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Ms Anja Woods

On behalf of the West Yorkshire Strategic Management Board (SMB) I am pleased to present the Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA) 2022-2023 annual report.

MAPPA consists of effective working partnerships between agencies to manage the risk presented by violent or dangerous individuals.

This report contains the statistics related to the management of individuals under MAPPA (sexual offenders, violent offenders and other dangerous offenders) to safeguard our communities from harm. It also explains how different agencies involved work together in West Yorkshire.

The MAPPA Responsible Authority (RA) agencies (police, prison and probation) have continued to work alongside duty to cooperate agencies which include, Youth Offending Teams, Children’s and Adults Social Care, Health and Mental Health, Education, Home Office Immigration Enforcement, Accommodation and Electronic Monitoring providers to ensure the management of some of the most dangerous offenders is robust to protect the public and make our communities safer.

The case study illustrates multi-agency working in practice and the outcome achieved as a result of effective information sharing and collaborative partnerships. A result of the collective commitment from agencies to cohere and coordinate solutions for complex cases. Evidently, MAPPA adds value by providing oversight and scrutiny for complex cases. This demonstrates the success of the MAPPA platform.

The SMB would like to thank Mr. Amit Bhagwat for his hard work and the contributions he has made as the Lay Advisor. As a core member of the SMB, during the last seven years, Mr. Bhagwat has provided an independent voice in monitoring the effectiveness of MAPPA, reviewing of MAPPA functions and identifying any changes needed for improvement. We would like to wish him all the best for the future.



Mr.Nick Hawley

The SMB would like to pay a special tribute to Mr. Nick Hawley, former Chair of the SMB. Sadly Mr. Hawley passed away after a short period of illness. He worked tirelessly in steering risk management processes to robustly manage those offenders who pose the most significant risk of serious harm to our communities. He is greatly missed by all. We will continue to work in achieving Mr Hawley’s aim of building safer communities for everyone.

The SMB’s key objective of 2023-2024 is improving the quality of MAPPA provision in West Yorkshire which will see the implementation of HMIP recommendations. As we hand over the Chairing of SMB to Police colleagues we will continue to review our membership of SMB to ensure we are including all relevant partnerships.

On behalf of the SMB, I would like to thank all staff involved in the MAPPA process for maintaining an excellent level of service to the public. I look forward to continuing to work with partner agencies to fulfil our responsibility in keeping our communities safer.



Ms. Anja Woods

MAPPA SMB Chair and Head of Bradford and Calderdale Probation Delivery Unit

# What is MAPPA?

MAPPA background

MAPPA (Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements) are a set of arrangements to manage the risk posed by individuals who have committed the most serious sexual, violent and terrorist offences (MAPPA-eligible individuals) 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, Department for Work and Pensions and Local Housing and Education Authorities.

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

Lay Advisers are members of the public appointed by the Minister with no links to the business of managing MAPPA-eligible individuals 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 individuals 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 4 categories of MAPPA-eligible individual:

* **Category 1** –subject to sex offender notification requirements.
* **Category 2** – mainly violent offenders sentenced to 12 months or more imprisonment or a hospital order.
* **Category 3** – individuals who do not qualify under Categories 1, 2 or 4 but whose offences pose a risk of serious harm.
* **Category 4** – terrorism convicted and terrorism risk individuals.

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 individual 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 individual.
* **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 individuals 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 individuals move between areas, enhancing public protection measures. ViSOR allows staff from the Police, Probation and Prison Services to work on the same IT system, improving the quality and timeliness of risk assessments and interventions to prevent offending.

MAPPA and Terrorism

The government published an Independent Review of the MAPPA used to Supervise Terrorism and Terrorism-risk individuals on 2 September 2020 and published its response 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, the majority of which have been implemented, including via the Counter-Terrorism and Sentencing Act 2021 and the Police, Crime, Sentencing and Courts Act 2022. The Secretary of State has also revised the statutory MAPPA Guidance on terrorism offenders.

The Probation Service, via its National Security Division, 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 individuals in the community. This includes the management of terrorist connected and terrorist risk offenders. The NSD and Counter-Terrorism Policing work closely with local SMBs to ensure the robust management of terrorism cases. Data on Category 4 individuals is not included in this report due to data protection issues related to low numbers. This data will be aggregated and published nationally.

All MAPPA reports from England and Wales are published online at: [www.gov.uk](http://www.gov.uk)

# MAPPA Statistics

MAPPA-eligible individuals on 31 March 2023

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Category 1: Subject to sex offender notification requirements | Category 2: Violent offenders | Category 3: Other dangerous offenders | Total |
| Level 1 | 3135 | 1072 | - | 4207 |
| Level 2 | 39 | 33 | 18 | 90 |
| Level 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| Total | 3175 | 1105 | 19 | 4299 |

MAPPA-eligible offenders in Levels 2 and 3 by category (yearly total)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Category 1: Subject to sex offender notification requirements | Category 2: Violent offenders | Category 3: Other dangerous offenders | Total |
| Level 2 | 61 | 67 | 24 | 152 |
| Level 3 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 12 |
| Total | 67 | 70 | 27 | 164 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Category 1 cautioned or convicted for breach of notification requirements | 83 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Category 1 who have had their life time notification revoked on application | 4 |

Restrictive orders for Category 1 offenders

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Sexual Harm Prevention Order (SHPO) | 313 |
| SHPO with foreign travel restriction | 2 |
| Notification Order | 6 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Number of individuals who became subject to sex offender notification requirements following a breach(es) of a Sexual Risk Order (SRO) | 0 |

Level 2 and 3 individuals returned to custody

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Returned to custody for breach of licence | Category 1: Subject to notification requirements | Category 2: Violent offenders | Category 3: Other dangerous offenders | Total |
| Level 2 | 10 | 16 | 7 | 33 |
| Level 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Total | 10 | 17 | 7 | 34 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Breach of SHPO |  |
| Level 2 | 1 |
| Level 3 | 0 |
| Total | 1 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Total number of individuals subject to sex offender notification requirements per 100,000 population | 153 |

This figure has been calculated using the mid-2021 estimated resident population, published by the Office for National Statistics (ONS) on 21 December 2022, excluding those aged less than ten years of age.

Consistent with previous publications, this figure should be based on mid-2022 estimated resident population; however, the ONS has changed its publication schedule such that the mid-2022 estimates will be published later this year. As such, the current figure may differ from the corresponding figure based on the mid-2022 estimates.

# Explanation commentary on statistical tables

MAPPA background

The totals of MAPPA-eligible individuals, broken down by category, reflect the picture on 31 March 2023 (i.e., they are a snapshot). The rest of the data covers the period 1 April 2022 to 31 March 2023.

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

(b) Subject to Sex Offender Notification Requirements – 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 individuals 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 – individuals convicted of violent offences who were sentenced to imprisonment or detention for 12 months or more, or detained under a hospital order and a small number of individuals convicted of sexual offences who are not subject to notification requirements. These individuals are assessed and managed by the Probation Service, Youth Offending Team or Mental Health Services.

(d) Other Dangerous Offenders – individuals who do not qualify under the other MAPPA-eligible categories but have committed an offence that indicates that they pose a risk of serious harm which requires management via MAPPA meetings. These individuals are assessed and managed by whichever agency has the primary responsibility for them.

(e) Terrorism and Terrorism Risk Offenders – individuals subject to terrorism offender notification requirements; individuals convicted of terrorism or terrorism related offences who were sentenced to imprisonment or detention for 12 months or more or detained under a hospital order; and those who have committed an offence and may be at risk of involvement in terrorism-related activity. These individuals are assessed and managed by Counter-Terrorism Police and the National Security Division of the Probation Service.

(f) Breach of Licence – individuals released into the community following a period of imprisonment will be subject to a licence with conditions (under probation supervision). If the individual does not comply with these conditions, the Probation Service will take breach action and the individual may be recalled to prison.

(g) Sexual Harm Prevention Order (SHPO) (including any additional foreign travel restriction).Sexual Harm Prevention Orders (SHPOs) and interim SHPOs replaced Sexual Offence Prevention Orders are intended to protect the public from individuals convicted of a sexual or violent offence who pose a risk of sexual harm to the public by placing restrictions and/or positive obligations on their behaviour. They require the individual 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 on the balance of probability 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 individual. In the case of an order made on a free standing application by a Chief Officer, the National Crime Agency (NCA), British Transport Police (BTP) or the Ministry of Defence Police (MODP), the chief officer/NCA/BTP/MODP must be able to show that the individual has acted in a way since their conviction that makes 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.

(h) Notification Order – this requires individuals convicted of qualifying sexual offences overseas to register with the police, in order to protect the public in the UK from the risks that they pose. The police in England and Wales may issue a notification order directly to an offender who is already in the UK or who is intending to come to the UK who has to notify within three days of receipt. Individuals have a right of appeal against notification.

(i) 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, NCA, BTP or MODP 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.

An SRO may prohibit the person from doing anything described in it, including travel overseas, or place positive obligations upon them. Any prohibition and/or obligation 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.

An 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 an 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 an SRO are recorded on VISOR as a Potentially Dangerous Person (PDP).

(j) Lifetime notification requirements revoked on application – A legal challenge in 2010 and a corresponding legislative response means there is a mechanism in place that allows qualifying individuals to apply for a review of their notification requirements. Qualifying individuals 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 subject to notification requirements 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.

# West Yorkshire MAPPA

There are three MAPPA units in West Yorkshire – Bradford/Calderdale, Leeds, and Wakefield/Kirklees.

The Strategic Management Board (SMB) in West Yorkshire is currently chaired by the Head of Service for the Bradford and Calderdale Probation Delivery Unit. The role of the SMB is to ensure the quality and effectiveness of MAPPA work in West Yorkshire.

Although it is impossible to eliminate all risks when offenders are being managed within the community, the three responsible authority agencies; Police, Probation and Prisons are fully committed to ensuring through MAPPA partnerships, risks are reduced to ensure the continued safety of our communities.

The Prison Service in Yorkshire and Humberside prepares offenders for release from prison and provides key release information on hundreds of prisoners each year in advance of their release back into Yorkshire and Humberside, as part of an agreed and managed joint process with community agencies.

Through the West Yorkshire Probation Service MAPPA has access to a range of interventions and group activities, some of which seek to restrict offenders’ actions and behaviours, others try to help offenders change the way they behave. Licence conditions can impose restrictions on offenders such as exclusion zones. West Yorkshire Probation Service also works closely with victims of crime who have been affected by either a serious violent or sexual offence.

MAPPA enables West Yorkshire Police to coordinate with other agencies and contribute to the effective risk management of sexual and violent offenders. West Yorkshire Police take a lead in the management of Category 1, Registered Sexual Offender MAPPA cases. Officers who know the offender will contribute to risk assessment and action planning. Regular contact takes place between Probation Officers and Police staff across West Yorkshire.

The MAPPA Units coordinate meetings, undertake administration of MAPPA and provide a MAPPA Chair who objectively guides the meeting to develop a robust Risk Management Plan for each MAPPA Offender and holds agencies to account for completing the actions they have agreed to undertake. There is also a WY MAPPA Coordinator who acts as a bridge between the SMB and MAPPA agencies, supporting operational, policy and strategic development in accordance with SMB requirements and national MAPPA guidance, as well as acting as a single point of contact for other MAPPA areas and forging links at regional and national levels.

# Lay Advisor’s perspective

This perspective marks completion of my 2nd and final term in this role. Let me begin therefore by thanking all our colleagues associated with MAPPA and SMB who made this a worthwhile public role for me. As the year gone has not been hugely different to the year before, let me use this space to reflect on the entirety of my 2 terms. In all, during these 7 years, I worked with 4 SMB chairs, 2 SMB co-ordinators and 3 MAPP meetings chairs in each of the 3 MAPPA districts covered by this SMB, plus colleagues from NSD chairing TACT-related meetings.

The world was very different in 2016, when I began as the sole Lay Member. In my view, while on the one hand MoJ ways of working were rather old fashioned then, on the other, there was far greater stability in the national policy space with a fixed-term parliament having just been concluded and ministerial rotations been infrequent. I began the role well aware of the recommended practices in conduct of the senior independent board member and scrupulously maintained my independence through the two terms, also offering agencies a way to provide constructive critique to partners, including the SMB chair.

Throughout my term, and especially during those very early days even before the online MAPPA training became available, I received kindnesses of many on the SMB and wider MAPPA, and patient response to my curiosity by many colleagues, despite their heavy workloads. However, there were also a few challenges identified, and happily, rectified through individual organisational processes, that helped maintain professionalism, especially in the changing workplace with empathy towards disabilities and cultural diversity – a development I take special pride in.

Two years into my first term I had opportunity to attend my first national conference and towards end of my first term I contributed to, and co-chaired the next national conference, receiving many kind compliments from MoJ and Lay colleagues.

Sadly, the pandemic was just around the corner and the Jan 2020 conference in beautiful ambiance of the prison officers’ training college turned out to be my last MAPPA national conference, perhaps the last such conference to date. 2020 also marked transition in so many other ways. While I often worried about how “20th century” practices of a number of the partners were before 2020, the pandemic turned the MAPPA partners into public services quite well equipped for remote electronic working and transitioned into the 21st century. As I progressed through my second term, as an experienced contributor to the SMB I enjoyed investing my time more productively, freed by new ways of working, into development of my new colleagues, among them, new SMB chair, MAPPA co-ordinator, MAPP meetings chairs, etc. It was also a delight to support research work and work of various statutory inspectorates in helping MAPPA improve through learning and intellectual diversity.

Diversity, going beyond the protected characteristics, and especially leveraging on intellectual and experiential diversity, was also a key theme of my term in office and I am glad and proud that SMB colleagues supported my approach to diversity monitoring that was open and looked to understand how individuals felt they were diverse and whether and how they felt discriminated, or not well served by a system, rather than just focussing on the characteristics that are no longer the greatest sources of discrimination in modern Britain.

I also felt delighted and privileged that following observations I made from my experience, the SMB accepted and acted on my feedback in putting together a far more intellectually and experientially diverse panel to select my successor. The campaign saw a number of talented and public-spirited candidates and I wish my successor the very best, as I do the rest of my hard-working SMB colleagues.

There were many recurring issues of national rather than local origin, that I insisted should be included in my perspective in annual reports over the years and my SMB colleagues and national MAPPA leads began to see merit in the independent member of SMB being able to bring his independent critical input to bear on topics of policy and strategy nationally, that had, and continue to have, long-term impact on keeping the society safe. It is not possible to go through all these topics in the limited space I have, though overall, through these 7 years, the societal gap has widened, even as the society, as a whole, has got poorer and investment in education and young person development has been underwhelming.

People are living increasingly in their private space and while this can be fulfilling and productive for many, this also appears to have increased the latency in certain types of serious criminals coming to attention of Public Protection Agencies in good time. Indeed, two of the most high-profile cases - murders of the Batley MP and the Bradford toddler have been attributed to criminals who were not known to public protection agencies, though subsequent spotlight on those perpetrators has suggested that what they did might perhaps have been foreseen had different professionals worked with sufficient professional curiosity, or at least additional professional safeguards might have been created to protect the victims.

I fear that the risk of such serious criminals neither known to MAPPA nor being stopped from perpetrating serious offences, has perhaps increased during these 7 years. There is also disappointment that despite recommendation from me and many other Lay Advisors, and even our willingness to support nationwide effort, we still do not have national resources for Serious Case Reviews, perhaps in the form of an elite panel of independent chairs funded centrally and able to ensure high quality reviews and national dissemination of lessons learnt, regardless of local availability of funds.

Ultimately, these things can be changed, perhaps within duration of a single responsible parliament, if those in strategic leadership positions work, and are allowed to work, strategically. I have been highlighting the lack of stability or long-term thinking at the very top of the policy space by counting the number of secretaries of state that there have been in MAPPA-related government departments in recent times.

The final tally, between my first SMB meeting in May 2016 and the first SMB meeting after me in May 2023 is: 7 prime ministries, 9 lord chancellorships, 7 Home Secretaries (including appointment of one person appointed in two non-sequential cabinets), 8 local government Secretaries (including appointment of two individuals in two non-sequential cabinets, besides twice rescoping of the department), 9 Education Secretaries and 6 Health Secretaries (including appointment of one person in two non-sequential cabinets, besides once rescoping the department).

As I wish my successor and my MAPPA colleagues the very best, I hope and wish that the next 7 years will be years of stable national leadership, strategic thinking, and systematic introspection and continuous improvement at the highest level, and across government departments.

Amit Bhagwat

# Case Study

Mr. X was referred for Level 2 MAPPA management by his Probation Officer. His index offence was a sexual offence, involving repeat victimization of the same female child over a prolonged period of time. Mr. X had been sentenced to an extended determinate sentence; therefore he had the possibility of being released early on licence; if the Parole Board assessed that he had significantly reduced the risk of serious harm he posed to the public. However, if the Parole Board did not support re-release, he would still be released at the half-way stage of his sentence.

Mr. X was assessed by probation as presenting a very high risk of serious sexual harm to known adults and children, of indecently assaulting strangers and also a risk of violence to others. In addition to the risks presented, he did not have any stable accommodation. He was extremely isolated, having no positive support networks in the community. There were also concerns regarding personality disorder and mental health issues. It was identified that there was active Victim Liaison Officer (VLO) involvement in the case, and that a Probation Approved Premises would be essential for risk management upon release. Mr. X also presented as unwilling to comply with the Probation Service.

At the screening meeting, consideration was given to the fact that he had previously been convicted of both sexual and violent offences. He maintained his innocence and had not completed any offence related / risk reduction work whilst in custody. Police colleagues also provided intelligence which indicated that Mr. X had a history of other concerning sexual behaviors, which he had not been convicted for, but which indicated a concerning pattern of violent and sexual behaviour over a prolonged period of time.

All the above factors were considered to potentially increase the risk of recidivism. As a result, multi-agency management was felt necessary to ensure that information and concerns were appropriately shared between all agencies. Given there was a possibility of his release on parole it was also considered beneficial and necessary for a multi-agency approach to develop a risk management plan for release.

An initial Level 2 MAPPA meeting was convened for Mr. X. At this meeting Probation, Police, Prison Offender Management (POM), local authority housing, children’s social care (CSC), Mental Health representatives and Prison Psychology were all in attendance. The risks to his family were discussed. Based on all the available information the risk assessment was agreed as follows: the panel concluded that Mr. X posed a very high risk of serious harm to his family members including his child and the victim of the index offence.

It was agreed that escalation to Level 3 management may be required if release was granted by the Parole Board. The panel discussed and developed a robust risk management plan; in the event that the Parole Board did support Mr X’s release, and a number of additional licence conditions were agreed by the panel that were deemed both proportionate and necessary to manage the very high risk Mr. X posed. This included, additional disruption curfews, disclosure of relationships and electronic tagging to monitor Mr X’s movements.

However, the Parole Board recognised the risks in this case and had similar concerns to the MAPPA panel. They did not support Mr. X’s release on parole. Mr. X remained in custody. A further Level 2 review meeting was held, with the aim of reviewing the case, his custodial behaviour and the relevance of the original risk management and release plan devised at the initial MAPPA meeting.

During this meeting it was noted that Mr. X had displayed inappropriate behaviour to female custodial staff, further evidencing poor attitudes towards females and authority and potential risk to females. There was also consideration given by the panel to the need for additional resources to support the management of his case in the community and thus the Panel agreed that the case should be escalated to Level 3 MAPPA management and given status as a Critical Public Protection Case (CPPC)

At the Level 3 meeting it was agreed that CSC needed to support the family with safeguarding Mr. X’s child, supporting the mother with appropriate disclosure of the situation, as well as developing risk management strategies. The VLO advised of the additional licence conditions requested by the victim. The Approved Premises (AP) key worker was confirmed in advance so they could begin to build a positive working relationship with Mr. X prior to his release, similarly the Police identified an officer who would be working with Mr. X upon release. It was further recommended that the officer would support Probation colleagues regarding safeguarding Mr. X’s ex-partner.

In addition, it was raised as a concern that Mr. X was located in a prison outside of the local area, and this could pose significant risk of him absconding upon release and therefore the risk increasing. Therefore, it was recommended by the MAPPA panel that Prison colleagues in his current establishment should liaise with the local remand prison Governor to facilitate a prison transfer for a local release. It was assessed this would benefit the risk management plan as Mr.X. could be collected from Prison by the Police and transported directly to the AP. Local release would enable Mr. X to engage immediately with the AP and with his Probation Officer in the local area.

Upon release Mr. X has been aided in his rehabilitation in the community. The proactive approach by agencies informed the meticulous risk management planning. Electronic tagging evidenced Mr. X had not travelled into his exclusion zone and no contact had been attempted with the victim or other family members. He attended all appointments with his Probation Officer and was supported to adjust to living in the community. The transition was challenging but positively a more transparent and trusting relationship was established with his Probation Officer and AP staff.

To summarise, this case was very complex with a high risk of recidivism. Due to the intense MAPPA involvement there was a more collaborative approach to the rehabilitation and risk management of Mr. X for the protection of victims and the wider public. The risk to public safety was mitigated through the robust actions taken by agencies to safeguard the community from further harm.

# 

**All MAPPA reports from England and Wales are published online at:**

[**www.gov.uk**](http://www.gov.uk)





