.1 Practice guidance with associated mandatory instructions and an outline of processes can be found in EQuIP. This is an online portal available to all staff and contains all PS and OMiC operational and corporate processes, procedures and guidance.

If you do not already have access, go to <https://equip-portal.rocstac.com> to request an account. When considering case transfer or risk escalation practitioners should consult equip for the most up-to-date process detail. Useful guidance includes -

- Case Transfer page
- Risk Escalation page
- OMiC Risk Escalation
- Touchpoints Model (TPM)
- CRISS case recording
- National Standards

Transfers in or out of jurisdiction

The aim of this document is to provide practical guidance to staff with regard to jurisdiction and practice for the enforcement of orders that are:

- Imposed in England and Wales and managed in another part of the United Kingdom, or
- Managed in England and Wales after being imposed elsewhere in the United Kingdom.



UK Jurisdiction
community penalties

https://equip-portal.rocstac.com/ctrlwebisapi.dll/?__id=docDetails.showDoc&doc=D52927F1211848DCAB19A316A71A3D87&dpt=1

Transfers from Youth to Adult services

The most recent process and practice guidance for transition from youth to adult probation can be found in equip:

England

Equip - Youth Transfer (England)



Joint_National_Protocol_for_Transitions_in

Wales

Equip Link - Youth Transfer (Wales)



Y2A_Principles_and_Guidance_Wales.pdf