Ministry of JUSTICE

Punishment and Reform: Effective Community Sentences

Government Response

Response to Consultation CP(R)20/2012

October 2012

Punishment and Reform: Effective Community Sentences

Government response

Presented to Parliament
by the Lord Chancellor and Secretary of State for Justice
by Command of Her Majesty

October 2012

Cm 8469 £10.75

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at effectivecommunitysentences@justice.gsi.gov.uk

This publication is available for download at www.official-documents.gov.uk and on our website at www.justice.gov.uk

ISBN: 9780101846929

Printed in the UK by The Stationery Office Limited
on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office
ID 2520239 10/12

Printed on paper containing 75% recycled fibre content minimum.

Contents

Ministerial Foreword

The public wants a justice system that protects them from crime and properly punishes those who have committed it. But ours is failing to live up to expectations.

The most serious weakness concerns our prisons, which do too little properly to challenge the individuals who end up inside them. The consequence is that nearly half those exiting the gates re-offend within a year, creating thousands more victims. Sorting out that situation is why I'm determined to deliver a rehabilitation revolution: ensuring that more of the right people are inside prison, but that fewer come back.

But the limitations of our system don't stop at the prison walls. Community sentences are a vital part of any effective justice system – because judges and magistrates need options for those who commit less serious crimes, where a prison sentence would not be merited. Just like prison, to be credible and effective community sentences need to punish those who have done wrong and help them to go straight. The trouble is – ours aren't working well enough.

It's true that, with the right mix of requirements, community sentences can be effective at rehabilitating offenders and a great deal of excellent work is going on across the justice system in support of this goal. But overall re-offending rates for community sentences remain too high. And – more serious still – they lack credibility as effective punishment. Sentences can involve just a weekly meeting with probation officers, or as little as six hours a week of community payback. A frustrating inability to prove offenders' means can result in fines and compensation being set at levels apparently unrelated to the swaggering lifestyles of some criminals. And, despite recent improvements, enforcement action when offenders don't turn up for community payback or bother to pay fines is still too patchy and inconsistent.

I share public concern that offenders given community sentences often feel they are getting away with it, slapped on the wrist rather than properly punished. Meaningful alternatives to prison that command public confidence are vital to delivering a better system: one where victims feel that justice has truly been done, where sentencers can exercise real choice in how they punish offenders, and where more tools are available to those working to help rehabilitate offenders.

This Government has already made a start on making community sentences more robust. But it is our ambition to go even further. That is why, since March, we have been consulting on proposals to bring about a step change in what community sentences require of offenders. A wide range of groups and individuals found time to respond. I am grateful for the views received and have listened carefully to them. This document sets out our revised plans for credible, recognisable punishment in the community – which sends a clear

message wrongdoing will not be tolerated, while driving down reoffending so that people do not come back into the system.

Under our proposals, in future:

- Courts will be required to make sure there is punishment in every community order – whether community payback, a curfew that curtails an offenders' freedom, or fines. In the future, community sentences will always punish offenders as well as dealing with the reasons why the offence was committed in the first place.
- Punishments will be credible and meaningful. We are already reforming the delivery of community payback so that it will in future involve a full five day week of hard work and job seeking. We are also extending the maximum length of curfew from 12 to 16 hours a day, and increasing the maximum duration from 6 to 12 months. And we are giving courts the power to ban offenders from foreign travel. On top of these steps we will strengthen financial penalties so that they really bite. In future, those with assets like expensive cars will no longer be able to plead poverty. And we will allow courts access to data held by the taxman and the benefits office so offenders can not hide their true incomes. This measure should also help with swifter and more consistent enforcement when people refuse to pay.
- Sentences will grip offenders more effectively. We propose to allow courts to impose location monitoring. Using new technology, this will ensure that we can find out where offenders subject to the new measure have been. We will also be able to monitor compliance with other requirements, meaning that there will always be consequences for offenders who breach the terms of their sentences (for example, by going into areas they are not supposed to under an exclusion requirement).
- Finally, we are ensuring that community sentences do much more for victims, building on other reforms we've previously set out in *Getting it right for victims and witnesses.* Restorative justice can improve victim satisfaction and help offenders realise the consequences of their wrong-doing. We are changing the law to support its much greater use before sentence, as part of our wider strategy to embed RJ across the justice system. We will also remove the £5,000 cap on orders requiring offenders to pay compensation that currently applies in the magistrates' courts.

Altogether this package of reforms will help ensure that community sentences are properly punitive, are taken more seriously by offenders, and do more for victims. But the benefits don't end there. Though my aim is not to switch offenders between prison and the community, tougher community sentences may give more options to sentencers who currently feel that prison is the only robust choice. Crucially too, the changes should also help ensure that community sentences are more effective in delivering rehabilitation. For example, used creatively, the new provisions on electronic monitoring and curfews won't just punish offenders, but will support them to stop re-offending – whether by preventing them from being in places that may increase their risk of offending, or by fitting punishment around the support they receive to

reform. Similarly, wider use of restorative justice has the potential to help motivate many more offenders to go straight – as they confront what they've done to their victims and seek to make meaningful reparation.

Debates on criminal justice are too often framed as a choice between punishment or rehabilitation. But the truth is, this is a false division. Any sensible system needs both. If we get this reform right, stronger, more sensible community sentences will deliver better punishment and better rehabilitation. Together they will bolster our justice system, improving public confidence and contributing to reduced crime.

Chris Grayling

Lord Chancellor and Secretary of State for Justice

Introduction

1. On 27 March 2012, the Government published the consultation document *Punishment and Reform: Effective Community Sentences*. The consultation set out wide-ranging proposals to reform community sentences so that they can be effective both at reducing re-offending and providing robust and credible punishment.

2. The consultation closed on 22 June 2012. We received 247 written responses. We also held a number of events to ensure that we captured the views of relevant stakeholders, practitioners, and offenders:

   - Two consultation events, attended by sentencers, probation staff, and other practitioners working with offenders in the private, public and third sectors.
   - Three workshops with magistrates, court legal advisers and probation staff to explore in detail proposals specifically related to community orders.
   - A workshop with criminal justice practitioners to explore the equality impacts of the proposals.

3. We are grateful to all those who gave their time to respond to the consultation or to contribute to discussions at these events. A list of organisations that provided written responses to the consultation is at Annex A.

4. During and after the 12 week consultation period, we have reviewed the written responses and the feedback given to us at these events. This document summarises the responses, and sets out how we have refined our proposals in light of them.

5. We have also updated the Equality Impact Assessment following the consultation, and completed an Impact Assessment for the policy proposals being taken forward. Both of these are published as separate documents alongside this response.

Intensive Community Punishment

6. Rather than centrally mandating or marketing a set intensive order for specified types of offenders, we will encourage courts (drawing on advice from Probation Trusts) to make use of improvement to the community order framework to create intensive combinations of requirements that meet local needs. For example, once provisions are commenced the maximum length of curfew courts can impose will be extended from 12 hours a day to 16 hours, and the overall duration from 6 months to 12. The Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders (LASPO) Act 2012 also creates new foreign travel prohibition; alcohol abstinence and

monitoring requirements and gives sentencers more discretion to impose treatment requirements for offenders with mental health issues or problems with alcohol or substance abuse.

Mandatory punitive element in every community order

7. We will legislate to place a duty on courts to include in the community order a requirement that fulfils the purpose of punishment for the offender. The court will be able to exercise this duty by imposing a fine instead if it considers that to be appropriate. While we will not specify what requirements courts should impose, on the basis that what is punitive for one offender may not be punitive for another, our expectation is that these would generally be restrictions of liberty that represent to the public a recognisable sanction (such as curfews, exclusion, or community payback). The duty will provide for an exemption in exceptional circumstances where it would be unjust to impose a punitive element.

Electronic monitoring

8. We will encourage courts to make use of changes to the length and duration of curfews under the LASPO Act 2012, and to make more flexible and creative use of curfews within these powers. We will also legislate to give courts the power to impose location monitoring as part of a community order by extending the current electronic monitoring requirement. This will allow courts to make use of new technology to track offenders as part of their sentence (rather than just monitoring compliance with other requirements), for the purposes of deterring crime, public protection and crime detection.

9. We are clear that implementation of this new provision will be subject to the relevant technology being affordable and fit for purpose, and to appropriate safeguards for its use being in place. We envisage that guidance to probation pre-sentence report writers will provide advice to courts on assessing the appropriate duration of location monitoring, and on offenders for whom it might be appropriate to use it. As we do not know for which group of offenders this requirement might be most effective, we intend to assess carefully how courts make use of it and its effectiveness. We also propose to publish a code of practice setting out the appropriate tests and safeguards for the use, retention and sharing of any collected data. We intend to consult further on safeguards before full implementation of this provision.

Offenders' assets

10. Rather than pursue a standalone sentencing power to seize assets as a punishment, we will legislate to make it clear that courts can, where appropriate, take account of an offender’s assets when fixing the value of a financial penalty. This will allow courts to impose proportionate and equitable fines and compensation orders in cases where offenders may

be cash-poor but have property of significant value. We will also review whether existing court powers to seize property in lieu of unpaid financial penalties – for example, powers to issue distress warrants or to clamp the cars of fine defaulters – give the courts the tools they need. The Government is clear that tough sanctions should be available for offenders who ignore orders to make payments to victims, prosecuting authorities and courts. We want to ensure that courts can take swift and robust action to seize assets in cases where offenders seek to delay or evade payment.

Improving compliance with community sentences

11. Rather than proceeding with a fixed penalty scheme or with giving offender managers new powers to deal with breach, we will work with the courts, judiciary and probation trusts to explore improvements in operational procedures for dealing with breaches of community orders. The focus of this work will be to ensure that offenders are aware of the consequences of breach, and face swift and immediate sanctions from courts if they do breach their order.

Fines

12. As part of our proposals on a mandatory punitive requirement, we will make it clear that courts can fulfil this duty by imposing a fine on the offender alongside a community order. Alongside this, the Sentencing Council has agreed to consider the inclusion of material on courts' ability to use fine Bands D and E for offences that have crossed the community order threshold in future offence-specific guidelines. They will also consider how best to draw sentencers' attention to their ability to impose a fine alongside a community order.

13. We will also legislate to allow for DWP and HMRC to share data with HMCTS for the purposes of fixing and enforcing financial penalties. Having access to this data at an earlier stage will improve the financial information available to courts, and allow for more fines to be set at the right level in the first instance. It will also improve the information available to HMCTS for enforcing payment of outstanding fines.

Restorative justice

14. Restorative justice (RJ) can have positive impacts both on victim satisfaction and on re-offending. We believe that access to RJ should be available for all victims at all stages of the justice process, so that, where appropriate, they can opt in at a time that is right for them. For some victims, this may happen immediately an incident occurs, whilst other victims may want to participate in an RJ process post-sentencing. The major gap at present is the usage of RJ between conviction and sentence, at the pre-sentence stage. We will therefore legislate to explicitly provide for courts to defer sentencing to allow for a restorative

justice intervention, in cases where both victim and offender are willing to participate. Local provision will need to be available and victims and offenders will have to be assessed as suitable for the intervention. The offender's participation in RJ activity will not automatically affect the sentence that he receives. It will be for the court to decide whether or not the offender's participation in RJ will affect the sentence that is imposed. The sentence imposed will continue to reflect the seriousness of the offence. RJ will not lead to offenders escaping punishment.

15. This will form an integral part of the Government's wider work on developing a cross-criminal justice system framework for RJ, which is being considered separately by the newly formed RJ Steering Group. The RJ framework will seek to ensure that there is a coherent vision of how RJ should apply across all stages of the justice process, including how we build local capacity within available funding, and how we ensure a consistently high quality of delivery through accreditation and training standards. The framework, together with legislating for pre-sentence RJ, will help to ensure that RJ is established across and embedded into the justice system.

Compensation orders

16. We will legislate to remove the current £5,000 limit on compensation orders imposed in the magistrates' courts. The Government will also consider as part of our forthcoming review of the Victim Personal Statement (VPS) how more effective use of it can be made to provide courts with relevant information about injury, loss or damage an offence has caused to a victim. We hope this should provide courts with better information to consider when deciding whether to impose a compensation. Alongside this, the Sentencing Council will examine whether changes could be made to guidelines on compensation orders as part of its review of the Magistrates' Courts Sentencing Guidelines.

Female offenders

17. We will publish a document on the Ministry of Justice website setting out our approach and strategic objectives for female offenders, including those in the community. This document will be published before the end of 2012.

18. We recognise that women can have a different profile of risks and needs to men, as previously documented in the Corston Report, *"A Review of Women with Particular Vulnerabilities in the Criminal Justice System",* and we are committed to taking this into account, where appropriate. This is not about preferential treatment but about ensuring that, as well as appropriate punishment, the system supports the rehabilitation of female offenders. We want to ensure that there is suitable provision in the community to support the use of community orders that can help to address factors associated with women's offending, such as mental health; substance misuse; domestic and sexual violence; housing, finance and employment needs.

Compulsory sobriety

19. The Government will pilot alcohol abstinence and monitoring requirements for community orders and suspended sentence orders. In addition, we have already started a pilot for sobriety conditions to be attached to a conditional caution in relation to low level offences. Where offenders admit the offence, they will be given the choice of accepting sobriety conditions or being prosecuted and facing the prospect of a drinking banning order if convicted.

Responses to specific questions

Intensive Community Punishment

20. We set out a proposal for a new, intensive punitive disposal that the courts could use for offenders who deserve a significant level of punishment, but who are better dealt with in the community than in custody. We suggested that such orders should last a maximum of 12 months, in order to be short but intensive, and should include a combination of community payback, restrictions on liberty, a driving ban, and a fine.

21. We asked:

> Question 1: what should be the core elements of Intensive Community Punishment (ICP)?
>
> Question 2: which offenders would Intensive Community Punishment be suitable for?

22. 172 respondents answered Question 1. The requirements most commonly mentioned (in descending order of frequency) were:

    - A curfew.
    - Other restrictions on liberty, such as exclusion, attendance or residence requirements.
    - Unpaid work.
    - Supervision.
    - Rehabilitative requirements (excluding treatment requirements such as those for mental health, drug or alcohol issues).

23. There was a mixed response on inclusion of fines. Some respondents argued that a financial penalty imposed alongside a community order could be a clear and recognisably punitive element of the sentence. However, others argued that fines were not appropriate for offenders on low incomes. Few respondents thought that foreign travel bans or driving bans should be a core part of the ICP.

24. A number of respondents raised the need for punitive elements to be visible and recognisable to the public. Others argued that the ICP needed to be primarily rehabilitative, rather than focused on punishment. Several respondents suggested that ICP should be called an ‘Intensive Community Order’, rather than ‘Intensive Community Punishment’. Many respondents made the point that the greater the number of requirements, the more likely the offender was to breach the order. Some argued for setting a maximum number of requirements – for example, three from the final list – rather than everything on the list.

25. 153 respondents answered Question 2. Types of offender most commonly mentioned included:

    - Those with entrenched or persistent offending behaviour. Some respondents suggested this on the assumption that the ICP would be primarily rehabilitative. Others that a primarily punitive order could be appropriate for persistent offenders for whom previous rehabilitative approaches have not worked.
    - Offenders with no relevant or recent previous convictions.
    - Offenders for whom being sentenced to immediate custody might leave them particularly vulnerable, could lead to the loss of a job, or prevent care for dependants.
    - Offenders who pose a low risk to the public but who have passed the custody threshold.

26. However, there was no universal agreement on any of these as suitable groups. Other groups less commonly mentioned by respondents as suitable for the order included:

    - Those with mental health issues or learning difficulties/disabilities that would make them unable to understand what is required of them, or that would render them unable to complete requirements (for example not being able to complete unpaid work).
    - Those who would be major risks to themselves or others.
    - Those with drug, alcohol or literacy problems.
    - Those in employment or with caring responsibilities.
    - Women offenders and those aged 18–25.

27. We have considered carefully the range of responses we received to these questions. Respondents suggested a wide range of types of offenders or circumstances in which an intensive order might be appropriate, either for the purpose of punishment, for rehabilitation, or for both. Given this, we do not consider that it would be appropriate to mandate to probation trusts or market to sentencers a centrally-set intensive order for specified groups of offenders. The experience of the Intensive Alternative to Custody (IAC) pilots, for example, was that the ability of local courts and trusts to target orders on types of offender specific to their area was important for the successful delivery of the orders.

28. Changes to the community sentence framework under the LASPO Act 2012 will give courts new and strengthened requirements to impose on offenders, and will increase their flexibility to tailor rehabilitative requirements to offenders' needs. For example, once provisions are commenced the maximum length of curfew courts can impose will be extended from 12 hours a day to 16 hours, and the overall duration from 6 months to 12. The 2012 Act also creates new foreign travel prohibition and alcohol abstinence and monitoring requirements, and gives

sentencers more discretion to impose treatment requirements for offenders with mental health issues or problems with alcohol or substance abuse.

29. We consider that these changes should provide courts with more flexible and robust community order requirements, which can be combined in creative ways to provide a sentence that delivers intensive punishment in the community. In the light of consultation responses, we believe that leaving these decisions to sentencers, on the basis of advice from probation trusts is the better way to proceed.

Mandatory punitive element in every community order

30. We proposed that every community order should include a clear punitive element alongside any other requirements aimed at rehabilitation or reparation. We suggested that the punitive element should consist of community payback, a financial penalty, or a significant restriction of the offender's liberty. However, we also suggested that there might be some offenders for whom an explicitly punitive requirement might not be suitable.

31. We asked:

Question 3: Do you agree that every offender who receives a community order should be subject to a sanction which is aimed primarily at the punishment of the offender ("a punitive element")?

Question 4: Which requirements of the community order do you regard as punitive?

Question 5: Are there some classes of offenders for whom (or particular circumstances in which) a punitive element of a sentence would not be suitable?

Question 6: How should such offenders be sentenced?

Question 7: How can we best ensure that sentences in the community achieve a balance between all five purposes of sentencing?

32. 178 respondents answered question 3. A small majority disagreed with the proposal, with most of those that did so arguing that current community orders all contain a punitive element. Some also argued that the proposal could have a negative impact on re-offending. Those in favour of this proposal tended to qualify their responses by stressing that every offender's circumstances are different, and that what is punitive for each offender needed be tailored accordingly.

33. 145 respondents answered question 4. In line with responses to the previous question, there was no agreement amongst respondents on what constitutes a punitive element. Some were of the view that all the

existing community order requirements had the potential to be punitive. Amongst those who specified particular requirements as punitive, unpaid work and curfews were mentioned by nearly all, closely followed by exclusion, attendance and prohibited activities.

34. 145 respondents answered question 5. Nearly all respondents indicated that offenders with mental health issues should be excluded from a mandatory punitive requirement, although responses differed about the level of clinical need that should exempt an offender. Many respondents also suggested that offenders with learning difficulties which prevented them from understanding the sentence, those unable to carry out the requirement because of poor health or addiction, and those with personality disorders or low maturity (in the case of young adults) should also be excluded. Very few respondents thought that there should be no exceptions at all.

35. 123 respondents answered question 6. Most suggested adapting the sentence to the needs of the offender, whether to take account of particular needs or to allow for individual circumstances such as employment or caring responsibilities. Most advocated the use of rehabilitative requirements aimed at reducing reoffending. Some argued for diversion and wider use of community projects for women offenders.

36. 137 respondents answered question 7. Most made the point that the sentence should be tailored to the individual offender, and that effective communication between sentencers and probation staff, as well as high quality pre-sentence reports, were critical to achieving this.

37. The Government remains of the view that it is vital, if community sentences are to have the confidence of victims and the public, that they should wherever possible include a demonstrably punitive element. However, we are mindful of the significant feedback we have received that that what is punitive for one offender in one set of circumstances will not necessarily be punitive for another offender in a different set of circumstances. We have borne in mind respondents' views that there will be rare occasions when a punitive requirement within a community order will not necessarily be appropriate.

38. We are therefore introducing amendments to the Crime and Courts Bill to create a duty on courts to include at least one requirement in a community order – or alternatively, a fine alongside the community order – that fulfils the purpose of punishment in the offender's case. While we will not specify what requirements courts should impose, on the basis that what is punitive for one offender may not be punitive for another, our expectation is that these would generally be restrictions of liberty that represent to the public a recognisable sanction (such as curfews, exclusion, or community payback). The duty will provide for an exemption in exceptional circumstances where it would be unjust to impose a punitive element.

Electronic monitoring

39. We sought views on how to make more creative use of existing electronic monitoring technology in enforcing community order requirements. We also proposed to make use of new location monitoring technologies, both to monitor existing requirements and to monitor whereabouts (tracking) to prevent future offending.

40. We asked:

> Question 8: should we, if new technologies were available and affordable, encourage the use of electronically monitored technology to monitor compliance with community order requirements (in addition to curfew requirements)?
>
> Question 9: which community order requirements, in addition to curfews, could be most effectively electronically monitored?
>
> Question 10: are there other ways we could use electronically monitored curfews more imaginatively?
>
> Question 11: would tracking certain offenders (as part of a non-custodial sentence) be effective at preventing future offending?
>
> Question 12: which types of offenders would be suitable for tracking? For example, those at high risk of reoffending or harm, including sex and violent offenders?
>
> Question 13: for what purposes could electronic monitoring best be used?
>
> Question 14: what are the potential civil liberties implications of tracking offenders and how can we guard against them?

41. 149 respondents answered question 8. The great majority were in favour of the use of new electronically monitored technology to monitor compliance with community order requirements. Most argued that this could increase public confidence in community sentences. Many also emphasised that the use of electronic monitoring should not replace face-to-face relationships between offenders and offender managers, or engagement with interventions to support behavioural change.

42. 124 respondents answered question 9. The most commonly supported requirements that would benefit from the use of electronic monitoring were:

    - Exclusion requirements and orders with an exclusion component
    - Residence requirements
    - Supervision
    - Monitoring prohibited activity

- Requirements to attend re-training or community payback
- Attendance for appointments for drug and alcohol treatments.

43. 124 respondents answered question 10. There was general agreement that more flexible use of curfews, including daytime, weekend or staggered curfews, could be supported by electronic monitoring. Supporting unpaid work requirements through curfews was a key theme: for example, the use of curfews the evening before an offender is expected to attend unpaid work. Many respondents saw curfews as a way to support attendance or specified activity requirements, including education and drug rehabilitation appointments. The use of curfews to enforce restraining orders was also noted by many respondents. Some suggested the use of targeted curfews based on the offender's specific offences, behaviour or circumstances and linked to specific risk times: for example to prevent an offender travelling to a particular area or to prevent association in places with particular opening hours.

44. 129 respondents answered question 11. Responses were mixed regarding the effectiveness of tracking to prevent future offending. While some argued that the preventative effect might last for the duration of the sentence period, others argued that tracking must be supported by rehabilitative requirements.

45. 122 respondents answered question 12. Most argued that tracking to prevent further offending should be targeted at offenders at high risk of re-offending, or those in cases where victims are vulnerable and need to be protected. Key types of offender identified included:

    - Violent or sexual offenders whose offence fell short of custody
    - Persistent and prolific offenders
    - Those subject to restraining orders and exclusion zones
    - Serious offenders released from custody on licence.

46. 114 respondents answered question 13. Key purposes identified included:

    - To deter future offending (for example, by protecting victims or providing evidence that could be used to prove a further offence)
    - To monitor and reinforce compliance with the requirements of the sentence (particularly geographical exclusions)
    - To punish the offender.

47. 115 respondents answered question 14. A few considered that the civil liberty implications were too significant to justify tracking for the purposes of reducing re-offending. However, other respondents, while identifying issues, set out various safeguards:

    - Limiting the purposes of location monitoring to deterring further offending and to protecting the public.

- Providing for re-sentence assessments of the offender and any dependants.
- Requiring that the offender consent to the tracking.
- Ensuring that data is stored, managed and disposed of carefully.

48. We will draw on the examples of innovative uses of electronically monitored curfews provided by respondents to support probation pre-sentence report writers in making suitable recommendations to courts. We are currently re-competing the electronic monitoring contracts. Once they have been awarded we will seek to strengthen community sentences by using new location monitoring technology to monitor compliance with requirements such as curfew and exclusion.

49. Given the support that respondents expressed for tracking – so long as it has the primary purpose of deterring further offending or protecting the public, and has appropriate safeguards in place – we are introducing amendments to the Crime and Courts Bill to extend the definition of electronic monitoring to allow the court to impose location monitoring as part of a community order.

50. Based on views expressed by sentencers and other respondents, we believe it is most likely location monitoring would be used for offenders who present a high risk of re-offending, or who might pose a risk to the public. While it will be a matter for courts as to which offenders receive location monitoring, we intend to provide guidance to probation pre-sentence report writers about assessing the appropriate duration of location monitoring, and about offenders who might be suitable for this requirement.

51. The Government is clear that implementation of this new power will be subject to the relevant technology being affordable and fit for purpose. We have taken careful note of respondents' views on what safeguards would be necessary to avoid adverse implications for civil liberties, and are committed to ensuring appropriate safeguards for use of this provision are in place. As we do not know for which group of offenders this requirement might be most effective, we intend to assess carefully how courts make use of it and its effectiveness. We also propose to issue a code of practice setting out the appropriate tests and safeguards for the use, retention and sharing of any collected data. We intend to consult further on safeguards before full implementation of this provision.

Offenders' assets

52. We sought views on how to create a new sentencing power that would allow courts to confiscate offenders' property as a punishment in its own right.

53. We asked:

> Question 15: Which offenders or offences could a new power to order the confiscation of assets most usefully be focused on?
>
> Question 16: How could the power to order the confiscation of assets be framed in order to ensure it applied equitably both to offenders with low-value assets and those with high-value assets?
>
> Question 17: what safeguards and provisions would an asset confiscation power need in order to deal with third-party property rights?
>
> Question 18: what would an appropriate sanction be for breach of an order for asset seizure?

54. 122 respondents answered question 15. Few were in favour of this proposal, and as a result many did not identify a group for whom it would be an appropriate sentence. Many respondents argued that such a power would be difficult to enforce in practice, and that confiscation of assets would be better targeted at recovery of unpaid financial penalties or the proceeds of crime.

55. 87 respondents answered question 16. Some suggested a system similar to fine bandings, with ranges depending on seriousness that could confiscate a proportion of an offender's assets. Others raised concerns that even with a system of bandings or similar, the proposal could have a disproportionate impact on lower-income offenders.

56. 81 respondents answered question 17. There was no clear consensus on how third-party rights might be safeguarded. A number of respondents stated that ownership would need to be proven not assumed, and that there would need to be a swift appeal mechanism. Others raised the risk of adverse impacts on dependents.

57. 87 respondents answered question 18. Most respondents felt that committal to custody would be an appropriate sanction for breach, with a few arguing in favour of a curfew or unpaid work.

58. Given the obstacles to creating a new sentencing power to seize assets that many respondents identified, we do not propose to take forward this proposal in the form set out in the consultation paper. However, we have noted that some respondents argued for making more effective use of existing powers to seize property to enforce unpaid financial penalties. Some also argued that courts should be able to take greater account of offenders' assets when assessing financial circumstances prior to fixing the value of a fine.

59. We agree that a court should, where appropriate, be able to take account of an offender's assets when fixing the value of a financial penalty, and will therefore legislate in the Crime and Courts Bill to make clear that courts can do so. This will allow courts to impose proportionate and

equitable fines and compensation orders in cases where offenders may be cash-poor but have property of significant value. We will also review whether existing court powers to seize property in lieu of unpaid financial penalties – for example, powers to issue distress warrants or to clamp the cars of fine defaulters – give the courts the tools they need. The Government is clear that tough sanctions should be available for offenders who ignore orders to make payments to victims, prosecuting authorities and courts. We want to ensure that courts can take swift and robust action to seize assets in cases where offenders seek to delay or evade payment.

Improving compliance with community sentences

60. We sought views on how we could ensure that offenders face swift and immediate sanctions for breach of a community order, and suggested that a fixed penalty-type scheme might be one means of doing so. We also sought views on whether such a scheme could be appropriate for administration by offender managers, rather than by courts.

61. We asked:

Question 19: How can compliance with community sentences be improved?

Question 20: would a fixed penalty scheme for dealing with failure to comply with a requirement of a community order be likely to promote greater compliance?

Question 21: would a fixed penalty scheme for dealing with failure to comply with a requirement of a community order be appropriate for administration by offender managers?

Question 22: what practical issues do we need to consider further in respect of a fixed penalty type scheme for dealing with compliance with community requirements?

62. 147 respondents answered question 19. A significant number advocated greater flexibility and discretion for probation staff in deciding whether an offender who has breached the community order requirements should be dealt with by the court. Many welcomed the revision of probation National Standards and the support for greater exercising of professional discretion. Some suggested regular reviews and more robust monitoring, including reminders by text or phone call, and use of electronic or location monitoring technology.

63. A majority of respondents shared the view that a meaningful relationship between the offender manager and the offender was crucial to ensuring compliance. Issues raised under this heading included continuity of engagement, one-to-one coaching, and meaningful engagement in activities that offenders see as relevant. Many respondents said that sentencers should not overload the sentence with requirements, as that

could set the offender up to breach. Some respondents advocated a greater use of review powers under section 178 of the Criminal Justice Act 2003.

64. 128 respondents answered question 20. The majority were against this proposal, arguing that the courts were best placed to deal with breach and that diluting this could put at risk relationships between offenders and their offender managers. Some argued that a financial penalty could be counterproductive, potentially resulting in further offending. Others argued it would be costly to enforce (probation trusts would have to put systems in place to collect the fines).

65. 127 respondents answered question 21. In line with the responses to the previous question, the majority of respondents were against the suggestion. Most respondents reiterated the points made in answer to the previous question.

66. 101 respondents answered question 22. Many pointed to the significant burden this would put on probation in assessing means, as well as the costs of setting up administrative mechanisms. A number of respondents illustrated their position by referring to the fact that courts can already have difficulties collecting fines when offenders are on benefits, low income or are in debt. Many respondents also argued that such a mechanism would simply delay a return to the court rather than preventing it.

67. The Government recognises the concerns that respondents have raised about a fixed penalty for certain breaches of community orders, and about giving offender managers the power to impose this. As a result, we do not propose to take forward this option. Instead, we have considered alternative means of making the breach process swifter and more immediate for offenders. For example, a significant cause of adjournment of breach hearings is that the defendant is not present. We propose to work with the courts, judiciary and probation service to explore improvements in operational procedures for dealing with breaches, with the aim of ensuring that offenders are aware of the consequences of breach and that if they do breach, this is dealt with as swiftly as possible.

Fines

68. We set out proposals to promote more flexible use of fines, both instead of and alongside community orders. We also sought views on how to improve the information available to courts about offenders' financial circumstances.

69. We asked:

> Question 23: how can pre-sentence report writers be supported to advise courts on the use of fines and other non-community order disposals?
>
> Question 24: how else could more flexible use of fines alongside, or instead of, community orders be encouraged?
>
> Question 25: how can we better incentivise offenders to give accurate information about their financial circumstances to the courts in a timely manner?

70. 111 respondents answered question 23. Some suggested that better information be made available to report writers about ranges of fines given for particular offence types, and training on what can be ordered by the court. Others argued that the current system works well and that it is very rare for magistrates to ask for advice and a fine subsequently turning out to be appropriate.

71. 109 respondents answered question 24. Most welcomed flexible use of fines alongside community orders, with some suggesting greater use of fine Bands D and E. Some argued that offenders who typically receive community orders are likely to have low incomes so fines may be inappropriate. Some respondents commented that changes to sentencing guidelines would be helpful to bring out more strongly the existence of Bands D and E.

72. 113 respondents answered question 25. A number suggested that courts should have access to relevant financial information held by DWP and HMRC. Some suggested giving a discount to the fine for providing accurate information. One respondent suggested that it would be useful to remind courts of their power to make a Financial Circumstances Order under section 162 of the Criminal Justice Act 2003. Finally, some respondents suggested providing support to offenders with poor literacy or cognitive skills, who might not understand what means information is being asked for.

73. The consultation responses revealed that some sentencers did not consider it possible to impose a fine alongside a community order, or where the seriousness of an offence has passed the community order threshold. We consider that the current legislation does allow for this. In addition, as part of our proposals on a mandatory punitive requirement, we will make it clear that courts can fulfil this duty by imposing a fine on the offender alongside a community order.

74. Alongside this, the Sentencing Council has agreed to consider the inclusion of material on courts' ability to use fine Bands D and E for offences that have crossed the community order threshold in future offence-specific guidelines. They will also consider how best to draw sentencers' attention to their ability to impose a fine alongside a community order.

75. Finally, we are introducing amendments to the Crime and Courts Bill to allow for DWP and HMRC to share data with HMCTS for the purposes of fixing and enforcing financial penalties. Having access to this data at an earlier stage will improve the financial information available to courts, and allow for more fines to be set at the right level in the first instance. It will also improve the information available to HMCTS for enforcing payment of outstanding fines.

Restorative justice

76. We sought views on how to build a better evidence base for the use of pre-sentence restorative justice, and on how to maximise benefits and mitigate risks of such interventions. We also asked for feedback on how to strengthen the role of victims in restorative justice, and on how to increase capacity for restorative justice at a local level.

77. We asked:

Question 26: how can we establish a better evidence base for pre-sentence restorative justice?

Question 27: what are the benefits and risks of pre-sentence restorative justice?

Question 28: how can we look to mitigate any risks and maximise any benefits of pre-sentence restorative justice?

Question 29: is there more we can do to strengthen and support the role of victims in restorative justice?

Question 30: are there existing practices for victim engagement in restorative justice that we can learn from?

Question 31: are these the right approaches? What more can we do to help enable areas to build capacity and capability for restorative justice at local levels?

Question 32: what more can we do to boost a cultural change for restorative justice?

78. 150 respondents answered question 26. Many pointed to evidence bases from other jurisdictions – particularly from New Zealand and Northern Ireland – or to existing evidence on the use of restorative practices in the youth justice system in England and Wales. A number of respondents also drew attention to particular projects in England and Wales: for example, work in London, Greater Manchester, Cheshire and Thames Valley probation trusts, or work at HMP Bronzefield. A few respondents argued that the evidence based on pre-sentence RJ was already sufficiently well-developed, and that the priority was to build on this operationally. A significant number of respondents suggested that

changes to legislation were necessary in order to promote the use of pre-sentence restorative justice.

79. 139 respondents answered question 27. Key benefits of pre-sentence restorative justice that were mentioned by many respondents included:

    - Increased victim satisfaction – through having a voice in the system, and by getting swift involvement before any final outcome.
    - Reduced re-offending.
    - Better information for sentencers to inform rehabilitative or reparative requirements in the eventual sentence.
    - Increased public confidence.

80. Key risks that were mentioned by many respondents included:

    - Pressure from courts or other justice agencies to conclude pre-sentence RJ quickly, leading to selecting the wrong victims and offenders, or pressurising victims into taking part when they are not ready.
    - Offenders entering into pre-sentence RJ for cynical motives, for example to seek a reduction in their sentence.
    - Revictimisation of victims.
    - Delays to criminal proceedings.
    - Victims and the public seeing pre-sentence restorative justice as an overly lenient option.

81. 122 respondents answered question 28. Many argued that detailed individual assessments of both victims and offenders were critical to ensuring the right people were selected to participate. Some, for example, suggested that offenders and victims needed to have it made clear that participation would not necessarily influence the sentence. Others suggested guidance to sentencers would be necessary on the types of cases where pre-sentence restorative justice would be suitable might be of benefit, and that probation areas also needed guidance on how and what to report back to courts after the conference. One response argued that partnership working beyond the probation service, involving both justice agencies and other public, private or third sector organisations, was essential to mitigating any risks.

82. 117 respondents answered question 29. Some argued that better education and publicity about restorative justice was needed to encourage victims to engage. A number suggested using well-trained workers from a range of agencies and voluntary sector groups, and ensuring that restorative justice was offered as part of a wider package of support for victims.

83. 96 respondents answered question 30. Existing examples of victim engagement that were raised included:

    - YOT practice under referral orders
    - CPS guidance on restorative justice within conditional cautions
    - Thames Valley's schemes
    - RJC best practice guidance
    - National Occupational Standards
    - NOMS 'Wait 'Til Eight' guidance
    - The work of Prison Fellowship
    - Northern Ireland's Youth Conferencing Service
    - SORI programme in West Midlands
    - RJ panels in Somerset
    - Remedi in South Yorkshire
    - 'Why Me?' organisation
    - Essex RJ programme run by YOT and Victim Support

84. 113 respondents answered question 31, giving a wide variety of answers. Some suggested funding local services involving the third sector, and supporting professional training and accreditation for coaches and mentors. Similar suggestions were made about focusing capacity building support or funding on local third sector groups. Others argued for strengthening the role and involvement of victim services within restorative justice. One respondent suggested changes be made to police counting rules to ensure restorative justice was counted as a sanction detection. Many respondents argued that changes to legislation to support pre-sentence restorative justice were necessary, although one suggested that attempts to legislate have been counter-productive in other countries, and that restorative justice was strongest when grown from the bottom up.

85. 117 respondents answered question 32. Some suggested more clarity about which agency leads on delivering restorative justice, and pointed to the need for partnership approaches, and legislation to underpin those approaches. Most also pointed to the need for better promotion of, and education about, the benefits of restorative justice for victims and the public.

86. We have noted the particularly significant support that respondents expressed for increasing the use of pre-sentence restorative justice, given the potential benefits for both victims and offenders. We are therefore introducing an amendment to the Crime and Courts Bill to provide for courts to defer sentencing to allow for a restorative justice intervention in cases where both victim and offender are willing to participate. Victims and offenders will have to be assessed as suitable and local provision will

need to be available. The offender's participation in RJ activity will not automatically affect the sentence that he receives. It will be for the court to decide whether or not the offender's participation in RJ will affect the sentence that is imposed. The sentence imposed will continue to reflect the seriousness of the offence. RJ will not lead to offenders escaping punishment.

87. This proposal forms part of a much wider Government drive to increase the use of RJ. The findings from the recent Criminal Justice Joint Inspectorate (CJJI) Report, *Facing up to Offending: Use of Restorative Justice in the Criminal Justice System*, show many examples of existing restorative practices that have had positive impacts on victim satisfaction and on re-offending. The report supports the need for a more strategic and coherent approach to the use of restorative justice in England and Wales. The Restorative Justice Steering Group was brought together by the Ministry of Justice in July 2012 to develop a framework for the delivery of restorative justice. Working with the Restorative Justice Council and other partners, the Steering Group is considering how awareness of RJ can be improved, how RJ at a local level can be made as accessible as possible and, most importantly, how accreditation and training standards of RJ practitioners can be maintained and improved. Ultimately RJ will only be effective for victims if it is delivered to a high standard and with suitable quality assurance.

88. This framework will enable criminal justice agencies and partner organisations to build on the existing good practice in providing RJ that we already have to deliver restorative activities to a consistently high quality across the justice system. We will publish the new Restorative Justice Framework shortly: the strategic actions within it take into account the responses we received to this consultation.

89. We are also leading work with 15 local areas to develop a new part of the justice system: Neighbourhood Justice Panels. These will bring together the offender, the victim and representatives of the community to respond to low-level crime by using restorative justice and other reparative processes. Panels are not a diversion route for offences which should be dealt with formally, but where the interests of justice, the perpetrator and the victim are best met through agreeing a restorative justice outcome, panels are a way of facilitating this process, whilst engaging the wider community, including through recruiting and training Panel facilitators from community volunteers. We will be evaluating the work of these panels, to assess whether they are effective in reducing re-offending but also to gain a better understanding of what impact they have on victim satisfaction and public confidence in the system.

Compensation orders

90. We sought views on how to improve the information available to courts about loss, damage or injury caused by offences, so that courts could impose compensation in as many cases as possible. We also proposed to remove the current £5,000 cap on a single compensation order for adult offenders in the magistrates' courts, in line with equivalent provisions for fines in the LASPO Act 2012.

91. We asked:

Question 33: how can we ensure that courts are provided with the best possible information about injury, loss or damage in order to support decisions about whether to impose a compensation order?

Question 34: how could sentencing guidelines support a more consistent approach to fixing the value of compensation orders?

Question 35: would removing the £5,000 cap on a single compensation order in the magistrates' courts give magistrates greater flexibility in cases where significant damage is caused and offenders have the means to pay?

92. 100 respondents answered question 33. Many mentioned the role of the Victim Personal Statement (VPS) in giving information about financial, physical or emotional harm. Some argued that the pre-sentence report could be helpful in providing this information.

93. 89 respondents answered question 34. A wide range of suggestions were made. A number argued in favour of more detailed sentencing guidelines on this topic. Others disagreed, saying existing case law was sufficient or arguing that use of compensation was already consistent and that guidelines were unnecessary.

94. 96 respondents answered question 35. Nearly all were in favour of removing the current limit of £5,000 on compensation orders issued in the magistrates' courts. Some felt it would only be in exceptional cases that magistrates might impose orders over this value: for example, in environmental offences or criminal damage offences where significant harm was involved.

95. The Government will consider as part of our forthcoming review of the VPS how more effective use of it can be made to provide courts with relevant information about injury, loss or damage an offence has caused to a victim. We hope this should provide courts with better information to consider when deciding whether to impose a compensation. Alongside this, the Sentencing Council will examine whether changes could be made to guidelines on compensation orders as part of its review of the Magistrates' Courts Sentencing Guidelines.

96. We have noted the significant support for removing the current £5,000 limit on compensation orders imposed in the magistrates' courts. We are introducing an amendment to the Crime and Courts Bill to take this proposal forward.

Female offenders

97. We set out steps the Government is taking to ensure that community sentences support women in addressing their needs as part of the rehabilitation process.

98. We asked:

Question 36: how else could our proposals on community sentences help the particular needs of women offenders?

99. 139 respondents answered question 36. Many argued that women offenders should be dealt with in the community rather than in custody wherever possible, and that such community orders should have a primarily rehabilitative focus, focusing less on risk and more on empowering women.

100. Some respondents argued that proposals in the consultation could have an adverse impact on women offenders: for example, financial penalties for breach of community orders, or greater use of curfews. By contrast other respondents felt greater use of curfews could be an appropriate community order requirement for women offenders, particularly if used as an alternative to custody. Similar arguments were made about unpaid work (completed when children were at school or in childcare), and in favour of greater use of women's centres. Women-only supervision and attendance days were also suggested. A number of respondents cited examples of probation trusts that had introduced Women's Champions, and the effectiveness of these initiatives.

101. A number of respondents suggested, in cross-reference to the linked consultation on reforms to probation, that retaining offender management to the public sector was important for addressing the needs of women offenders.

102. We will ensure that these comments are taken into account as the proposals outlined in this document are implemented. The NOMS draft Commissioning Intentions document recognises that women may require different services and different delivery methods. For example, suitable provision for women to complete their Community Payback may mean avoiding situations where it is likely to be a lone female in a work group. Similarly, electronically-monitored curfews can be used imaginatively to fit around caring responsibilities or educational commitments. Because many female offenders have multiple needs it is particularly important for Probation Trusts to work collaboratively in the community with other providers and commissioners on this issue.

103. Community based women's services that aim to provide new options for the courts to support community sentences, through the provision of needs-led holistic services for women, are an important part of the Government's approach. In 2012/2013, NOMS has provided £3.78m funding for some 31 women's community services. This funding is now embedded in the NOMS community budget baselines to allow for continued support of provision for women in years to come.

104. For 2013/2014, women's community services will be commissioned by Probation Trusts in line with the NOMS Commissioning Intentions document for the commissioning round for 2013/14, which specifically outlines the opportunities for Women's Community Services to enhance the community based sentences for female offenders, and explicitly asks Probation Trusts to demonstrate how they will ensure the appropriate provision of women's services going forward. Women's Champions are established in all Probation Trusts and play an important role in supporting the commissioners of services for female offenders.

Compulsory sobriety

105. We set out proposals then being considered by Parliament in the Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Bill to create a new alcohol abstinence and monitoring requirement as part of a community order. To bolster evidence from the pilots of this requirement, we sought views on which offenders this requirement would be most suitable for, and on what additional provisions should be in place to support its effective delivery.

106. We asked:

Question 37: what is the practitioner view of implementing enforced sobriety requirements?

Question 38: who would compulsory sobriety be appropriate for?

Question 39: are enforced sobriety requirements appropriate for use in domestic violence offences?

Question 40: what additional provisions might need to be in place to support the delivery of enforced sobriety requirements?

Question 41: what other areas could be considered to tackle alcohol-related offending by those who misuse alcohol but are not dependent drinkers?

107. 128 respondents answered question 37. While some wanted to await any evaluation of the pilot scheme before giving an opinion, the great majority felt that compulsory sobriety would only be effective if imposed alongside relevant support or addiction management programmes.

108. 107 respondents answered question 38. Key offences and offenders raised by respondents as being potentially suitable for compulsory sobriety were:

- Binge drinkers who are not dependent on alcohol
- Drink drivers (particularly repeat drink drivers)
- Violent or public order offenders whose crimes are linked to binge drinking or the night-time economy
- Offenders who have shown a willingness to address their problem.

109. There was general agreement that compulsory sobriety was not appropriate for dependent drinkers.

110. 107 respondents answered question 39. There was a mixed response to this question. Some respondents felt that it would not be appropriate, but the majority considered that it could be appropriate in certain cases, but only subject to robust risk assessment and in conjunction with intensive support and interventions. A number of respondents stated that alcohol was rarely a root cause of domestic violence, although it might exacerbate it, and hence enforced sobriety would not in itself tackle re-offending.

111. 101 respondents answered question 40. There was a strong consensus that enforced sobriety needed to be accompanied by additional requirements, for example:

- Treatment requirements
- Targeted education and support
- Supervision requirements
- Curfew or exclusion to prevent association with friends or coming back into contact with pubs/shops etc.

112. 99 respondents answered question 41. It received a wide range of answers, but the most commonly raised issues included:

- Education of the general public.
- Work with the industries associated with producing or selling alcohol.
- More use of curfews and attendance centres.

The Government intends to pilot the alcohol abstinence and monitoring requirement as part of community orders and suspended sentence orders. In addition, we have already started a pilot for sobriety conditions to be attached to a conditional caution in relation to low level offences. Where offenders admit the offence, they will be given the choice of accepting sobriety conditions or being prosecuted and facing the prospect of a drinking banning order if convicted.

Consultation Co-ordinator contact details

If you have any comments about the way this consultation was conducted you should contact Sheila Morson on 020 3334 4498, or email her at: sheila.morson@justice.gsi.gov.uk.

Alternatively, you may wish to write to the address below:

Ministry of Justice
Consultation Co-ordinator
Better Regulation Unit
Analytical Services
7th Floor, 7:02
102 Petty France
London SW1H 9AJ

The consultation criteria

The seven consultation criteria are as follows:

1. **When to consult** – Formal consultations should take place at a stage where there is scope to influence the policy outcome.

2. **Duration of consultation exercises** – Consultations should normally last for at least 12 weeks with consideration given to longer timescales where feasible and sensible.

3. **Clarity of scope and impact** – Consultation documents should be clear about the consultation process, what is being proposed, the scope to influence and the expected costs and benefits of the proposals.

4. **Accessibility of consultation exercises** – Consultation exercises should be designed to be accessible to, and clearly targeted at, those people the exercise is intended to reach.

5. **The burden of consultation** – Keeping the burden of consultation to a minimum is essential if consultations are to be effective and if consultees' buy-in to the process is to be obtained.

6. **Responsiveness of consultation exercises** – Consultation responses should be analysed carefully and clear feedback should be provided to participants following the consultation.

7. **Capacity to consult** – Officials running consultations should seek guidance in how to run an effective consultation exercise and share what they have learned from the experience.

These criteria must be reproduced within all consultation documents.

Annex A: list of respondents

The respondents to the consultation included individual members of the judiciary, probation officers, academics, parliamentarians, members of the public, and the following organisations:

Addiction Dependency Solutions

Alcohol Monitoring Systems Inc.

The Alliance (Catch 22, Serco, Turning Point)

Association of Black Probation Officers

Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO)

Association of Convenience Stores

Association of Northern Mediators

Avanta

Avon and Somerset Police

Avon and Somerset Probation Trust

Bedfordshire Criminal Justice Board

Belong London

Berkshire Bench

Betsi Cadwaladr University Health Board

Birmingham Law Society

Bradley Group

British Association of Social Workers

BUDDI

Cambridgeshire, Peterborough and Northamptonshire Probation Trusts

Care Not Custody

Caritas Social Action Network

Catch 22

Charles Preece

Cheshire Probation Trust

Stakeholders of Cheshire Probation Trust

Chris Donovan Trust

Citizens' Advice

Cleveland Bench

Cooperative and Mutual Solutions Ltd & Ex-Cell Solutions

Cornwall Voluntary Sector Forum

Council of Circuit Judges
Coventry Bench
Crown Prosecution Service
Criminal Bar Association
Criminal Justice Alliance
CTC
Cumbria Probation Trust
Cymorth Cymru
Derbyshire Probation Trust
Drugscope
Durham Bench
Durham Tees Valley Probation Trust
Eaves
Enfield Disability Action
Gender Identity Research and Education Society (GIRES)
Gloucestershire Probation Trust
Greater Manchester Probation Trust
Hampshire Probation Trust
Hertfordshire Probation Trust
High Peak, North East Derbyshire and Dales, and Southern Derbyshire Benches
Howard League for Penal Reform
Humberside Probation Trust
Independent Academic Research Studies (IARS)
Independent Probation Alliance
JUSTICE
Justices' Clerks Society
Kent Probation Trust
Lancashire Probation Trust
Law Society
Leap Confronting Conflict
Leicester Bench
Lincolnshire Probation Trust
Lincolnshire Youth Offending Service
Liverpool Church of England Council for Social Aid
Local Government Association
London Criminal Courts Solicitors' Association

London Probation Trust
Magistrates' Association
Make Justice Work
Mayor of London Office for Policing and Crime
Mencap
Merseyside Probation Trust
NACRO
NAPO
NAPO Durham Tees Valley
Greater London NAPO
National Approved Premises Association
National Bench Chairmen's Forum
National LGB&T Partnership
North East Suffolk Bench
Norfolk and Suffolk Probation Trust
Norfolk Bench
Northumbria Local Criminal Justice Board
Northumbria Probation Trust
Policy into Practice
Prince's Trust
Prison Reform Trust
Probation Chiefs Association
Religious Society of Friends
Respect
Restorative Justice Council
Restorative Solutions
Revolving Doors Agency
RoadPeace
Royal College of Nursing
Safe Durham Partnership
Safe Newcastle Unit
Salford Community Safety Partnership
Sandwell Magistrates’ Court
Senior Judiciary of England and Wales
Sentencing Council
Sheffield Hallam University

Social Pioneers

Sodexo

South Cambridgeshire Bench

South East London Bench (combining the former Bexley, Bromley and Greenwich Benches)

South East Suffolk Bench

South Yorkshire Probation Trust

Staffordshire County Council

Stonham Home Group

Surrey and Sussex Probation Trust

Sussex Police

Taunton, West Somerset and Sedgemoor Benches

Thames Valley Partnership

Thames Valley Probation Trust

The Foyer Federation

The Liverpool Church of England Council for Social Aid

Transition to Adulthood Alliance (T2A)

Transport for London

Turning Point

Tyne Housing Association Ltd

Victim Support

Wales Probation Trust

Walsall Bench

Walsall Local Delivery Unit

Warwickshire Bench

Warwickshire Probation Trust

Welsh Government

Women in Prison

WomenCentre

Women's Breakout

York and North Yorkshire Probation Trust

Youth Justice Board

Published by TSO (The Stationery Office) and available from:

Online
www.tsoshop.co.uk

Mail, telephone, fax and email
TSO
PO Box 29, Norwich, NR3 1GN
Telephone orders/general enquiries 0870 600 5522
Order through the Parliamentary Hotline Lo-Call 0845 7 023474
Fax orders: 0870 600 5533
Email: customer.services@tso.co.uk
Textphone: 0870 240 3701

The Houses of Parliament Shop
12 Bridge Street, Parliament Square,
London SW1A 2JX
Telephone orders/general enquiries: 020 7219 3890
Fax orders: 020 7219 3866
Email: shop@parliament.uk
Internet: http://www.shop.parliament.uk

TSO@Blackwell and other accredited agents

ISBN 978-0-10-184692-9