



**Policy name:** Probation Service Management of MAPPA Level 1 Cases Policy Framework

**Reference:** N/A

**Re-Issue Date:** 05 October 2022

**Implementation Date:** 16<sup>th</sup> August 2021

**Action required by:**

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

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

**For Information:** By the implementation date Governors<sup>1</sup> of Public Sector Prisons and Contracted Prisons and Heads of Probation Delivery Units must ensure that any new local policies that they develop because of this Policy Framework are compliant with relevant legislation, including the Public-Sector Equality Duty (Equality Act, 2010).

Section 6 of the Policy Framework contains guidance to implement the mandatory requirements set out in Section 5 of this Policy Framework. Whilst it will not be mandatory to follow what is set out in this guidance, clear reasons to depart from the guidance should be documented locally. Any questions concerning departure from the guidance can be sent to the contact details below.

**How will this Policy Framework be audited or monitored:** There will be a 6 month review after the release of this Policy Framework to ensure it meets the needs of the Probation Service. This will be completed via a survey on the MAPPA website. Follow-up actions will be determined by the outcomes of that survey, and we will consult with the Probation Service on a yearly basis thereafter to determine if/when any iterations are necessary.

**Resource Impact:** A resource impact analysis has been undertaken, with the response of:

“It is estimated that the implementation of this policy framework, particularly the six-monthly MAPPA reviews for Level 1 cases, will result in an additional requirement of 50 FTE Probation

<sup>1</sup> In this document the term Governor also applies to Directors of Contracted Prisons.

Officers over existing benchmarks. This will result in an additional annual cost to HMPPS of £2.4m. This may increase in future years due to pay increases or greater demand for probation services.” Further discussions with the Workforce Modelling Team suggested that this would be covered under the sentence management (6 monthly reviews) and tiering work due to the overlap with the OASys 6 monthly reviews. This alignment of workstream requirements therefore reduces the resource demand and the annual cost to HMPPS as it has already been accounted for and approved for the Tiering Framework.

**Contact:** MAPPA@justice.gov.uk

**Deputy/Group Director sign-off:** Gordon Davidson, Public Protection Group Director, HMPPS.

**Approved by OPS for publication:** Sarah Coccia and Ian Barrow, Joint OPS Chairs, July 2021.

### Revisions

Date	Changes
4 <sup>th</sup> October 2021	Changes to paragraph 6.25.3.
27 <sup>th</sup> October 2021	Changes to paragraphs 5.3 and 6.5.1: MAPPA nominals should be recorded on the approved case management system within 3 days of sentencing.
05 October 2022	Updated due to the changes brought in by the Police Crime Sentencing and Courts (PCSC) Act 2022

## CONTENTS

Section	Title	Page
1	Purpose	5
2	Context	5
3	Evidence	5
4	Outcomes	6
5	Requirements	7
6	Guidance	10
6.1	Overview	10
6.2	Professional curiosity	11
6.3	Diversity, Inclusion and Equality	12
6.4	Touch Points	12
6.5	Identification	12
6.6	Information Exchange	12
6.7	Information Exchange – Women	13
6.8	Information Exchange – Transfer	14
6.9	Level Setting	14
6.10	Level Setting - Community	14
6.11	Level Setting Custody	14
6.12	Level Setting – Lifers and Indeterminate Sentenced Prisoners (ISPs)	16
6.13	Lead Agency Management and Monitoring of Risk	16
6.14	Lead Agency Management and Monitoring of Risk – Category 1 Offenders	17
6.15	Lead Agency Management and Monitoring of Risk – Domestic Abuse and Stalking	17
6.16	Responding to Risk Escalation	19
6.17	Disclosure	19
6.18	Level 1 Reviews	21
6.19	Review Process	22
6.20	Victims	23
6.21	Recording	24
6.22	Management Oversight	24

6.23	Referral to Level 2 or 3	25
6.24	Information Storage	25
6.25	Monitoring and Quality Assurance	26
	Appendix A	27
	Appendix B	28
	Appendix C	29
	Guidance Notes	30

## **1. Purpose**

- 1.1. The Probation Service (PS) has multiple aims that relate to protecting the public against further offences (protecting the public, empowering those that commit crimes to want to make positive changes and reducing the likelihood of reoffending) and addressing the harm caused by the original offence (highlighting the effects of crime on victims and facilitating appropriate punishment). This framework applies to PS management of Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA) nominals at Level 1. It sets the standards expected for managing cases at MAPPA Level 1. The framework contains guidance for practitioners working in this area, including Community Offender Managers (COM's), Senior Probation Officers (SPO's), MAPPA Coordinators, Heads of Probation Delivery Units, PS MAPPA Administrators and Case Administrators. Where the PS is not the lead agency managing the offender, other internal processes may apply.

## **2. Context**

- 2.1. MAPPA was designed as a mechanism to support agencies in discharging their statutory obligations to protect the public in a coordinated manner. It facilitates best practice of partnership working, where agencies share information, resources and responsibility for the delivery of agreed actions resulting in more effective supervision and better public protection. The value of MAPPA is information sharing among agencies to get a better, more informed overall picture of an offender's risk so that the right decisions can be made about the management of that person's risk.
- 2.2. Level 1 management does not mean that the offender is low or medium risk. High risk cases can be managed at Level 1, providing the lead agency can sufficiently manage the risk. Multi-agency input is still required at Level 1, but there is no need for formal MAPPA meetings. The lead agency will have sufficient powers to manage the offender effectively, but information sharing with other agencies is still required, and professionals meetings should still take place. The Risk Management Plan (RMP) will be sufficiently robust to manage identified risks, and there any barriers to the implementation of multi-agency actions can be resolved via line management. Unresolved barriers require a referral to Level 2 or Level 3.
- 2.3. MAPPA Level 1 nominals make up the majority of the MAPPA caseload. The number of people managed at Level 1 has continued to grow, with the latest figure, 84,349, as of 31 March 2020 being 4% higher than at the same date last year and 34% higher than at the same date in 2014. Despite this, the process for managing people at Level 1 has varied widely across the country.

## **3. Evidence**

- 3.1. Two separate reviews identified key areas for improvement in the management of MAPPA Level 1 cases: the Operational and System Assurance Group (OSAG) thematic review of PS cases managed at MAPPA Level 1 (unpublished) and the 'Management and supervision of men convicted of sexual offences' report by HM Inspectorate of Prisons and Probation.

### 3.2. Findings from the reports included:

- There is no national guidance relating to the management of Level 1 cases
- Arrangements for the management and review of Level 1 cases by PS are disparate and not consistently effective
- RMP's for MAPPA Level 1 cases are not always up to date
- Practitioners did not routinely respond to changes in circumstances by reviewing risk assessments and RMP's
- Many Level 1 reviews did not consider information from other agencies, in particular from the police

### 3.3. Recommendations from the reports included:

- Consider the development of a national process for timely level setting of MAPPA cases and review of MAPPA Level 1 cases where PS is the lead agency to consistently meet lead agency responsibilities within MAPPA
- Implement a MAPPA Level 1 review being undertaken at least every six months (or upon a significant change in circumstance) and supported by an OASys review, which must then be documented on nDelius or on a proforma
- Ensure that MAPPA Level setting is consistent, clearly communicated across the responsible authorities (RA), and underpinned by robust assessment and regular reviews
- Put in place a clear process for the classification and management of MAPPA Level 1 cases

3.4. Based on the recommendations from the above reports, this Policy Framework therefore offers a consistent approach to managing MAPPA Level 1 offenders that can be effectively quality assured to ensure MAPPA are being used effectively nationwide.

## 4. **Outcomes**

4.1. This Policy Framework is intended to empower practitioners to make decisions and take action to deliver effective public protection and to provide clarity to enable managers to have meaningful oversight. We have used language in line with the target operating model for the unified probation service post June 2021. We will as far as possible, use: 'Probation Practitioner' to denote the formerly-used terms 'Offender Manager'/'Responsible Officer' and 'Officer.' 'Sentence Management' will denote the formerly-used term 'Offender Management.' Exceptions to this approach will be when referring to delivery areas where we need to make specific distinctions such as Offender Management in Custody.

4.2. The Policy Framework aims to ensure that the right offenders are managed at Level 1 and that PS management of them is based on effective information sharing and partnership working, ensuring issues are responded to effectively to minimise escalating risks and support rehabilitation. It sets out clear expectations so that:

- Screening of cases is accurate, informed by multi-agency information, timely and appropriate with clear documented rationale

- PS practitioners understand the minimum standard for managing cases at MAPPA Level 1
- Practitioners regularly review Level 1 cases and update OASys
- The recording and storage of information is appropriate and consistent
- There is national consistency in the management of MAPPA Level 1 cases by PS
- PS management of Level 1 cases is in line with National MAPPA Guidance

4.3. The ultimate aim of this policy framework is to ensure that practitioners take all reasonable steps possible to protect the public. To achieve this, Managers will need to have prioritised and promoted the rollout of this Policy Framework appropriately through different levels of the organisation, and supported Practitioners to deliver the measures set out under this Policy Framework.

## 5. **Requirements**

### 5.1. **Professional Curiosity:**

- Professionals should adopt a healthy scepticism and use an investigative approach when managing cases under MAPPA Level 1.

### 5.2. **Diversity, Inclusion and Equality:**

- Equality and diversity must be considered during day-to-day management of cases as well as in the review process, and Probation Practitioners must make reasonable adjustments for each case as required.

### 5.3. **Identification:**

- The PS Court Team must identify and record all cases as MAPPA nominals on the approved case management system within 3 days of sentencing.

### 5.4. **Information Exchange:**

- PS as lead agency must actively seek out any new information that may affect risk assessment and management. Probation Practitioners should invite relevant agencies into all conversations or reviews where the inclusion of their expertise or particular specialism would benefit the management of any Level 1 offender.
- All new information and development in a case must be inputted to VISOR as soon as is reasonably practicable.
- Any updates to the RMP must be communicated to all agencies involved in the management of the case.
- It is critical to ensure an effective handover for eligible cases under the Offender Management in Custody (OMiC) model to ensure that appropriate information is exchanged, and to ensure effective management of an offender on licence.

### 5.5. **Level Setting:**

- Level setting decisions and rationale must be recorded and shared with relevant agencies.
- For **community sentences**, the Community Offender Manager (COM) must set the MAPPA Level no later than 15 working days from the offender's attendance at their first appointment, in line with the initial OASys.

- For **custody cases** the Level must be set at **least six months** prior to release, first parole date, each subsequent parole review hearing, or tariff expiry date.
- Where the person in prison has six months or less to serve in prison at the point of sentence the MAPPA level must be set as soon as possible and certainly in line with completion of the initial OASys.
- The Probation Practitioner must gather information from the prison, Police and all relevant Duty to Cooperate agencies to inform Level setting. They must then communicate the MAPPA Level to all relevant agencies.

**5.6. Lead Agency Management and Monitoring of Risk:**

- The Probation Practitioner must lead and coordinate management of the case with input from other agencies.
- When monitoring an offender's risk, the Probation Practitioner must consider and address both dynamic triggers and protective factors.
- Probation Practitioners must update all relevant agencies on any significant changes in a case.
- The Probation Practitioner must record instances where information is exchanged between agencies regarding a MAPPA Level 1 case on nDelius.
- Probation Practitioners must consider all high risk serial domestic abuse perpetrators for MAPPA Level 2 or 3 management, using Category 3 management where necessary

**5.7. Responding to Risk Escalation:**

- In cases where there has been a significant escalation in risk that requires immediate action, the Probation Practitioner must consider recall in the first instance.
- Probation Practitioners must respond to relevant new information, review the RMP, and consider if Level 1 management is still appropriate.

**5.8. Disclosure:**

- Disclosure is an essential part of risk management, putting victims at the heart of what we do. The need for disclosure must therefore be kept under review.
- Disclosure to a third party must comply with the law, must be necessary for public protection, and must be proportionate.
- Disclosure decisions must be signed off by the Senior Probation Officer (SPO).

**5.9. Level 1 Reviews:**

- The Probation Practitioner must review each Level 1 case:
  - At least every 6 months
  - After a significant change in circumstances, for example: moving out of an Approved Premises (AP), or being released from custody
  - Following a significant event, for example: the death of a family member
  - After receiving significant information from another agency which could impact the RMP
  - If the Probation Practitioner is considering recall or other actions to manage escalating risk
  - Preparation of Part B or Part C following recall/review
  - Preparation of an On/Post Tariff PAROM1 or Addendum
  - After any transfer that results in a change of Probation Practitioner, i.e. between Probation Delivery Units



- If disclosure is required which could affect the RMP
- At point of sentence termination
- Further information on changes of circumstance which may trigger a Level 1 review are detailed in the guidance.

#### 5.10. **Review Process:**

- Probation Practitioners are required to review Level 1 cases to ensure all risks are still being managed effectively and consider whether the activities in the RMP remain valid or if changes need to be made, including whether a referral to Level 2 or 3 is necessary.
- Probation Practitioners must:
  - Ensure the prompt sheet (Appendix B) is referred to and all components are covered, updating OASys where necessary
  - Engage with the MAPPAs nominal
  - Gather, collate, review and record all information from Police and other agencies in advance of the Level 1 review
  - Refer to the Level 1 review prompt sheet attached at Annex B
  - Consider progress against existing plans and actions from previous Level 1 reviews
  - Consider the wellbeing and safeguarding of the victim, which may include liaising with the Victim Liaison Unit
  - Consider disclosure
  - Update all plans pertinent to the management of the case
  - Record decisions and actions relating to risk management on the OASys RMP
  - Record completion of review and next date of review in nDelius, updating the flag accordingly
  - Escalate any issues to the SPO

#### 5.11. **Management Oversight:**

- Whilst management of Level 1 cases is conducted primarily by the Probation Practitioner, SPO's should be available for case oversight or consultation during Practice Supervision.
- The review of MAPPAs cases must be prioritised during Practice Supervision.

#### 5.12. **Recording:**

- The registration in nDelius and ViSOR (where there is a record) must reflect that a Level 1 review has been completed.
- The date of next review must be recorded on the MAPPAs registration on nDelius.
- Where a change to assessed risk or the RMP is required, OASys must be updated.
- Significant information, including the outcome of the Level 1 review must be copied to ViSOR as appropriate via the export function on nDelius.

#### 5.13. **Referral to Level 2 or 3:**

- The Probation Practitioner must refer an offender to Level 2 or 3 whenever a referral is necessary to support the management of the case. Movement between Levels must be dynamic and responsive.
- In completing the MAPPAs A, the Probation Practitioner must use established risk assessment tools to:
  - Estimate the likelihood of reoffending

- Estimate the risk of serious harm (when and to whom)
- Estimate the immediacy of serious harm
- The referral must include the reason for referral and demonstrate that there are specific factors that require inter-agency involvement, conferencing, information sharing and multi-agency risk management beyond that which can be provided by Level 1 management.

#### 5.14. **Information Storage:**

- Information must be stored and handled using the Government Security Classification Scheme, shared safely and securely and used by the appropriate personnel within those agencies for public protection purposes only.
- All official MAPPA documents must be saved electronically within nDelius, except for the MAPPA B (MAPPA minutes), which must be stored on ViSOR.

#### 5.15. **Quality Assurance:**

- Regions must audit MAPPA Level 1 cases on a yearly basis, using a random sample of the caseload but prioritising high risk of harm cases.
- SPO's should be involved in the audit process, and resource permitting, should audit one case for each Probation Practitioner that they manage. Quality Development Officers can support the audit process, which should be shared across probation practitioners.
- In line with the Core Quality Management Framework (CQMF) which asks Probation Practitioners to quality assure one case per quarter (totalling four cases per year), Probation Practitioners should ensure that at least one of these four cases is a MAPPA Level 1 case. This can be increased as necessary, but should remain representative of the entire caseload.
- When quality assuring MAPPA Level 1 cases, the regional case audit tool, which forms part of the CQMF, can be used for this purpose.
- Should regions choose to do a deep dive on MAPPA Level 1 cases as part of a local priority, over and above what is asked in the CQMF, Practitioners have the option of using the Audit of MAPPA Level 1 cases template, located in Appendix C.

## 6. **Guidance**

### 6.1. **Overview**

6.1.1. Section 325 of the Criminal Justice Act 2003 requires the Responsible Authority (Police, Prisons and Probation) to establish arrangements for the purpose of assessing and managing the risks posed by those subject to MAPPA management, and to work with the Duty to Cooperate (DTC) agencies in doing so.

6.1.2. There are a number of key aspects that differentiate MAPPA managed cases from non-MAPPA managed cases:

- **Convictions:** MAPPA nominals have been convicted of specified serious sexual, violent or terrorist offences, or are considered *Other Dangerous Offenders* (for criteria, refer to [MAPPA Guidance](#)).
- **Information sharing duties:** whilst there is an expectation that agencies work together to manage all cases, under MAPPA, there is a legal duty for agencies to work

together and agencies may share information to assess and manage the risk posed by an offender.

- **Escalation routes:** under MAPPA, cases must be regularly reviewed to ensure they are managed at the appropriate MAPPA Level. MAPPA provides a structure for escalation of cases where risk or complexity has increased or where a RMP is not achieving the set objectives.
- **Management:** MAPPA cases are managed in line with statutory MAPPA guidance where there is a requirement to consider disclosure.
- **Victims:** All victims of offenders who come into MAPPA under Category 2, and some who come under Category 1, will be offered access to the Victim Contact Scheme, which will ensure the views of the victims are considered when planning for an offender's release. Victim safety, preventing re-victimisation and avoiding the creation of new victims are fundamental to the MAPPA agencies' public protection role.
- **ViSOR:** The only recording system which all three Responsible Authorities have access to. MAPPA eligible cases should have a ViSOR record in line with the ViSOR PI and standards.

6.1.3. Level 1 management is where the risks posed by the offender are manageable by the lead agency without the need for formal multi-agency meetings. This does not mean that other agencies should not be involved, only that once the formal screening process is complete, the Lead Agency (for the purposes of this policy framework, PS, although this should apply to other MAPPA Lead Agencies) is confident that their RMP is sufficiently robust to manage the identified risks, and any formal decision making is sufficiently supported by information from multiple agencies. PS must be confident there are no barriers to the implementation of agreed multi-agency actions, and therefore it is not considered necessary to refer the case to a Level 2 or 3 MAPPA meeting.

6.1.4. Additionally in some cases, for instance where the risk is particularly high, or there is a particular public interest, even where agencies are working well together, PS may still decide there is a need for a formal multi-agency plan agreed at Level 2 or 3 to ensure additional management oversight and clarity and an audit trail of multiagency working. However the great majority of MAPPA cases are managed at Level 1 so it is important that there are clear processes in place to meet our statutory duties to assess and manage the risks posed.

## 6.2. Professional Curiosity

6.2.1 [Professional curiosity](#) when managing a Level 1 case is the process of adopting a healthy scepticism and taking an investigative approach to casework. It involves asking direct questions, active listening, and seeking independent verification of the information that is obtained where possible, not making assumptions, further exploration and reflective practice. Professional curiosity is a vital aspect of Level 1 management and such an approach will enhance the Practitioner's ability to effectively monitor progress but also assist with making informed professional judgements on risk and individual need. More information on professional curiosity can be found on [EQuIP](#).

6.2.2 Working with other agencies supports professional curiosity as it enables information to be gathered, shared and verified. ViSOR is an important tool for sharing such information as are Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conference (MARAC), Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH) and Victim Services. Sharing information between each agency ensures that all

professionals are kept up to date with any new information or changes, resulting in each agency having a full picture of the case and any new concerns.

### **6.3. Diversity, Inclusion and Equality**

6.3.1. It is important that we recognise diversity when working with those who may be socially disadvantaged or may have complex risk factors. Equality and diversity considerations must be embedded in the day-to-day management of offenders as well as the in review process, and Probation Practitioners should make reasonable adjustments for each case as required. Any resulting actions must be reflected in relevant RMPs as well as sentence planning objectives, and any reasonable adjustments logged on the Equality Monitoring Pane (EMP) in nDelius. The [Equality Information Form](#) and [Equality Information Form Guidance](#) can be found on [EQuIP](#). Further information can also be found in a series of seven-minute briefings, located on [EQuIP](#) under [Equalities](#).

### **6.4. Touch Points**

6.4.1. This PF has been written so that the requirements are in line with the expectations set out in the latest [Touch Point Model \(TPM\) Guidance](#) available on [EQuIP](#). In relation to MAPPA cases this will include:

- Initial discussion at allocation or at least 6 months prior to release to set the MAPPA Level where consultation by the Senior Probation Officer (SPO) is required.
- Review discussions set at intervals appropriate to the risks and needs of the case including a requirement for 6 monthly review discussions of high risk and complex cases. Such cases may also include those requiring a MAPPA Level 1 review.
- Bespoke oversight activities are linked to specific processes such as recall discussions, On/Post Tariff PAROM 1 quality assurance process and Lifer and IPP progression panels.

### **6.5. Identification**

6.5.1. The PS Court Team must identify and record all cases as MAPPA nominals on the approved case management system within 3 days of sentencing. Guidance on identifying and recording cases on nDelius is available on EQuIP: [National Delius Case Recording Instructions: CRI016 – MAPPA Registrations](#).

### **6.6. Information Exchange**

6.6.1. It is essential that information sharing takes place: Level 1 management is reliant on engagement from other agencies throughout the entire management process. Police and MAPPA DTC agencies play an important role in managing Level 1 nominals. Ensuring decisions are made in accordance with other agencies' actions, and enabling joint working, is fundamentally what the MAPPA process seeks to do. ViSOR must be utilised where possible, it is accessible to the MAPPA Responsible Authority (Probation, Prisons and Police) and is a vital tool for information sharing. Probation Practitioners must upload all relevant new information to ViSOR as soon as reasonably possible.

- 6.6.2. PS as Lead Agency must actively seek out any new information that may affect risk assessment and management. Probation Practitioners should invite Police and other relevant agencies into all conversations or reviews where the inclusion of their expertise would benefit the management of any Level 1 offender. Most agencies involved in the management of MAPPA Level 1 cases have a duty to cooperate with the MAPPA process. If this does not happen, it is the Probation Practitioner's responsibility to escalate as appropriate up the line management chain in order to facilitate engagement and/or consider a referral into Level 2 or Level 3.
- 6.6.3. It is also the Probation Practitioner's responsibility to gather all necessary information from agencies to inform the initial level setting and in preparation for any reviews, including the Level 1 review, detailed below. Any new risk related information will feed into risk assessments and RMPs which must be reviewed and potentially revised on a regular basis. This may lead to a necessary referral to Level 2 or 3. Probation Practitioners must keep a consistent audit trail and record of decision making.
- 6.6.4. Probation practitioners can use the Information Request form (Appendix A) to gain relevant information from agencies for level setting, as part of day-to-day case management or prior to a Level 1 review. Use of this form is not mandated but it may prove helpful in preparation for the Level 1 review.
- 6.6.5. The sharing of information must be in accordance with the law and the statutory basis for sharing information between RA and DTC agencies under MAPPA is found in section 325(4) of the Criminal Justice Act 2003 (CJA). This expressly permits the sharing of information between these agencies for the purposes of assessing and managing the risks posed by offenders subject to MAPPA management.
- 6.6.6. Information that is shared under MAPPA remains the responsibility of the agency that owns it and it will be for that agency to deal with any Subject Access Requests (SAR) under the Data Protection Act 2018 (DPA).

## **6.7. Information Exchange – Women**

- 6.7.1. Where the offender subject to MAPPA management is located in the women's custodial estate, there may be information on them that is known to HMPPS Women's Team through the Women's Estate Case Support and Advice Panel (WECASP) for Restricted Status Women and Women with Complex Needs. This was formerly known as the Centralised Case Supervision System (CCSS). The information sharing platform provides case support and advice on the care and management plans for some of the most complex and challenging offenders located within the women's estate. It aims to help progression through stabilising behaviour and improving wellbeing; including for those who have been segregated for long periods of time and those with indeterminate sentences who are significantly over tariff. Further guidance on this can be found in the Women's Estate Case Advice and Support Panel Policy Framework.
- 6.7.2. Access to this national support mechanism is through a referral process that is completed by the prison, with the support of the Probation Practitioner. It is the responsibility of the holding prison's governor to identify offenders and complete the necessary documentation. Further information can be obtained through the functional mailboxes, WECASP@justice.gov.uk or

WomensTeam@justice.gov.uk. If a Probation Practitioner thinks an offender may meet the criteria, they should contact the functional mailboxes and request a check of the system.

## **6.8. Information Exchange – Transfer**

6.8.1. Where an offender is transferred between Probation Delivery Units, the Probation Practitioner in the transferring Unit should consult the [Case Transfer Policy Framework](#) in the first instance. The Probation Practitioner in the transferring unit must seek to arrange a transfer discussion with the receiving unit and ensure handover arrangements are in place as soon as is practicable. The assessment of transfer suitability and formal acceptance of the case by the receiving area should be concluded within 20 working days.

## **6.9. Level Setting**

6.9.1. Under the information sharing requirement of this policy framework, Probation Practitioners must contact the police, prisons and all the relevant Duty to Cooperate (DTC) agencies to inform the decision on the level of MAPPA management required. Use of the MAPPA Q (MAPPA screening form) for MAPPA Level screening is recommended as best practice as detailed in the [MAPPA Guidance](#). The minimum required standard is that Level setting decisions and rationale must be recorded and shared with relevant agencies. The Level Setting process must consider risk in custody (where relevant) and must reflect an offender's predicted risk upon release into the community. Further information can be found in the [MAPPA Guidance](#).

6.9.2. Probation Practitioners must utilise information from all relevant agencies when setting the MAPPA Level. Where necessary and where it aids the management of the case, the Information Request Form (Appendix A) can be used to obtain information from relevant agencies.

## **6.10. Level Setting – Community**

6.10.1. For those serving a community sentence or suspended sentence, the Level setting process must begin upon allocation, alongside the initial OASys.

6.10.2. Probation Practitioners must complete the initial OASys and set the MAPPA Level no later than 15 working days from the offender's attendance at their first appointment. Developing the RMP and Sentence Plan and the setting of the MAPPA Level must be a coherent and joined up process with each informing the other. The TPM has provision for an initial discussion about the MAPPA Level setting between the Probation Practitioner and SPO.

## **6.11. Level Setting – Custody**

6.11.1. The Probation Practitioner must complete the Level setting with input from the prison and communicate the Level once set to the prison.

6.11.2. For custody cases the COM must set least six months prior to release, first parole date, each subsequent parole review hearing, or tariff expiry date.

- 6.11.3. Where the person in prison has six months or less to serve in prison at the point of sentence the MAPPA level must be set as soon as possible and in line with completion of the initial OASys.
- 6.11.4. Under the OMiC model, where a prisoner has more than 10 months to serve from point of sentence, responsibility for the case will be passed from Prison Offender Manager (POM) to COM at seven and a half months prior to Conditional Release Date, or eight months before Parole Eligibility Date or Tariff Expiry Date. This handover period will depend on the sentence type and nature of the case, but practitioners must work together to ensure that both the POM and COM contribute to the Level setting process which must take place at least six months pre-release. If the prisoner has 10 months or less to serve from point of sentence, the COM is responsible from the outset and there will be no formal handover; a POM will be assigned in a supporting capacity only. It is the COMs responsibility to initiate and arrange any handover meetings with the POM, and such meetings must ensure effective information exchange between prison and community and inform the Level setting. Further guidance on handover and timescales can be found in the [OMiC Handover Guidance](#), available on [EQuIP](#).
- 6.11.5. It is the responsibility of the COM to set the MAPPA Level but the decision must be informed by input from the prison as well as police and DTC agencies. There must be collaboration between the COM and POM to set MAPPA Level at least six months before release. The Level assigned must be communicated to and acknowledged by the holding prison no later than six months before release.
- 6.11.6. If the POM is not notified of an offender's MAPPA Level by the 6-month pre-release point they should in the first instance contact the COM. If this does not resolve matters the POM should escalate the issue up the line management chain in line with the [MAPPA Guidance](#). Probation Practitioners should work collaboratively with all relevant parties to facilitate participation in the MAPPA process.
- 6.11.7. There may be some cases under OMiC where the handover process needs to start earlier due to the complexity and seriousness of the case, these offenders will therefore be subject to the Early Allocations Process. Offenders who are referred into the Early Allocations Process automatically will not be managed at Level 1. Discretionary referrals are also not likely to capture Level 1 cases. Guidance on eligibility for the [Early Allocations Process](#) can be found on [EQuIP](#). The TPM has provision for an initial discussion about the MAPPA Level setting between the Probation Practitioner and SPO.
- 6.11.8. For legacy CRC cases where the index offence would not have been MAPPA eligible, the COM will not be allocated to the prisoner until 12 weeks pre-release. If the offender is referred into MAPPA under Category 3, a decision will be made on whether it needs to be managed at Level 2 or 3. There are no timescales for the setting of Levels for Category 3 cases as the timing is dictated by the circumstances of the case, but referrals should always be undertaken in a timely fashion where they are required.

## **6.12. Level Setting – Lifers and Indeterminate Sentenced Prisoners (ISPs)**

- 6.12.1. In collaboration with the POM, the COM must set the MAPPA Level at least 6 months prior to the On Tariff Parole Review. In the build-up to each subsequent parole review, the COM



must review the MAPPA Level to ensure the correct level of management is applied to the case. This consideration should be included in the process of preparing the PAROM1. The TPM has provision for a discussion about MAPPA Level setting between the COM and SPO as part of the PAROM1 or pre-release discussion. Guidance on the parole process can be found in the [Generic Parole Process Policy Framework](#).

- 6.12.2. As with any offender who has spent a significant period in custody, Lifers and ISP's will need support to resettle into the community. SFO reviews identify the potential for rapid escalation of risk in this group, especially within the first few weeks of release, which will need to be monitored closely by the COM on release. When confirming the MAPPA Level, practitioners must consider what support they will need from other agencies to deliver the RMP effectively and how other agencies can contribute to monitoring as well as interventions that could assist with effective risk management.
- 6.12.3. New guidance on [Managing Parole Eligible Offenders on Licence](#) has been published on the Intranet in place of PI 08/2015 – Managing Indeterminate Sentenced Offenders on Licence.

### **6.13. Lead Agency Management and Monitoring of Risk**

- 6.13.1. The Lead Agency is the agency with the main statutory authority and responsibility to manage a MAPPA offender in the community. The Lead Agency is usually but will not always be a member of the Responsible Authority (Police, PS or Prison Service). The PS will be the Lead Agency for any offender subject to MAPPA management who is aged over 18 and is subject to PS supervision, including licences, suspended sentences, Community Orders, post-sentence supervision, and licences for subsequent non-MAPPA offences until the supervision period expires. The Lead Agency's risk assessment and RMP is the primary MAPPA assessment and RMP at any given time, but will be contributed to by other agencies. Further information on the lead agency, responsible authority and risk management plans can be found in the [MAPPA Guidance](#).
- 6.13.2. Whilst the lead agency has the primary responsibility for managing MAPPA Level 1 cases, multi-agency working is still essential. Some regions may have established joint Police and Probation Units to manage high risk of serious harm cases. Such arrangements do not affect who the lead agency is or what their responsibilities are. Other agencies may be involved in risk management, providing support or other oversight and it is expected that regular information sharing takes place. The Probation Practitioner should initiate regular communication with agencies involved in the management of Level 1 cases.
- 6.13.3. Professionals' meetings are another important aspect of Level 1 management. Time invested in such meetings can assist management of a case and may help identify issues early, rather than spending additional time dealing with a crisis. In some situations, communication with other agencies is sufficient by phone or email. Where discussions via email are not sufficient, professionals' meetings should take place, either in person or virtually. Meetings should ensure information pertaining to escalating risks is shared appropriately. Probation Practitioners are expected to arrange and lead these meetings to ensure a successful multi-agency approach to management, however if another agency chooses to arrange a professionals meeting regarding a case, the Probation Practitioner should be in attendance. Where possible and where resource allows, PS Administrative Officers should support professionals meetings. Where this is not possible, the Probation Practitioner must ensure any decisions and actions resulting from the meeting are recorded on nDelius. The Probation



Practitioner should consider if any disagreement at professionals' meetings should be escalated up the line management chain to decide the best course of action, and should consider a referral to Level 2 or 3 where appropriate.

6.13.4. All relevant agencies must be updated on any significant changes in a case. The Probation Practitioner must record instances where information is exchanged between agencies on nDelius. This includes where information is exchanged via email or phone, as well as in-person discussions. Information should be shared with DTC agencies as well as any other associates that the Responsible Authority considers may contribute to the assessment and management of the risk presented by MAPPA offenders under MAPPA (introduced by the Police Crime Sentencing and Courts Act 2022).

#### **6.14. Lead Agency Management and Monitoring of Risk – Category 1 Offenders**

6.14.1. For MAPPA Category 1 offenders, the [ARMS informed OASys](#) (Aol) guidance sets out additional expectations to MAPPA Level 1 requirements, specifically around home visits. Joint home visits by Police and Probation can provide an opportunity to gather new information through observing home circumstances, increasing knowledge of the local area, and having the opportunity to meet family members or significant others. This can inform the initial sentence plan and aid ongoing case management. It is also considered good practice to complete a joint home visit prior to a change of Lead Agency, for example, when PS supervision comes to an end and Police supervision begins, a joint home visit can inform the PS' final sentence plan. Probation Practitioners should refer to the guidance on assessing ARMS factors in OASys on EQuIP for further information, as well as the [Home Visit Guidance for Offenders Managers' \(September 2019\)](#).

#### **6.15. Lead Agency Management and Monitoring of Risk – Category 4 Offenders**

6.15.1 Probation Practitioners should consult with the Joint Extremism Unit (JEXU) Probation Counter Terrorism (PCT) Unit when managing Extremism Offenders. The JEXU PCT network / NSD will triage relevant cases and make a decision around whether each case should be referred to the Probation National Security Division for Category 4 management.

#### **6.16. Lead Agency Management and Monitoring of Risk – Domestic Abuse and Stalking**

6.16.1. For management of offenders whose convictions or behaviours include domestic abuse, Probation Practitioners should refer to the [Domestic Abuse Policy Framework](#) in the first instance. Probation Practitioners should expect to work with a variety of other agencies to manage the risks perpetrators pose and to ensure the safety and wellbeing of victims and children. Particular care must be taken to ensure that information from other agencies informs the decision on what Level of MAPPA management will best support the RMP, and feeds into reviews of cases managed at Level 1. Active steps should be taken to work with partner agencies to ensure the victim's perspective has informed the risk management plan in all cases including those cases managed at Level 1 or outside of MAPPA

6.16.2. Domestic abuse and stalking offenders may be convicted of offences or subject to a sentence which make them automatically MAPPA eligible under [Category 1 or Category 2](#). This includes those who have been convicted of murder or an offence specified under Schedule 15 or Section 327(4A) of the Criminal Justice Act 2003 (CJA 2003) and have been sentenced to 12 months or more in prison, as well as sexual offenders subject to notification

requirements. An offence under section 4 or 4A of the Protection from Harassment Act 1997 (c.40) (putting people in fear of violence and stalking involving fear of violence or serious alarm or distress) is specified in Schedule 15. Here the sentence threshold has been met Probation Practitioners will set the MAPPA level in line with this PF and the MAPPA guidance.

- 6.16.3. Referral into Level 2 or 3 should also be considered for those with other convictions/sentences for stalking or displaying stalking behaviours using Category 3. Probation Practitioners should have an understanding of stalking behaviours, their relevance to a risk of harm assessment, and the impact of these behaviours on victims. Although not true in all cases, stalking behaviours may be closely linked to domestic abuse: approximately 50% of those who stalk target ex-partners. In cases linked to domestic abuse, Probation Practitioners should carefully manage these offenders in the same way as others who perpetrate domestic abuse, factoring the stalking concerns into the SARA and overall risk assessment. Probation Practitioners should consult the [EQuIP Stalking Pathway](#) for support in identifying the stalking typology exhibited by the offender with whom they are working. The guidance and support in this area will help to identify the most appropriate risk management and intervention considerations and inform decisions on when MAPPA Level 2 or 3 management is required.
- 6.16.4. Practitioners should be familiar with Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conferences (MARAC), child safeguarding case conferences, Integrated Offender Management (IOM) and any other local arrangements (such as MATAC in the North East). In prisons, Inter Departmental Risk Management meetings (IRMM) and Multi-Agency Lifer Risk Assessment Panels (MALRAP) provide an important opportunity for staff from different areas of the business to work together and share information to inform risk management activities and interventions in custody and in preparation for release. The [Domestic Abuse Policy Framework](#) sets out some of the differences between MAPPA and MARAC, which along with local information on referral criteria, will help staff to identify the most appropriate approach to coordinating multi-agency working. A MAPPA eligible offender may be referred into MARAC if there is a need for immediate coordination and information sharing between partnership agencies to manage an identified risk to a victim, whilst still remaining at MAPPA Level 1 management, under the assurance of continued close multi-agency working.
- 6.16.5. However, Probation Practitioners must consider all high risk and serial domestic abuse or stalking perpetrators for MAPPA Level 2 or 3 management, using Category 3 management where necessary. A history of domestic abuse toward one or more partners is a significant risk factor within a risk assessment. This can be in the context of a current relationship or following a separation. Probation Practitioners should actively monitor for changes that may indicate escalating risk and use SARA alongside OASys to support their review of risk. SARA is a structured professional judgment tool which assesses known risk factors for domestic abuse to aid assessors in identifying factors which indicate an increased risk of domestic abuse related harm. It should inform judgements on risk of harm levels and risk management plans in OASys. Both SARA and the overall ROSH Summary within OASys provide the opportunity to document concerns and information to support referrals into MAPPA Level 2 or 3 management, using Category 3 where relevant. It is equally important to evidence the appropriateness of Level 1 management. MAPPA Level 2 or 3 management should be considered as a means of formally establishing information sharing and risk management planning amongst partnership agencies, whilst considering victim safety

through protective measures, disclosure of relevant information, and establishing appropriate victim support.

6.16.6. Domestic Abuse can include coercive and controlling behaviour and may be present whether or not it is represented as a conviction. Probation practitioners should familiarise themselves with the government definition of coercive and controlling behaviours: although less visible than physical abuse, these behaviours are considered to be a significant indicator of ongoing and future harm to victims. Coercive control can affect a whole family. Liaison with partner agencies is necessary to ensure that children are safeguarded. Perpetrators of coercive and controlling behaviour may be adept at manipulating those around them – including professionals. Probation practitioners should use information sharing and professional curiosity to ensure they have an accurate understanding of an offender’s behaviour and circumstances when managing those who display controlling and coercive techniques. Although not an automatic MAPPA eligible offence, the risk associated with controlling and coercive behaviour should be understood, monitored and acted on in each case with an appropriate multi-agency approach. SARA and the overall ROSH summary within OASys should be used to determine the risk levels presented by controlling and coercive behaviour. Any risk escalations should be shared with partnership agencies and trigger prompt consideration for referral into Level 2 or 3 MAPPA using Category 3 where necessary. Probation Practitioners may need to challenge their own thinking and the assumptions of other professionals, and managers should provide support in doing so. More information on [Coercive Control](#) can be found on [EQuIP](#).

## **6.17. Responding to Risk Escalation**

6.17.1. Having taken all reasonable steps to gather information from other agencies, Probation Practitioners must respond to relevant new information appropriately. In cases where there has been a significant escalation in risk that requires immediate action, the Probation Practitioner in appropriate consultation with their manager should consider first whether the recall threshold has been met, a decision needs to be made as to whether the risk is such that it can no longer be safely managed in the community.

6.17.2. Where the recall threshold has not been met, the need for escalation to Level 2 or 3 will be clear in some cases. Referral criteria for Level 2 and Level 3 is in the [MAPPA Guidance](#), located on the [MAPPA website](#). If a case managed at Level 1 incurs a significant escalation in risk that requires a greater level of oversight, the Probation Practitioner can get support in strengthening the RMP by immediately referring the offender for Level 2 or 3 management using the MAPPA A (MAPPA Level 2/3 referral form) and sending the form to the MAPPA Coordinator and the relevant MAPPA functional mailbox. Referral to MAPPA Level 2 or Level 3 as well as the outcome must be recorded on nDelius. While cases should be managed at the lowest level that provides a defensible RMP, high risk cases should only be managed at Level 1 if the risks are manageable by the lead agency without the need for formal meetings. Further guidance can be found on [EQuIP](#).

## **6.18. Disclosure**

6.18.1. The need to disclose information to a third party can arise at any time during the management of a case, and can trigger the need for a Level 1 review. Probation Practitioners must take a multi-agency approach when considering disclosure and consider implications for other Agencies. Professionals’ meetings should be utilised where possible.

#### 6.18.2. Reasons to disclose may include:

- To protect past or potential future victims, in particular where those subject to MAPPA management enter into new relationships with partners who may be at risk or where there are children or access to other young persons under 18
  - This may include friends or neighbours who have children
- Where there is evidence that grooming may be taking place, for example through leisure clubs, faith-based groups, or employment
- If there is a condition in a Sexual Harm Prevention Order / licence excluding an offender from a specific location or having contact with named persons
- Where others may be at risk, for example in supported accommodation
  - This may include other residents or staff and managers who are told for placement purposes and for greater vigilance to be exercised
- Where the public may be at risk through the offender's employment, training or education
- Disclosure to third sector organisations, voluntary and faith groups for the purpose of public protection
- Any organisation who could contribute to public protection but who is not detailed in the statutory guidance or identified as a DTC agency in the [MAPPA Guidance](#).

6.18.3. Prompt disclosure can be very important in cases where an offender has a history of domestic abuse and information is received about apparent new relationships, or where the practitioner is not sure that a current partner has full knowledge of the domestic abuse history. Further advice on the action to take can be found in, the [Domestic Abuse Policy Framework](#), the [seven-minute briefing on domestic abuse disclosure](#), and in further guidance on [making disclosures in cases of domestic abuse](#) also available on [EQuIP](#).

6.18.4. All disclosure decisions and plans for disclosure should be discussed with and signed off by the SPO. See [Touch Point Model \(TPM\) Guidance](#) available on [EQuIP](#). It is not necessary to inform the MAPPA Coordinator about disclosure decisions for Level 1 cases, but Probation Practitioners must record details of any decision making on nDelius so they can be made available if required. Disclosure decisions must reference police and other agency involvement where relevant.

6.18.5. If complex disclosures are being considered, referral to Level 2 or 3 may be necessary. In taking the case to a formal MAPPA Level 2 or Level 3 meeting for review, all information to inform the decision is fully shared and plans to manage the disclosure can be made on a multi-agency basis.

6.18.6. Probation Practitioners are encouraged to follow local safety guidance regarding disclosure to any persons, and should refer in the first instance to the [MAPPA Guidance](#) and any local guidance published by the MAPPA Strategic Management Board (SMB). Further information can be found on [EQuIP](#) in the seven-minute briefing provided by Effective Practice & Service Improvement Group, located under Risk [here](#).

6.18.7. Disclosure to a third party must comply with the law, must be necessary for public protection, and must be proportionate. Disclosure can be considered if the case for doing so is necessary and proportionate in all the circumstances for the protection of specific individuals or the

public at large. For the disclosure to be proportionate it must not go further than what is necessary and only be used where other ways of providing the protection are not applicable. Probation Practitioners should consult the [Handling Sensitive Information Framework on EQuIP](#) for further guidance relating to the management of information regarding those managed under MAPPA.

## 6.19. Level 1 Reviews

6.19.1. Keeping the suitability of Level 1 MAPPA management under review is an integral part of risk management and public protection and must be informed by evidence from a range of sources as well as from the offender to be assessed. Risk will change during the course of a sentence and will be influenced by a number of factors. Probation Practitioners must exercise professional curiosity to understand what is influencing the current level of risk, verify the information that is being provided and use risk assessment tools such as OASys and SARA to inform the assessment. Probation Practitioners should consult the [Risk of Serious Harm Guidance](#) for further information.

6.19.2. A Level 1 review is required at the following specific points:

- At least every 6 months
- After a significant change in circumstances, for example: moving out of an Approved Premises (AP), or being released from custody
- Following a significant event, for example: the death of a family member
- A marked decline in mental health
- After receiving significant information from another agency which could impact the RMP
- If the Probation Practitioner is considering recall or other actions to manage escalating risk
- Preparation of Part B or Part C following recall/review
- Preparation of a PAROM1+ or Addendum
- After any transfer that results in a change of Probation Practitioner, i.e. between Probation Delivery Units
- If disclosure is required which could affect the RMP
- At point of sentence termination

6.19.3. As a broad set of considerations for whether an event is significant or not, Probation Practitioners should consider:

- If there is a change that could affect the offender's risk assessment
- If you have discovered new risk factors through the course of supervision and ongoing assessment
- Where your understanding of the interrelationship between risk factors changes
- Where there is a change in the sufficiency of protective factors to mitigate risk
- Where new Safeguarding concerns emerge
- Where a person's behaviour, access to victims, or circumstances change and may have an impact on the immediacy of risk
- Pre-release changes, i.e. deterioration in custodial behaviour, new adjudications or risk information received from prison
- Where there needs to be a change to the RMP – of particular note:



- A move from an AP to independent accommodation. This is a significant reduction in monitoring and should result in a review
- To aid understanding of a case; where the Probation Practitioner has changed
- Escalating media interest
- New partner
- Emerging or new risk factors

6.19.4. The above list is not exhaustive and other events will require Probation Practitioner's professional judgement to determine if they need to undertake a Level 1 review outside the set timescales. If cases encounter any of the above triggering conditions on a regular basis, the Probation Practitioner must conduct a Level 1 review and consider whether to escalate to Level 2 or 3.

6.19.5. For ISPs, the initial Lifer Panels and Imprisonment for Public Protection (IPP) Progression Panels should be completed within 3 months following release and should form the basis of a Level 1 review. Thereafter, the outcome of each Level 1 review should support any decisions made in the management of the case. All decisions and actions related to risk management must be recorded on the OASys RMP. Further guidance on Lifer Panels and IPP Progression Panels can be found on EQuIP.

6.19.6. Practitioners do not need to undertake reviews where supervision has been suspended. Practitioners should undertake reviews as soon as supervision has resumed, and then regularly until supervision has been suspended once more.

6.19.7. Where an offender has been convicted of domestic abuse or exhibits domestic abuse behaviours, Probation Practitioners should refer to the [Domestic Abuse Policy Framework](#) when reviewing the case. Probation Practitioners must consider all serial domestic abuse perpetrators for MAPPA Level 2 or 3 management. Partnership working is paramount, and Probation Practitioners must prioritise the safety and wellbeing of victims and children. Probation Practitioners should ensure they are familiar with the guidance on [Stalking](#) as well as [Coercive Control](#) and their links to [Domestic Abuse](#).

6.19.8. When an offender subject to MAPPA management is recalled to prison on a fixed term recall, the COM must review their MAPPA management Level before the offender's release. When the offender under MAPPA is recalled on a standard recall, the COM must review their MAPPA management Level:

- Before the 28 day Parole Board review
- 6 months before any subsequent Parole Board review or as soon as is practicable
- Prior to any consideration for executive re-release

## **6.20. Review Process**

6.20.1. Practitioners are required to review Level 1 cases to ensure all risks are still being managed effectively and consider whether the activities in the RMP remain valid or if changes need to be made, including whether a referral to Level 2 or 3 is necessary. Appropriate and relevant information needs to be gathered and recorded correctly. Probation Practitioners must also check completion of any actions on RMPs and from previous Level 1 reviews and escalate any issues to the SPO.

- 6.20.2. In the Level 1 review, the Probation Practitioner must consider either the incident or change in circumstance that prompted the review, or the progress over the last 6 months. Along with relevant information collated from agencies (supporting document attached at Appendix A), the Probation Practitioner should also review any plans pertinent to the case.
- 6.20.3. A prompt sheet (MAPPA Level 1 Review) designed to be used as a cognitive aid alongside OASys is provided at Appendix B. As a minimum the Probation Practitioner must refer to the OASys Risk of Harm summary and the RMP, consider the prompt sheet items and decide whether changes are required. The prompt sheet is for reference and does not need to be uploaded unless it is helpful for the management of the case. Other assessments and plans may be relevant in individual cases.
- 6.20.4. The Level 1 review will determine if an updated OASys assessment is required, though the main purpose is to ensure necessary information is being shared between agencies and the relevant plans are up to date and meet the current identified risks.
- 6.20.5. Disclosure should always be considered as changes in circumstance or receipt of new information may mean that disclosure becomes necessary. Decisions on disclosure will be informed by information gathered in advance of the Level 1 review.
- 6.20.6. Any significant changes highlighted in the review must be added to OASys in line with current standards requiring an OASys to be completed where there is a change in circumstances.

## **6.21. Victims**

- 6.21.1. All MAPPA offenders must be risk assessed to identify anyone who may be at risk of serious harm from them, this includes all victims or potential victims regardless of their participation in the Victim Contact Scheme (VCS). The risk management plan must identify how these risks, including the risk of psychological harm, will be managed. As part of this process, consideration must be given in each case to whether the disclosure of information about an offender to others should be made to protect victims, potential victims, staff, and other persons in the community. The overriding factor is the need to protect the public and safeguard children and adults at risk.
- 6.21.2. Statutory victims and others identified at risk of serious harm should always be considered during a Level 1 review. The Probation Practitioner should consult with the Victim Liaison Unit and consider the [PI 48/2014 Victim Contact Scheme \(VCS\) Guidance Manual](#) where necessary. The Code of Practice for Victims of Crime in England and Wales as well as supporting public information and materials can be found on [GOV.UK](#).
- 6.21.3. The VCS is designed to keep victims of the most serious offences, where the perpetrator has been made subject to a long prison sentence, informed of key stages of the sentence, and give victims the opportunity to request licence conditions on release. There are cases where a discretionary service may be offered to victims who do not fall into the eligible criteria, this is set out in [PI 03/2017 \(Probation Victim Contact Service – Non-Statutory Cases\)](#).
- 6.21.4. In cases where a victim or known individual is at risk but they do not meet the criteria for the statutory or discretionary VCS, the Probation Practitioner must ensure that the RMP has the

necessary measures in place to manage the risk. This may involve engaging directly with the victim, disclosing information, or signposting them to other relevant agencies, for example police safeguarding units or the local authority or voluntary sector support services. Such cases should be discussed at the Level 1 review and referred to Level 2 or 3 management where necessary.

## **6.22. Recording**

6.22.1. The Probation Practitioner must record the completion of a Level 1 review, its outcome the reasons for decisions taken in nDelius. The MAPPA registration must be updated and the date of next review recorded on the MAPPA registration on nDelius. This ensures the data is flagged and will provide a prompt when data is run by PS Administrative Officers.

6.22.2. Where there is a change in behaviour, access or increased proximity to victims or other factors that may indicate risk is increasing or has decreased, urgent actions and outcomes must be recorded in nDelius and reflected in OASys. The Probation Practitioner must also record any action that demonstrates due regard was given to equality and diversity issues.

6.22.3. Probation Practitioners can upload the completed prompt sheet at Appendix B to nDelius if it will support the management of the case, though this is not mandatory. Once complete this must be marked as Official Sensitive. The form can be attached to the contact, which should be marked sensitive if necessary.

6.22.4. Significant information, including the risk summary and outcome of the Level 1 review must be copied to ViSOR as appropriate via the export function on nDelius. The ViSOR export facility will be activated upon ViSOR registration. Selecting the export to ViSOR box in nDelius will allow the information to be exported and then copied into ViSOR by an PS MAPPA Administrator. All Category 1 and 3 cases, and all Level 2 and 3 cases will have a ViSOR record. The PS is working towards having all Category 2 Level 1 cases on ViSOR. A RMP should be uploaded for Category 2, Level 1 nominals, where a ViSOR record exists and where the infrastructure allows. Where one does not exist, it is good practice to file a request for a record be created. The most recent Prison Service / Probation Instruction in relation to ViSOR - [PSI 40/2014 - PI 56/2014 Mandatory Use of ViSOR](#), sets out the National Standards for ViSOR.

6.22.5. As a minimum the Probation Practitioner should refer to the prompt sheet (Appendix B), to ensure they have covered all necessary components and update OASys. The registration in nDelius and ViSOR (where there is a record) must reflect that a review has been completed. If the local area chooses to undertake additional actions and they have the resource available, it is at their discretion to do so.

## **6.23. Management oversight**

6.23.1. For day-to-day management of particularly complicated cases, Probation Practitioners are expected to consult as appropriate and seek guidance from the SPO as needed and refer to Level 2 or 3 where necessary. For information on practitioner and SPO oversight expectations, including minimum standards around face-to-face case discussions, refer to the [Touch Point Model \(TPM\) Guidance](#) and the [Reflective Practice Supervision Standards](#) (formerly the SLMMF), available on [EQuIP](#).



6.23.2. The review of MAPPA cases should be prioritised during Practice Supervision. At a minimum, it is expected that Probation Practitioners and SPO's discuss all Level 1 reviews where the case is recorded as being *high risk*. In these instances, the SPO must be satisfied that the OASys is up to date. Such discussions should be evidenced using the Management Oversight nDelius entry. The MAPPA flag should be updated by the Probation Practitioner.

6.23.3. The PS MAPPA Administrator or Case Administrator can run data from nDelius and ViSOR on a monthly basis to provide the Head of the Probation Delivery Unit (PDU) with management information on the completion of Level 1 reviews. The Head of PDU should use this as a basis for discussion with SPO's in management supervision to ensure Level 1 reviews are being completed within individual teams.

## **6.24. Referral to Level 2 or 3**

6.24.1. Should the Level 1 review, or separate receipt of any significant information, suggest a referral to Level 2 or Level 3 is required, practitioners should undertake the referral using the MAPPA A in accordance with local procedures. A more formal Level 1 review may not be required if the need for referral to Level 2 or 3 is clear, see the [MAPPA Guidance](#) for more information on thresholding. Practitioners can seek advice or support from SPOs in these cases where necessary. In completing the MAPPA A, the Probation Practitioner must use established risk assessment tools to:

- Estimate the likelihood of reoffending
- Estimate the risk of serious harm (when and to whom)
- Estimate the immediacy of the risk of serious harm

6.24.2. The referral must include the reason for referral and demonstrate that there are specific factors that require inter-agency involvement, conferencing, information sharing and multi-agency risk management beyond that which can be provided by Level 1 management. This is the opportunity for the practitioner to set out what they need help with in managing the case. Referrers must:

- Identify those who need to be invited to the meeting
- Include the lead agency risk assessment
- Include the lead agency RMP

6.24.3. If a prisoner has been referred to Level 2 or 3 and the referral has been accepted, the prisoner will be managed by the COM from that point on.

## **6.25. Information Storage**

6.25.1. Information must be stored and handled using the Government Security Classification Scheme, shared safely and securely and used by the appropriate personnel within those agencies for public protection purposes only. Documents must be marked as Official Sensitive where necessary.

6.25.2. Any documents associated with the MAPPA Level 1 review must be stored on nDelius and exported to ViSOR, along with other relevant documents. Probation Practitioners should store MAPPA Level 1 and Level 1 review documentation on nDelius in line with the [Touch Point Model \(TPM\) Guidance](#).

6.25.3. All official MAPPA documents must be saved electronically within nDelius, except for the MAPPA B (MAPPA minutes), which must be stored on ViSOR in line with the [MAPPA Guidance](#). MAPPA minutes should only be printed in a secure environment and not removed from that environment unless absolutely necessary. Where an organisation retains MAPPA meeting minutes outside ViSOR, they must be held under the organisation's own data protection procedures, including those on the retention and destruction of records.

## **6.26. Monitoring and Quality Assurance**

6.26.1. Managers should be able to access Management Information (MIS) reports detailing completion of MAPPA Level 1 initial screenings and reviews for all relevant cases in their teams. This will support them to monitor and review the Level 1 procedures and identify outstanding screenings or reviews. SPOs can provide oversight and ensure compliance with this process, and should report their findings to the Head of PDU for discussion during supervision.

6.26.2. The management of Level 1 MAPPA cases should be routinely quality assured to promote consistently good practice. Regular audits have added value and may enhance the quality assurance process. Regions should audit MAPPA Level 1 cases on a yearly basis, using a random sample but prioritising high risk of harm cases. SPO's should be involved in the audit process, and resource permitting, should audit one case for each Probation Practitioner that they manage. Quality Development Officers can support the audit process, and the workload should be shared across Probation Practitioners.

6.26.3. In line with the CQMF which asks SPOs or QDOs to quality assure one case per quarter (totalling four cases per year), at least one of these four cases should be a MAPPA Level 1 case. This can be increased as necessary, but should remain representative of the entire caseload.

6.26.4. When quality assuring MAPPA Level 1 cases, amongst others, the nationally approved regional case audit tool, which forms part of the CQMF, should be used. Should regions choose to go over and above what is asked in the CQMF, for example, a deep dive on MAPPA Level 1 cases as part of a local priority, Practitioners have the option of using the Audit of MAPPA Level 1 cases template, located in Appendix C.

**Appendix A**  
**INFORMATION REQUEST**



**Information-sharing must be lawful**

Information sharing must be in accordance with the law. The statutory basis for sharing information between RA and DTC agencies under MAPPED is found in section 325(4) of the Criminal Justice Act 2003 (CJA). This expressly permits the sharing of information between these agencies for the purposes of assessing and managing the risks posed by offenders subject to MAPPED management. For further information, please refer to the [MAPPED Guidance](#).

<b>Name:</b>	<b>CRN:</b>	<b>Date:</b>
<b>Agency:</b>	<b>Requester Name:</b>	<b>Role:</b>
<b>Please share any information you have about this offender which could help identify any risks or enhance the risk management plan to help manage them whilst in the community</b>		
<b>Contact</b> Include details of any contact or involvement you have had with the case, the offender or their family		
<b>Risk</b> Include your agency's own assessment of risk of harm and the accompanying risk management plan		
<b>Support</b> Include details of any additional support your agency is providing		
<b>Concerns</b> Include any concerns or issues that may have arisen		
<b>Progress</b> Include any comments on progress		
<b>Any Other Comments</b>		

Appendix B

MAPPA Level 1 Review: Probation Service



When completing a Level 1 review, please consider the following:

<p><u>Have all relevant partner agencies submitted the necessary information for this review? Yes/ No</u></p>	
<p><b>Any Increasing or Decreasing Risk Issues?</b></p> <p><u>Increasing and decreasing risk issues must be recorded in OASys</u></p>	<p><b>Consider:</b>                  Any changes in circumstance? Yes/No                  Is the OASys still current? Yes/No</p> <p>Any Acute or Dynamic risk factors present?</p> <p>In your view, is there a change in risk immediacy?</p> <p>What controls are in place or can be applied?</p> <p><b>Changes recorded in:</b>                  OASys <input type="checkbox"/>                  nDelius <input type="checkbox"/>                  ViSOR <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p><b>Review of Risk Management Plan – Four Pillars</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Supervision</b></li> <li>• <b>Monitoring &amp; Control</b></li> <li>• <b>Interventions &amp; Treatment</b></li> <li>• <b>Victim Safety Planning</b></li> </ul> <p>Consider any information received from other agencies and ViSOR, as well as behaviour, motivation and compliance. Include progress and any positives also.</p>	<p>Does OASys RMP need updating? Yes/No</p> <p>Does ViSOR need updating? Yes/No</p> <p>Is the Contingency Plan suitably thorough? Yes/No</p> <p>Has Safeguarding and domestic abuse concerns been considered? Yes/No</p> <p>Are there any referrals required? Yes/No</p> <p><b>Changes to RMP must be recorded on OASys</b></p>
<p><b>Review of MAPPA Level</b></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Retain at Level 1</b>                      <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Refer to Level 2 / 3</b></p> <p>Reasoning recorded in nDelius/OASys <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p><b>Disclosure</b></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Considered</b>  <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Required</b>  <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Not Required</b></p> <p>Reasoning recorded <input type="checkbox"/>                  ViSOR updated <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p><b>Equality and Diversity</b></p>	<p><b>Consider:</b>                  Have potential needs been identified and accommodated?</p>
<p><b>Actions</b></p>	<p>Have previous plans/ actions been reviewed? Yes/No                  What new actions need to be taken? <b>Actions recorded in:</b>                  OASys <input type="checkbox"/>                  nDelius <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p><b>Date of next review</b></p>	

## Appendix C

### Audit of MAPPA Level 1 Cases



<b>Identification</b>	
1. Was the offender's MAPPA category recorded correctly? (see guidance notes)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Information Sharing</b>	
2. Had all opportunities to share information been taken? (see guidance notes)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Risk Assessment</b>	
3. Has the current level of risk been identified correctly? (see guidance notes)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
4. Where there is more than one agency managing the case, has the risk assessment been agreed?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Risk Management</b>	
5. Have identified dynamic triggers and protective factors been addressed? (see guidance notes)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
6. Can it be demonstrated that the balance of restrictive and rehabilitative interventions has been considered? (see guidance notes)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
7. Are the Risk Management Plan actions appropriate?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
8. Have appropriate actions been taken in relation to any risk issues identified?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
9. Has there been management oversight?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
10. Have reviews taken place when required?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
11. Is there evidence that third party disclosure was considered in a defensible manner?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Overall Review</b>	
12. Was the offender correctly managed at Level 1?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Comments:

## Guidance Notes

### Audit of MAPPA Level 1 Cases



1. The MAPPA category should be recorded on agencies' shared or individual recording systems. These include ViSOR, Delius, Asset, etc.
2. It is essential that **all** information that has a bearing on the offender's risk is shared with other relevant MAPPA agencies. It is also essential that the sharing of information is properly evidenced.
3. Has information been actively sought from other agencies to inform the risk assessment? Dependent on which risk assessment tool is used, the term 'risk' can mean different things.
  - OASys – Risk of reconviction and risk of serious harm
  - Asset – Risk of serious harm
  - RSR – Risk of Serious Recidivism
  - RM 2000 – Risk of reconviction (to be replaced by OSP)
  - OSP – OASys Sexual Reoffending Predictor
4. Risk assessments across all agencies must be consistent, where there are discrepancies these must be resolved or otherwise escalated up the line management chain to ensure a consistent level of risk. Risk levels should be communicated between agencies where it is not possible to jointly assess the level of risk
5. Both dynamic triggers and protective factors must be considered and addressed.
  - **Dynamic triggers** – factors linked to offending which can change, e.g. heavy drinking, lack of accommodation
  - **Protective factors** – positive influences in an individual's life, e.g. stable accommodation, appropriate relationship, that act as barriers to offending behaviours.
6. Interventions delivered must have a good balance of both restrictive and rehabilitative interventions.
  - **Restrictive interventions** – These are strategies aimed at controlling and reducing opportunities for harmful behaviour, e.g. by restricting access to particular venues such as schools and leisure facilities.
  - **Rehabilitative interventions** – These are strategies that focus more on developing their own ability to avoid and manage risk situations, e.g. attendance at accredited cognitive-behavioural programmes, co-operation with drug and alcohol advisory services.
7. Do the actions reflect the issues flagged in the Risk Management Plan?
8. Are the actions appropriate and proportionate to the risk issues identified?
9. Have agencies' policies in relation to supervision been adhered to and is this evident?
10. Have reviews been conducted according to agency policy?
11. The disclosing of information to third parties about MAPPA eligible offenders should be considered. Details of such should be evident on the relevant recording systems.
12. Considering all of the above, in your professional opinion, was the offender correctly managed at Level 1?