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1. **Introduction**

This guidance is for treatment managers and all programmes staff, in custody and community, who currently use Risk Matrix 2000 (RM2000) to determine eligibility for accredited programmes for those with sexual/sexually motivated convictions. This document must be read alongside the OASys Sexual (proven reoffending) Predictor (OSP) Policy Framework document which contains further information about the tool.

OSP will replace RM2000 and be used to assess programme eligibility. From 1 March 2021, all new cases will have OSP scores calculated producing both an OSP contact (OSP/C) and an OSP indecent images\(^1\) (OSP/I) risk score. This score will replace RM2000 and be used for assessing eligibility for accredited programmes for people with convictions for sexual or sexually motivated offences.

RM2000 scores should no longer be generated. The RM2000 assessment tool will no longer be used by HMPPS in assessing the likelihood of proven reoffending for people with sexual or sexually motivated convictions. Therefore RM2000 will no longer be used to determine eligibility for accredited programmes\(^2\).

Detailed guidance is outlined throughout this document about how the switch over will be managed for the period where there will be cases with both a RM2000 and an OSP score. **This is different for custody and community cases** (see section 5).

The scoring and rescoring of OSP will be the responsibility of the responsible officer undertaking the OASys assessment at designated points (see OSP Policy Framework document). As OSP is calculated in OASys and only recalculated at certain review points, programme teams will not be required to calculate OSP\(^3\). Therefore, prior to undertaking suitability assessments, the Treatment Manager should make sure they are doing so using the most the OSP scores in the most up-to-date OASys assessment.

1.1. **OSP Validation**

Two quantitative studies have confirmed the predictive validity of OSP in comparison to RM2000 using large samples from NOMS (now HMPPS) (Howard & Barnett, 2015 and Howard & Wakeling, in press). These findings were subject to external peer reviews in February 2020, the outcomes of which support the plans to implement of OSP.

An ‘inter-rater’ reliability trial has been completed on the scoring of OSP. Furthermore it was found that OSP, in comparison to completion of RM2000, is quicker to use and could be completed using written guidance, as opposed to the 2 days training requirement for RM2000.

\(^1\) The OSP internet (OSP/I) scale refers to likelihood of proven re-offending related to viewing and downloading of indecent images whereas the OSP Contact (OSP/C) scale relates to likelihood of proven contact and other types of non-contact re-offending.

\(^2\) The only exception to this is whereby sentencing decisions have already been made on the basis of RM2000 for community cases. Please refer to section 5 within this document for further guidance.

\(^3\) The only time limited caveat to this will be for custody cases on programme waiting lists at the time OSP is implemented.
The 2 year proven reoffending rates are set out in the following table. It is important to remember that the two scales predict different types of reoffending based on different information, therefore the two scales are not directly comparable in terms of reconviction rates. (NB Further information will be available in the OSP manual).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>OSP/C</th>
<th>OSP/I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Using OSP/C and OSP/I for programme targeting

Calculating OSP produces two outcomes:

- **OSP/C** predicts proven reoffending for a sexual/sexually motivated offence involving actual or attempted physical contact with a victim (proven contact sexual reoffending)
- **OSP/I** predicts proven reoffending involving indecent images of children (IIOC) (proven IIOC reoffending).

OSP/I scale is a three point scale categorising cases as low, medium or high. This is different to OSP/C part of the scale which has a 4 point rating of low, medium, high and very high.

The two scales are used in different ways to identify eligibility for different programmes.

Of the two OSP scales, only the OSP/C score will be used to assess eligibility for the programmes in the table below. .

Table 1 programmes using OSP/C score only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>OSP/C scale rating:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaizen*</td>
<td>High OSP/C and above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becoming New Me +*</td>
<td>High OSP/C and above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Me Strengths*</td>
<td>Medium OSP/C and above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizon</td>
<td>Medium OSP/C and above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For these programmes, additional programme need assessment should be conducted as per programme manual instructions; to include Programme Needs Analysis (PNA), and where relevant, New Me Strengths need assessment and assessment of learning disability and challenges.

*Horizon differs in approach using both OSP/I and OSP/C in combination. This is outlined and explained later in this document.
It is vital that Treatment Managers are clear that they have the OSP/C score for the individual and are not referring to or incorporating the OSP/I score when reviewing referrals for the above programmes.

2.1. A note regarding Healthy Sex Programme (HSP)

This programme is available in custody only. It is primarily intended as a secondary programme for graduates of one of primary aligned programmes (see table 1 programmes using OSP/C score only above). There may be occasions whereby referrals come from Offender Manager processes for individuals who have not accessed a previous primary aligned programme. These should be infrequent and Treatment Managers must follow guidance in the management manual for HSP when considering such cases. Therefore referrals for HSP would generally include only participants with OSP/C scores of medium and above (unless override criteria has been applied, guidance for which is in the HSP manual).

2.2. A note about people with Indecent Images of Children (IIOC) convictions in custody.

People with IIOC offences will have an OSP/C score calculated, as well as an OSP/I score.

Some cases may have an OSP/C score of medium or above, which if applying the guidance above, will seemingly make them eligible for a programme. However in custody there is no ‘internet only’ programme (i.e iHorizon) provision available. Other accredited programme offers for this cohort are not commissioned, except where the individual is assessed as very high on RM2000.

OSP does not change this commissioning position but utilises a combination of the contact and internet scale to identify these exceptional cases. Therefore using OSP, people with IIOC offences should only be considered for programmes addressing sexual offending in custody where they score both OSP/I high and OSP/C very high.*

* Additional needs assessments apply as usual where required and if applicable for the programme being considered. Treatment Managers should refer to programme suitability and assessment manuals for further information.

3. iHorizon (NPS community only)

The OSP/I score should be the starting point when considering eligibility for iHorizon in the community for cases that have IIOC only convictions.

It is important to understand that cases with no internet convictions and mixed types (contact and non-contact) will still have a score generated on the OSP/I scale. Such cases should NOT be considered for iHorizon as they do not meet the suitability criteria for the programme. They could, however, be considered as appropriate for other programmes, should their OSP/C scores meet the relevant criteria.

Additional guidance for men with extreme pornography offences - Where extreme pornography offences co-exist with IIOC offences, iHorizon is still considered a suitable programme and the

---

* If the individual has other types of non-sexual offending and a medium or above OGRS score i.e. risk of all types of reoffending they could be considered for a TSP suitability assessment. They may also be in scope for suitability assessment for BNM+ or Kaizen if other offence history is present and risk and need criteria met.
guidelines below should be followed. However if someone’s ONLY sexual offences are extreme pornography, iHorizon is NOT suitable and you should refer to Section 4 below.

3.1 OSP and iHorizon eligibility

1. All OSP/I cases scoring high are automatically in scope and eligible for iHorizon providing they have IIOC only convictions and meet other suitability criteria for the programme.

2. For medium OSP/I cases see section 3.2 below.

3. Cases scoring **low on OSP/I are not in scope for iHorizon** – cases with OSP/I Low score will **not** have an IIOC related conviction.

3.2. Instruction for OSP/I Medium cases

Individuals with one IIOC conviction will automatically have a score of OSP/I Medium. If using OSP, as we have RM2000 previously, this would bring all cases (where an individual has an IIOC conviction and no contact convictions) into scope, even if that is their only conviction. This would increase demand for the programme significantly and would not be in line with evidence base on effective programme targeting principles pertaining to ‘Risk Need and Responsivity’.

Where a person with **IIOC only offences has an OSP/I score of medium and** meets the programmes’ suitability criteria, the **OSP/C scale should be consulted.**

Only cases with OSP/I medium scores and OSP/C medium or above scores will be in scope for iHorizon [see table below].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSP/I score</th>
<th>OSP/C score</th>
<th>iHorizon eligibility outcome:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Not in scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Not in scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium, High or Very High</td>
<td>In Scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>In Scope</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By using the OSP/C scale in this way for iHorizon only, it helps target people with 1 IIOC conviction who have additional risk indicators linked to age and criminal history which the evidence base suggests are at elevated risk of proven reoffending. It is these such cases that are understood to be more likely to benefit from intervention such as iHorizon in comparison to lower risk counterparts.

3.3 New Me Strengths (community only, custody to refer to section 2.2 above)

For people with learning disabilities and challenges (LDC), New Me Strengths (NMS) is available to people in the community with IIOC offences on the basis of their static risk being OSP/I high or OSP/I medium and OSP/C being medium and above (see table below). Suitability must then always be additionally assessed with the person meeting not only risk but the need criteria stipulated for NMS. Under no circumstances should people be placed on NMS on the basis of their OSP scores alone.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSP/I score</th>
<th>OSP/C score</th>
<th>In scope for NMS</th>
<th>Progress to needs assessment required to determined suitability:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Not in scope</td>
<td>NA*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Not in scope</td>
<td>NA*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium, High or Very High</td>
<td>In Scope</td>
<td>NMS needs assessment OASys Learning Screen Tool Adaptive Functioning Checklist Revised Clinical Interview (optional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>In Scope</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Needs assessment would only be progressed for such cases if clinical over ride criteria was considered relevant for lower static risk cases (see section 6 of this document)*

4. OSP and Non-Contact/ Non-IIOC offending

OSP estimates the risk of proven reoffending for contact sexual and IIOC offences. It does not estimate the risk of further non-contact/non-IIOC (NC/NIIOC) offending (e.g. offences involving Exposure, Voyeurism or Bestiality). While the risks of contact sexual and IIOC reoffending are usually of primary concern, all men who have been convicted of a sexual offence present some risk of NC/NIIOC reoffending, and NC/NIIOC reoffending may be the primary concern for men whose sexual offending history exclusively involves NC/NIIOC offences.

These cases will be put into scope for programmes based upon the number of separate sanctions they have for these offences, however it should be noted that OSP/C score ALWAYS takes precedence. Therefore if someone has an OSP/C score of medium or above they are in scope for programmes as detailed above.

Please note that this section is for people whose ONLY sexual offending is non-contact/Non IIOC. Where individuals have engaged in other types of sexual offending as well as non-contact offending the usual guidance is followed. It is also important to note that where extreme pornography offending co-exists with IIOC offending they may still be in scope for iHorizon – see section 3 above.

4.1 In the community

Anyone whose only sexual offence is one NC/NIIOC conviction is out of scope for programmes unless they have an OSP/C classification of medium or above. Anyone with two or more NC/NIIOC sanctions is automatically in scope for Horizon or NMS*.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of NC/NIIOC sanctions</th>
<th>OSP/C score</th>
<th>Programmes in scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Out of scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium or above</td>
<td>Horizon/NMS*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or more</td>
<td>Low or above</td>
<td>Horizon/NMS*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* New Me Strengths need assessment and assessment of learning disability and challenges is required.

4.2 In custody

Anyone whose only sexual offence is one NC/NIIOC conviction is out of scope for programmes unless they have an OSP/C classification of medium which places them in scope for Horizon or NMS*, or an OSP/C classification of High or Very High which puts them in scope for Kaizen* or BNM+*. Anyone with two NC/NIIOC offences is in scope for Horizon or NMS* unless they have an OSP of high or above, in which case they are in scope for Kaizen* or BNM+*. Anyone with 3 or more cases is automatically in scope for Kaizen* or BNM+*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of NC/NIIOC sanctions</th>
<th>OSP/C score</th>
<th>Programmes in scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Out of scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Horizon/NMS*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High or above</td>
<td>Kaizen*/BNM+*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Low or Medium</td>
<td>Horizon/NMS*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High or Very High</td>
<td>Kaizen*/BNM+*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more</td>
<td>Low or above</td>
<td>Kaizen*/BNM+*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For these programmes, additional programme need assessment should be conducted as per programme manual instructions; to include Programme Needs Analysis (PNA), and/or where relevant, New Me Strengths need assessment and assessment of learning disability and challenges.

The usual caveats apply with regards to other factors affecting programme suitability, e.g assessments of need and responsivity.

5. OSP and existing cases assessed using RM2000

5.1. How RM2000 was previously used to identify programme eligibility

By way of reminder, community and custody programme eligibility using RM2000 was as follows:

- **iHorizon**: RM2000 medium and above
- **Horizon**: RM2000 medium and above
- **New Me Strengths (NMS)**: RM2000 medium and above
Kaizen* RM2000 high and above
Becoming New Me* + (BNM+) RM2000 high and above

Please see section 2.1 for a note regarding Healthy Sex Programme (HSP)

*Kaizen and BNM+ are available only in custody.

Whilst this guidance is for programmes targeting sexual and or sexually motivated convictions only, Interventions Services have other programmes which address other types of offending behaviours which also refer to RM2000 as part of selection consideration (e.g. Thinking Skills Programme-TSP). Programme teams should refer to the programme manuals for further information which will be updated in due course to reflect the change from RM2000 to OSP. Any questions should be directed to Interventions Services as per the contact details at bottom of this document.

5.2 How to apply OSP to community/licence cases only

Please note that the below guidance is for community cases and marks a different approach from custody. For custody cases please follow guidance in section 5.4 below.

There will be cases whose risk levels will change when assessed using OSP instead of RM2000. The introduction of OSP, however, is not intended to automatically affect or change sentence planning decisions which have already been made using RM2000 for community cases. That is, decisions which have been informed by RM2000 and implemented will not be overturned, and decisions that were determined and commenced when RM2000 was the actuarial tool will remain in place. For example, if a Court has sentenced someone to a programme requirement based on their RM2000 score, this will not change even if their OSP score means they would not automatically fall into scope for a programme. Similarly, if a prison governor has approved a request or the parole board have added a licence condition for a programme to be completed, this will remain. The principle is that no programme pathway decision already made, informed by RM2000 will be changed as a result of OSP for community/ licence cases. This is regardless of whether the OSP score, if applied, would move the person in or out of scope for a programme. This is a different approach to the management of custody cases (see section 5.4 below).

5.3 Cases moving from custody to community

There may be instances whereby someone in custody scored low RM2000 and did not undertake a programme and does not have a programme condition on their licence. Following an individual’s release from prison, their OSP score is generated. This could then place the individual into scope for a programme. In this instance, an appropriate pre-release decision had been made for a licence to be issued without a programme requirement on the basis of the RM2000 score. For this reason, the sentence plan should not change automatically based on the new OSP scores. That said, the OSP scores should be considered as new information, for example, giving more information about what specific risk the individual poses (i.e. a prediction of contact and internet proven reoffending rates). If the individual has stable dynamic risk factors, a robust Risk Management Plan and a number of protective factors in place, you should not seek to add a programme condition to their licence based only on the change in risk level using OSP. However, if there are concerns about the individual’s commitment to comply with conditions which are suggestive of offence related risks, or evidence of ongoing acute risk factors, then you may wish to consider whether a programme referral should be submitted. In this instance, you should discuss a programme with the individual and ensure that they are motivated to engage and comply.
5.4 How to apply OSP to cases in custody only

Please note that the below guidance is for custody cases and marks a different approach from community. For community cases please follow guidance in section 5.2 above.

All cases in custody must have OSP calculated, and the programme pathway decision will be based upon their OSP score.

From the date of OSP implementation, all cases that have been assessed as suitable for an accredited programme (using RM2000) and are on a waiting list but have not yet started that programme, will have their OSP scores manually calculated. This will be a one-off exercise using a standalone OSP calculator, which will not necessitate an OASys review. This will be overseen by Psychology Services, with Indeterminate Sentenced cases being prioritised first.

Furthermore, any cases which have already been referred in for assessment of suitability, will have their OSP scores calculated. The programme pathway decision will be based upon the OSP score. Where there is a change from RM2000 scores, the Treatment Manager\(^6\) will review the case to determine suitability in line with the updated guidance for determining programme suitability under OSP. For programmes where additional needs assessments are then undertaken before final pathway decisions are reached, these processes continue as usual. In the event a PNA has already been undertaken and indicates high need but the OSP once calculated is not high or very high, Treatment Managers can override the OSP score for programme pathway decisions on the basis of the PNA assessed need that individual has (as per override criteria). Programmes teams should continue to refer to the existing relevant programme and management manuals.

Once assessed using OSP, cases which are no longer in scope for a programme will be removed from the waiting list. Cases where the change in risk level means that a different programme may now be appropriate (e.g. Kaizen instead of Horizon), will be referred on for any further assessment required. Timely liaison with OMs will be essential during this process to ensure sentence plans can be reviewed/revised as required.

6. Low risk cases

As with RM2000, OSP also helps identify those cases who are not eligible for an accredited programme whereby structured supervision such as Maps for Change might be appropriate. An individual with the following scores would not be eligible for a programme:

- OSP/C Low and OSP/I Low
- OSP/C Low and OSP/I Medium

\(^6\) For Kaizen this will be undertaken in conjunction with the Treatment Managers Clinical Lead if the Treatment Manager is not a qualified Psychologist or Probation Officer.
6.1. Clinical Overrides for Low risk cases:

There are no significant changes to overriding programme pathway criteria for low risk cases who are usually out of scope for accredited programmes, based on static risk assessments. Therefore OSP overrides should be considered in much the same way as for RM2000.

We have included a reminder of some of the principles you might look to if considering this. Overrides should only be considered in exceptional cases. However please get in touch with Interventions Services should you wish to seek further guidance on any specific cases or have queries pertaining to clinical overrides decisions you are making.

There will be some individuals for whom, like with RM2000, the OSP score might not fully capture or represent the risk they present. Whilst HMPPS’s position is not to provide accredited sexual offending programmes for low risk people, where it is reasonably considered that OSP might underestimate risk (as outlined below), such cases can be considered for clinical override and people may access a place on a programme.

Considering clinical overrides may be relevant in the following circumstances:

Where an individual has a conviction for sexual homicide and may be classified as low risk of reconviction by OSP/C. Where this is the case, such individuals should be treated as if they are at least medium risk of reconviction on OSP/C and hence will be in scope for an accredited programme.

Where there is reason to believe that the OSP assessment might underestimate risk. Such cases might include:

- If the person is part of a marginal group on which the tool has not been properly tested and validated due to small or unknown sample sizes in original data sets upon which the tool is derived\(^7\). This may include for example aforementioned people with sexual homicide convictions and people with mental illnesses where risk could be underestimated. OSP should still be used and considered when looking at programme suitability for such cases but given this caveat it is important (as we would encourage for all cases) that Treatment Managers consider all available risk and need information in making defensible decisions regarding pathways. Such decisions should not only or indeed over rely on static risk alone for such groups.
- If the criminal history information used to complete the assessment is incomplete and or unavailable.
- If there are additional risk factors that OSP doesn’t measure (e.g. psychopathy, personality disorder).
- If the individual’s level of dynamic risk is not characteristic of someone in that risk group.
- Discretionary life-sentenced individuals and those serving indeterminate public protection sentences.

\(^7\) Unlike RM2000, OSP can be considered to have some predictive validity for people assessed as having LDC needs as this cohort were identified and included within original samples for the tool.
Such overrides must be monitored by Treatment and Programme Managers to avoid them becoming routine. This is because there is evidence that overrides can easily be used too frequently and do not usually reflect increased risk of reoffending. Overrides must only be used in exceptional circumstances, not in the majority of low risk cases.

In addition to overriding low risk cases caution should be employed when considering the OSP scores for all marginal groups where we are currently unable to ascertain the predictive validity of the tool in assessing likelihood of reoffending, for example with transgender people. (Please refer to the OSP Policy Framework document for further information.)

7. **Interventions Services contact details**

For queries relating to use of OSP for Accredited Programme suitability please contact the relevant clinical mailbox/s as appropriate:

**Interventions High Intensity Clinical Support**
<Interventions_HighIntensityClinicalSupport@justice.gov.uk>;

**Interventions Moderate Intensity Clinical Support**
<Interventions_ModerateIntensityClinicalSupport@justice.gov.uk>