

ANNUAL REPORT

2020/21



**London's Multi-Agency
Public Protection
Arrangements**

Working in Partnership to Protect the Public

This annual report reflects the work undertaken by MAPPAs (Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements) during the period 1st April 2020 – 31st March 2021, a year that has been dominated by the pandemic. I am pleased to report that despite the challenges of lockdown and the impact on staff, MAPPAs in London have continued to operate fully, thanks to the extraordinary hard work and creativity of colleagues across all the MAPPAs agencies.

MAPPAs operate in all 32 London boroughs and the City of London. These arrangements are statutory, which means that there is a duty on all the agencies involved to share relevant information about sexual and violent offenders and to fulfil their obligations in helping to manage them safely in the community. MAPPAs provide the formal structure that allows agencies to share information and enables them to work together to manage risk and protect the public.

MAPPAs are led primarily by police and probation but would not work effectively without information from prisons and the active participation of the other agencies that contribute to public safety. These include Local Authority Children's Services and Adult Social Care, Youth Offending Services, Housing Authorities, NHS Mental Health Services, Home Office Immigration and Enforcement and the Department for Work and Pensions (JobCentre Plus). These agencies have a statutory duty to co-operate with MAPPAs.

MAPPAs across London are overseen by the London MAPPAs Strategic Management Board (SMB). The SMB's role is to ensure that MAPPAs operate consistently across London and in line with the national MAPPAs guidance issued by the Ministry of Justice. The Board is made up of senior managers from the probation, police and prison services (which together form the MAPPAs Responsible Authority), along with representatives from the 'duty to co-operate' agencies. Victim Support is also represented on the Board. The SMB includes a number of independent Lay Advisers, who are members of the public and give of their time voluntarily to scrutinise the work of the Board. The Lay Advisers bring different expertise and act as 'critical friends' of MAPPAs. The SMB is served by the London MAPPAs Executive Office which consists of a small team that undertakes the work on the Board's behalf.

The strong working relationships that the SMB has developed at Board level are reflected in the close collaboration between agencies in the local boroughs, where regular MAPPAs meetings are held to share information about individual offenders. MAPPAs meetings help to ensure that their risks of harm to the public are properly identified and 'protective' factors recognised. Plans can then be made both to manage those risks safely and to build on the person's strengths. MAPPAs' priority is the protection of victims and this will mean close oversight and the imposition of restrictive controls. At the same time MAPPAs seek to ensure that offenders have access to the interventions they need to enable them to change their behaviour and desist from re-offending over time. MAPPAs does not itself supervise offenders; that work is the responsibility of the respective agencies. MAPPAs' role is to provide a confidential forum for professional discussion to inform practitioners in that important task.

The SMB's key priority throughout the year has been to uphold the quality of multi-agency risk management throughout the pandemic. The use of technology, described later in this report from the personal experience of one MAPPAs Chair, has helped to maintain a high level of attendance at meetings. In addition, the SMB issued updated guidance to all chairs about how meetings should be structured to ensure that there is a proper focus on 'risk' and that all the agencies play their part.

The SMB and the London MAPPA Executive Office have continued to oversee and co-ordinate the work of MAPPA across the capital. Members of the SMB carry out visits to local borough MAPPAs to observe the quality of the meetings and provide support for the MAPPA chairs and administrators. Their 'visit feedback reports' identify good practice and areas for improvement, and they are given careful consideration by the SMB. Visits were temporarily suspended at the beginning of lockdown but resumed remotely in October 2020. They have provided reassurance to the Board of improvement in MAPPA practice and administration across London.

In last year's report, I referred to the two horrific terrorist attacks in London. The SMB, in conjunction with the Ministry of Justice, commissioned a serious case review into the Streatham attack. This review, all findings of which were accepted by SMB, contributed to the independent review of the management of terrorist risk offenders, conducted by Jonathan Hall, QC, whose report was published in September 2020.

This report reflects the work of numerous people from many agencies, who are working hard day by day to protect their local communities from high-risk offenders and to help make London a safer place to be. Their effort and commitment to MAPPA throughout the pandemic has been remarkable. On behalf of the London MAPPA Strategic Management Board, I thank them all.



Charles Hayward
Chair, London MAPPA Strategic Management Board

What is MAPPA?

MAPPA background

MAPPA (Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements) are a set of arrangements to manage the risk posed by the most serious sexual, violent and terrorist offenders (MAPPA-eligible offenders) under the provisions of sections 325 to 327B of the Criminal Justice Act 2003.

They bring together the Police, Probation and Prison Services in each of the 42 Areas in England and Wales into what is known as the MAPPA Responsible Authority.

A number of other agencies are under a Duty to Co-operate (DTC) with the Responsible Authority. These include Social Services, Health Services, Youth Offending Teams, Jobcentre Plus and Local Housing and Education Authorities.

Local Strategic Management Boards comprising senior representatives from each of the Responsible Authority and DTC agencies are responsible for delivering MAPPA with their respective areas. The Responsible Authority is also required to appoint two Lay Advisers to sit on each MAPPA area Strategic Management Board (SMB).

Lay Advisers are members of the public appointed by the Minister with no links to the business of managing MAPPA offenders who act as independent, yet informed, observers; able to pose questions which the professionals closely involved in the work might not think of asking. They also bring to the SMB their understanding and perspective of the local community (where they must reside and have strong links).

How MAPPA works

MAPPA-eligible offenders are identified and information about them is shared between agencies to inform the risk assessments and risk management plans of those managing or supervising them.

That is as far as MAPPA extend in the majority of cases, but some cases require more senior oversight and structured multi-agency management. In such cases there will be regular MAPPA meetings attended by relevant agency practitioners.

There are 3 categories of MAPPA-eligible offender:

- **Category 1** - registered sexual offenders;
- **Category 2** – mainly violent offenders sentenced to 12 months or more imprisonment or a hospital order; and
- **Category 3** – offenders who do not qualify under categories 1 or 2 but who currently pose a risk of serious harm.

There are three levels of management to ensure that resources are focused where they are most needed; generally those presenting the higher risks of serious harm.

- **Level 1** is where the offender is managed by the lead agency with information exchange and multi-agency support as required but without formal MAPPA meetings;
- **Level 2** is where formal MAPPA meetings are required to manage the offender.
- **Level 3** is where risk management plans require the attendance and commitment of resources at a senior level at MAPPA meetings.

MAPPA are supported by ViSOR. This is a national IT system to assist in the management of offenders who pose a serious risk of harm to the public. The use of ViSOR increases the ability to share intelligence across organisations and enables the safe transfer of key information when high risk offenders move, enhancing public protection measures. ViSOR allows staff from the Police, Probation and Prison Services to work on the same IT system for the first time, improving the quality and timeliness of risk assessments and interventions to prevent offending.

MAPPA and Terrorism

In response to the terrorist attack committed by Usman Khan at Fishmongers' Hall on 29 November 2019, the Home Secretary and the Lord Chancellor commissioned Jonathan Hall QC, who is the Independent Reviewer of Terrorism Legislation, to undertake a review of MAPPA and the management of known terrorists and other extremist offenders (TACT Offenders). The terrorist attack committed by Sudesh Amman in Streatham High Road on 2 February 2020

served to reinforce the need for the review, since both Khan and Amman had been managed under MAPPA. The government published the report on 2 September 2020 and published a response to it on 9 December. Both documents are available at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/multi-agency-public-protection-arrangements-review>. The report made a number of recommendations, several of which have been or are being implemented via the Counter-Terrorism and Sentencing Act 2021 and the Police, Crime, Sentencing and Courts Bill. Others have already been introduced by the creation of the National Security Division (NSD) in the Probation Service to manage terrorist offenders. The Secretary of State has also revised the statutory MAPPA Guidance on terrorist offenders.

The Probation Service, via the NSD, has created a specialist dedicated and highly skilled workforce, which

provides an enhanced level of management and intervention for the most high-risk, complex and high-profile offenders in the community. This will include the management of terrorist connected and terrorist risk offenders. Five Probation Service national security units have been established across England & Wales during 2020/21. The NSD and Counter-Terrorism Policing will be working closely with local Strategic Management Boards to ensure the robust management of terrorism cases. The NSD also manages serious organised crime and the most high risk and high profile public protection cases.

All MAPPA reports from England and Wales are published online at: www.gov.uk

MAPPA Statistics

MAPPA-eligible offenders on 31 March 2021				
	Category 1: Registered sex offenders	Category 2: Violent offenders	Category 3: Other dangerous offenders	Total
Level 1	6498	3428	-	9926
Level 2	46	77	45	168
Level 3	5	16	16	37
Total	6549	3521	61	10131

MAPPA-eligible offenders in Levels 2 and 3 by category (yearly total)				
	Category 1: Registered sex offenders	Category 2: Violent offenders	Category 3: Other dangerous offenders	Total
Level 2	201	341	164	706
Level 3	29	49	37	115
Total	230	390	201	821

RSOs cautioned or convicted for breach of notification requirements	145
--	-----

RSOs who have had their life time notification revoked on application	48
--	----

Restrictive orders for Category 1 offenders	
SHPOs, SHPOs with foreign travel restriction & NOs imposed by the courts	
SHPO	431
SHPO with foreign travel restriction	0
NOs	19

Number of people who became subject to notification requirements following a breach(es) of a Sexual Risk Order (SRO)	3
---	---

Level 2 and 3 offenders returned to custody				
	Category 1: Registered sex offenders	Category 2: Violent offenders	Category 3: Other dangerous offenders	Total
Breach of licence				
Level 2	15	42	16	73
Level 3	4	6	4	14
Total	19	48	20	87
Breach of SOPO				
Level 2	0	-	-	0
Level 3	0	-	-	0
Total	0	-	-	0

Total number of Registered Sexual Offenders per 100,000 population	84
---	-----------

This figure has been calculated using the Mid-2020 Population Estimates: Single year of age and sex for Police Areas in England and Wales; estimated resident population, published by the Office for National Statistics, excluding those aged less than ten years of age.

Explanation commentary on statistical tables

MAPPA background

The totals of MAPPA-eligible offenders, broken down by category, reflect the picture on 31 March 2021 (i.e. they are a snapshot). The rest of the data covers the period 1 April 2020 to 31 March 2021.

(a) MAPPA-eligible offenders – there are a number of offenders defined in law as eligible for MAPPA management, because they have committed specified sexual and violent offences or they currently pose a risk of serious harm, although the majority are actually managed at Level 1 without formal MAPPA meetings. These figures only include those MAPPA eligible offenders living in the community. They do not include those in prison or detained under the Mental Health Act.

(b) Registered Sexual Offenders (RSOs) – those who are required to notify the police of their name, address and other personal details and to notify of any subsequent changes (this is known as the “notification requirement.”) These offenders are assessed and managed by the police. They may also be managed by probation or health services if they are subject to licence or a hospital order. Failure to comply with the notification requirement is a criminal offence that carries a maximum penalty of 5 years’ imprisonment.

(c) Violent Offenders – this category includes violent and terrorist offenders sentenced to imprisonment or detention for 12 months or more, or detained under a hospital order. It also includes a small number of sexual offenders who do not qualify for registration. These offenders are assessed and managed by the Probation Service, Youth Offending Team or Mental Health Services.

(d) Other Dangerous Offenders – offenders who do not qualify under the other two MAPPA-eligible categories, but who currently pose a risk of serious harm which requires management via MAPPA

meetings. These offenders are assessed and managed by whichever agency has the primary responsibility for them.

(e) Breach of licence – offenders released into the community following a period of imprisonment will be subject to a licence with conditions (under probation supervision). If these conditions are not complied with, breach action will be taken and the offender may be recalled to prison.

(f) Sexual Harm Prevention Order (SHPO) (including any additional foreign travel restriction). Sexual Harm Prevention Orders (SHPOs) and interim SHPOs replaced Sexual Offence Prevention Orders. They are intended to protect the public from offenders convicted of a sexual or violent offence who pose a risk of sexual harm to the public by placing restrictions on their behaviour. They require the offender to notify their details to the police (as set out in Part 2 of the 2003 Act) for the duration of the order.

The court must be satisfied that an order is necessary to protect the public (or any particular members of the public) in the UK, or children or vulnerable adults (or any particular children or vulnerable adults) abroad, from sexual harm from the offender. In the case of an order made on a free standing application by a chief officer or the National Crime Agency (NCA), the chief officer/NCA must be able to show that the offender has acted in such a way since their conviction as to make the order necessary.

The minimum duration for a full order is five years. The lower age limit is 10, which is the age of criminal responsibility, but where the defendant is under the age of 18 an application for an order should only be considered exceptionally.

(g) Notification Order – this requires sexual offenders who have been convicted overseas to register with the police, in order to protect the public in the UK from the risks that they pose. The police may apply to the court

for a notification order in relation to offenders who are already in the UK or are intending to come to the UK.

(h) Sexual Risk Order (including any additional foreign travel restriction)

The Sexual Risk Order (SRO) replaced the Risk of Sexual Harm Order (RoSHO) and may be made in relation to a person without a conviction for a sexual or violent offence (or any other offence), but who poses a risk of sexual harm.

The SRO may be made at the magistrates' court on application by the police or NCA where an individual has committed an act of a sexual nature and the court is satisfied that the person poses a risk of harm to the public in the UK or children or vulnerable adults overseas.

A SRO may prohibit the person from doing anything described in it, including travel overseas. Any prohibition must be necessary to protect the public in the UK from sexual harm or, in relation to foreign travel, protecting children or vulnerable adults from sexual harm.

An individual subject to an SRO is required to notify the police of their name and home address within three days of the order being made and also to notify any changes to this information within three days.

A SRO can last for a minimum of two years and has no maximum duration, with the exception of any foreign travel restrictions which, if applicable, last for a maximum of five years (but may be renewed).

The criminal standard of proof continues to apply. The person concerned is able to appeal against the making of the order and the police or the person concerned are able to apply for the order to be varied, renewed or discharged.

A breach of a SRO is a criminal offence punishable by a maximum of five years' imprisonment. Where an individual breaches their SRO, they will become subject to full notification requirements.

Individuals made subject of a SRO are now recorded on VISOR as a Potentially Dangerous Person (PDP).

(i) Lifetime notification requirements revoked on application

A legal challenge in 2010 and a corresponding legislative response means there is now a mechanism in place that allows qualifying sex offenders to apply for a review of their notification requirements. Persons do not come off the register automatically. Qualifying offenders may submit an application to the police to review their indefinite notification requirements. The police review the application and decide whether to revoke the notification requirements. This decision is made at the rank of Superintendent. Those who continue to pose a significant risk will remain on the register for life, if necessary.

Individuals will only become eligible to seek a review once they have been subject to indefinite notification requirements for a period of at least 15 years for adults and 8 years for juveniles. This applied from 1 September 2012 for adult offenders.

MAPPA and Covid

A MAPPA Chair's view

My last in-person MAPPA at ASKEW Road Probation office was on the 13th March 2020. I can't quite believe how long ago that seems now. We had eleven cases to work through and the meeting was well attended. I must say I have found that the Askew Road MAPPA meetings have always been well attended thanks, I'm sure, to our fantastic MAPPA administrators. After the announcement of the first country wide lockdown on the 23rd March 2020, my colleagues from Probation and I needed to think of the best way to keep as normal a MAPPA meeting as possible.

I had used Microsoft Teams on a few occasions before March 2020 but it was mostly a bit of a novelty. Any remote MAPPA meetings I had attended had always been via teleconference and I really didn't like that format. It was always hard to hear everyone and a nightmare if three people wanted to speak at once! I had previously thought that only Met Police users could use MS teams but learnt that we could set up meetings for external contacts too. My probation colleagues had been using Skype for a long time, so the move to MS Teams for our meetings didn't seem like too much of a stretch.

We decided to trial a fully remote MS Teams meeting for our Westminster meeting on the 2nd April. A day after April fools and eleven cases – what could go wrong? My initial concerns were around apprehension and inability to use the technology, bandwidths, confidentiality, and simply the fact that face-to-face meetings can help draw out participation. The first two concerns were never an issue. We devised some clear written advice to send with the invites and asked anyone with any concerns to raise this with us separately. I suspect the technology was being used so widely by our colleagues that it wasn't such a shock to the system. Connectivity has always been a concern but we've never had any major disasters.

Confidentiality presented a real challenge. Of course, we cannot know for sure who is around our participants when they dial in. All we can do is re-iterate the confidentiality statement and stop the meetings where any concerns are raised. I first discovered the 'threat' of smart home listening devices and other similar devices on a County MAPPA call. Rather comically the chair told us all that these devices had been known to record and store information without prompt. The funny thing was that after the Chair's warning her own smart device said 'sorry I didn't quite hear that!' Jokes aside, we have added an extra warning about these devices and have had no concerns ourselves. We deliberately tell panel members not to turn on their cameras to save our connections. I do worry about whether people have the meeting on in the background which clearly you can't do in person. However, from the contributions made I'm confident we have full concentration. Like everything, it took a little bit of getting used to but I find my chairing style hasn't changed much and the meetings run pretty much as they did in person.

I haven't noticed a significant drop, or up lift in attendance, though as I say we did have very well attended meetings pre-lockdown. Overall, I have found the use of MS Teams has been vital in continuing effective MAPPA meetings through the course of the pandemic. Where do I see us going as we tentatively move out of lockdown? I personally see potential value in a meeting in person with the core panel and a big screen with MS Teams dial in facility for those participants who are attending for just one case. You are much more likely to have effective attendance if a participant can dial-in rather than travel across London just for a thirty-minute meeting. I'm sure like everyone in my organisation, there is a certain level of 'Teams fatigue', but I have found its use in MAPPA has been fantastic and can see us using this for many years to come.

Detective Inspector Patrick Allen – Central West (AW)

Victim Support

Since 1 April 2019 I have had the privilege of heading up London services for victims and witnesses. This role has provided me with numerous and varied opportunities to work with external partners in their respective fields so I can bring the victims voice to the table at a strategic level.

It has been nearly three years since Victim Support in London was invited to sit on the MAPPA Strategic Management Board (SMB); sitting alongside other key stakeholders with a vested interest in public protection and offender management.

Joining the SMB at a time when the 'Four Pillars' was being rolled out to borough MAPP meetings was insightful as I was able to share the journey of MAPP Chairs learning about the theoretical and practical approaches underpinning the design of the framework and how it can be used to bring structure and consistency to discussions, whilst also acting as a prompt for discussions. The Four Pillars of Risk Management are Supervision and Oversight, Monitoring and Control, Interventions and Treatment and Victim Safety.

A key driver for my continued membership and commitment to the board is victim and public safety as I see and hear first-hand every day the devastating impact crime has on victims, witnesses, their families and friends and the wider community. This highlights the need for stakeholders to work collaboratively to keep people safe.

Being a member of the SMB means committing to attending 2 MAPP meetings each year as an observer. So far this year I have attended five borough MAPP meetings and seen how the 'Four Pillars' is implemented locally. It is always interesting to see the differences in styles of chairing the meetings. As you would expect one of the key priorities for me when attending MAPP meetings is victims; who they are and how the public protection arrangements are working to try and keep them safe from harm and minimise any ongoing risks to their safety. As part of the feedback to Chairs I am able to speak to them directly after the meeting to obtain their views of the meeting and offer my feedback before submitting my observation report to the SMB.

What has been interesting to see is the progress with compliance of MAPPA's in using the 'Four Pillars' tool as Chairs increasingly see the benefit of its use and how it can add structure and consistency to case discussions. Thinking back to when I was first introduced to the framework I recall discussions about its benefits and hearing reluctance of use due to it being new.

My involvement with the SMB is varied and this year, in addition to attending quarterly SMB meetings, I have been involved with shortlisting for lay advisors. It was pleasing to see the number and calibre of applicants willing to give their own time to commit to being a lay member of the board. Being a member of the SMB has enabled me to attend various webinars this year to increase my learning and understanding of the issues and challenges criminal justice partners are facing.

Whilst the pandemic has had an impact on all of us in different ways it has not had an impact on my involvement with the SMB. In fact due to all meetings and webinars being held via MS Teams it has increased my ability to be able to attend meetings and take part in events and whilst I would never want virtual meetings to fully replace in person meetings they have certainly provided a reliable and secure platform for continuity of service and have enabled the SMB to function effectively during a difficult 18 months of uncertainty. I look forward to working with SMB colleagues over the coming year to continue monitoring and reviewing the work of borough MAPP teams.

Caroline Birkett
Head of London Services

The Stalking Threat Assessment Centre

In 2016/17, Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Her Majesty's Crown Prosecution Service Inspectorate conducted a joint inspection of how the police and the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) tackle crimes of harassment and stalking. Their report 'Living in Fear' concluded that 'there is still much work to do at every level in order to improve the experiences of harassment and stalking victims, and to ensure that all victims are given a consistent high-quality service in the criminal justice system.' In 2017/18, Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary, Fire and Rescue Services were commissioned to conduct an inspection, following the tragic murder of a victim of stalking. These reports made several recommendations to the Home Office, National Police Chiefs Council lead, Chief Constables and the CPS.

The Stalking Threat Assessment Centre (STAC) is a multi-agency unit consisting of the Metropolitan Police Service, the London Probation Service, Barnet, Enfield and Haringey Mental Health Trust and the Suzy Lamplugh Trust, first funded by the Home Office in 2018. The concept for STAC was developed at a time of significant governmental interest in stalking. This interest remains, with the recent launch of Stalking Protection Orders and cross party calls for the creation of a national stalking register. It is also a priority for the London Mayor and the VAWG (Violence Against Women and Girls) sector; more recent funding has been secured through the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) until April 2022.

STAC has had considerable input into the MAPPA process. This includes delivering stalking training to MAPPA Chairs, working closely with probation practitioners to identify cases that would benefit from MAPPA level 2 or 3 management, and those that require referral to MAPPA as category 3 offences. It is significant that STAC has been added to the 4 pillars of risk management grid and that they sit under all 4 pillars.

One of the ways that STAC contributes to public protection is through the timely information sharing of new stalking allegations and police investigations to probation staff. The ability to communicate serious risk concerns in such a manner has enabled staff to make timely enforcement decisions, implement additional risk management measures, review risk assessment and ultimately improve the safety of the victim.

STAC also provides a service to London Probation Service practitioners enabling them to refer in any complex cases demonstrating stalking behaviours for multi-agency consultation. Case files are read in advance of the consultation, gaps in knowledge are identified and research from outside agencies such as health and police is requested where necessary. These consultations, in part, provide probation staff with the time to fully review their cases with the aid of a specialist team.

During consultations advice is given on psychologically informed ways of working with people on probation, which includes interviewing skills, and the team works together to help the probation practitioner interpret and analyse the information gathered, providing specialist risk assessment advice and escalating to management when necessary. The cases referred for consultation include some of the most intimidating, complex and manipulative high risk of harm offenders. Supervision and contact arrangements are reviewed in all instances.

Due to the existence of STAC, London Probation Service staff are also able to access specialist tailored psychological one-to-one interventions for their service users through the health team, specialist integrated victim advocacy for high risk victims via the Suzy Lamplugh Trust, and advice and support with risk assessment and sentencing recommendations at pre-sentence report stage.

STAC has been the subject of an independent feasibility study commissioned by MOPAC and an evaluation by University College London. The following benefits were identified:

- STAC is a unique and world-first model tackling stalking, leading to greater understanding and recognition
- The start of systemic change and building capacity via a more coordinated approach
- Improvement in identification of cases and managing demand through an applied tiered system that is universally agreed and understood by all agencies
- Providing sustainability against a loss of expertise
- Working with individuals that do not meet the threshold for regular services but cause significant harm to their victims
- Case study evidence of effectiveness of interventions that would not have occurred had STAC not been involved and positive feedback from victims

STAC has been involved in numerous cases where concerns have been raised over escalating risk of harm. One example includes a male who was assessed by STAC as posing an imminent risk of serious violence, including fatality, to two victims. In the months that followed, STAC monitored the case and liaised with the police regarding outstanding matters. There were additional concerns that this individual might be released for time already served in prison if found not guilty at Court, flagging the need for emergency risk management planning. Discussion at a MAPPA Level 3 panel highlighted these concerns and identified child safeguarding issues. STAC Police were also successful in having further offences committed from prison investigated and the Restraining Order amended to improve victim safety.

Arabella Hoskyns
Acting Senior Probation Office
Stalking Threat Assessment Centre (STAC)



All MAPPA reports from England and Wales are published online at:
www.gov.uk

Probation
Service



HM PRISON
SERVICE



METROPOLITAN
POLICE