



**Policy name:** HMPPS Risk Assessed Access for Personnel with Lived Experience of the Criminal Justice System Policy Framework

**Re-Issue Date:** 5th March 2026

**Implementation Date:** 1<sup>st</sup> April 2026

**Replaces the following documents (e.g. PSIs, PSOs, Custodial Service Specs) which are hereby cancelled:**

- PSI 27/2014, PI 23/2014 - Security Vetting - Additional risk criteria for ex-offenders working in prison and community settings.
- PI 55/2014 - Security vetting: using offenders as mentors in the community and in custody.

**Introduces amendments to the following documents: Not applicable.**

**Action required by:**

X	HMPPS HQ	X	Governors
X	Public Sector Prisons	X	Heads of Group
X	Contracted Prisons	X	The Probation Service
X	Under 18 Young Offender Institutions	X	Other providers of Probation and Community Services
X	HMPPS Rehabilitation Contract Services Team		

**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 must ensure that their local procedures do not contain the following: No local procedures identified for removal.

Governors 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 5 of the Policy Framework contains guidance to implement the mandatory requirements set out in section 4 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.

In this document the term Governor also applies to Directors of Contracted Prisons

---

## **How will this Policy Framework be audited or monitored**

To ensure the effective implementation, consistency, and integrity of this Policy Framework, HMPPS will apply a structured monitoring and evaluation process. This will support continuous improvement, uphold safeguarding standards, and ensure alignment with the organisation's commitment to inclusive employment and public protection.

### **Oversight and Governance**

- The Personnel Security Countermeasures (PSC) team will maintain a central log of all individuals working under a role-specific risk management plan.
- The Lived Experience Risk Assessment Panel (LERAP) will provide oversight of decision-making and ensure consistency across cases.

### **Case Review and Quality Assurance**

- A sample of Flex offence cases and other discretionary decisions will be reviewed quarterly to ensure consistency, fairness, and adherence to policy.
- Reviews will be conducted by a designated oversight group, including representatives from PSC, HR, and relevant appropriate leads.

### **Data Collection and Reporting**

- PSC will collect and analyse anonymised data on:
  - Applications received, approved, and declined.
  - Offence categories and outcomes.
  - Mitigations applied and their effectiveness.
  - Annual review outcomes and changes in risk status.

This data will inform policy updates and operational improvements.

### **Stakeholder Feedback**

- Feedback will be gathered from applicants, line managers, and external partners through surveys or structured interviews.
- Insights will be used to improve the clarity, accessibility, and fairness of the process.

### **Annual Policy Review**

- This Policy Framework will be reviewed within the first six months to assess its impact and then annually by HMPPS Policy Leads in consultation with PSC and operational stakeholders.
- Updates will reflect changes in legislation, safeguarding guidance, and learning from audits and reviews.

**Resource Impact:**

The implementation of this Policy Framework is expected to have a minimal resource impact, primarily in the following areas:

- **Training and Guidance:** Initial investment in briefings for Local Risk Owners (LROs), vacancy managers, and vetting contact points to ensure consistent application of the framework.
- **Data Management and Oversight:** Ongoing maintenance of central logs, monitoring systems, and reporting mechanisms to support transparency and audit.

**Contact:** [PSCLivedExperience@justice.gov.uk](mailto:PSCLivedExperience@justice.gov.uk)

**Deputy/Group Director sign-off:** Andy Rogers/Mark Greenhaf.

**Approved by OPS for publication:** Helen Judge, Chair, Operational Policy Sub-board, March 2026.

## CONTENTS

Section	Title	Page
1	Purpose	5
2	Evidence	5
3	Outcomes	6
4	Requirements	6
5	Constraints	7
6	Clearance and access requirements	7
7	Lived Experience Entry routes	9
	Risk assessment	12
	Risk management	12
8	Decision making	13
	Change in circumstances	14
	Extensions	18
	Conversions	19
9	Annex A: <b>Eligibility criteria for GFIE</b> Annex B: <b>Required mitigations</b> Annex C: <b>Request for Information to Consider</b> Annex D: <b>Request for Renewal of LEAP – Prison/Probation</b>	22-31

## **1. Purpose**

- 1.1 HMPPS is responsible for the care and rehabilitation of thousands of people. Part of that responsibility, along with reducing re-offending, is public protection and our responsibility to victims of crime. Everyone within, working alongside or delivering a service on behalf of HMPPS must maintain high ethical and professional standards, and must act with the utmost integrity.
- 1.2 HMPPS is dedicated to fostering a diverse and inclusive workforce by using schemes such as Going Forward into Employment (complete-guide-to-gfie-prison-leavers-and-lived-experience) to recruit individuals with lived experience of the criminal justice system. This not only enriches the organisation with unique perspectives but also enhances the support and rehabilitation services provided to individuals in custody or under supervision.
- 1.3 This policy recognises that individuals with lived experience may have encountered trauma and aims to create inclusive, safe, and empowering pathways into employment.
- 1.4 HMPPS recognises that an applicant's offending history may prevent them from being successfully vetted through the normal centralised framework. This policy sets out the provisions for them to be considered through a separate risk assessment process and ensures appropriate role-specific risk management procedures will commence where a case fails the normal vetting process due to their offending history.
- 1.5 This framework sets out guidance and requirements relating to the process that must be followed for all directly and non-directly employed people working in or on behalf of HMPPS, both within prisons and in the community, where passing HMPPS vetting Enhanced level 1 (EL1) or Enhanced level 2 (EL2) is not possible due to their criminal history.
- 1.6 All role-specific risk assessments should be appropriately and consistently carried out in accordance with the procedures set out in this framework. This extends to those involved in any work (including charity and voluntary work or otherwise) delivered on behalf of HMPPS by contractors and volunteers (non-directly employed).
- 1.7 Role specific risk assessments do not constitute standard vetting, and as such must reflect the need to have safeguards in place for the colleague and organisation.

## **2. Evidence**

- 2.1 This policy is underpinned by a combination of internal data, research insights, and operational learning. It draws on management information from the Ministry of Justice (MoJ) and HMPPS, including:
  - Outcomes from security vetting processes.
  - Findings from role-specific risk assessments.

In addition, the policy is informed by research evidence highlighting:

- The rehabilitative value of employing individuals with lived experience of the criminal justice system.
- The role of meaningful employment in reducing reoffending and improving outcomes.
- Effective strategies for managing risk within secure and/or sensitive environments.
- Alignment with the MoJ Insider Risk Strategy (2025–2030), which promotes contextual risk assessment and proportionate decision-making.

The framework also incorporates lessons learned from previous/existing initiatives:

- The Going Forward into Employment (GFIE) scheme.
- The Standard Plus pathway, now succeeded by the Lived Experience Appointment Pathway (LEAP).

To support consistent and proportionate decision-making, the Cambridge Crime Harm Index was initially used to identify offences that are excluded from consideration under this policy. The Index provides a structured method for ranking offences based on the harm they cause to victims, using sentencing guidelines as a proxy for severity. By applying this evidence-based tool, the policy ensures that exclusions are grounded in an objective assessment of harm, rather than solely on offence type or title.

### **3. Outcomes**

3.1 This policy framework sets out procedures that aim to:

- a. Provide an alternative to vetting that will facilitate employment within HMPPS for individuals with lived experience of the criminal justice system.
- b. Support rehabilitation outcomes by facilitating access to meaningful employment opportunities for individuals with criminal records.
- c. Assure the integrity of the organisation and safety of staff, workers, supervised individuals and visitors by mitigating known risks.
- d. Promote consistent, fair and objective standards in the management of all staff and workers within HMPPS who cannot attain traditional HMPPS vetting.

### **4. Requirements**

4.1 Personnel Security Countermeasures must maintain a register of all individuals working for the organisation who hold a role-specific risk management plan.

4.2 All Individuals who are unable to obtain HMPPS EL1/EL2 (as set out in Security-vetting-psi-072014-pi-032014) due to their lived experience of the criminal justice system will only be allowed to work for HMPPS where:

- a role-specific risk management plan has been agreed through the process set out in this policy, and

- they are not prohibited from employment within HMPPS by virtue of excluded offences or factors listed in Annex A.

4.3 This framework applies equally to individuals directly employed (DE) and non-directly (NDE) by HMPPS or those who are engaged in any capacity through a supplier of goods or services to HMPPS or where work is carried out in a regulatory capacity. It also applies to volunteers and standalone roles.

4.4 Role-specific risk management plans are only available via:

- a. The Going Forward into Employment scheme (for directly employed posts).
- b. The Lived Experience Appointment Pathway scheme (for non-directly employed positions)
- c. Previous transfer from a Community Rehabilitation Company via the Staff Transfer process.

4.5 All requests for role-specific risk management plans must be supported by the recruiting area's Deputy Director (for HQ posts), the Governor (for prison posts) or the Regional Probation Director (for probation posts). As potential risks vary by location with some sites carrying inherently greater operational or reputational risks Deputy Directors, Governors, and Regional Probation Directors are best placed to assess and manage those risks within their specific area. They understand the local operational context, enabling informed, balanced decisions that support inclusive recruitment and public protection. This individual, hereafter known as the 'Local Risk Owner (LRO)', must accept responsibility for managing any identified risks.

4.6 It is the responsibility of the recruiting area's LRO to ensure any agreed mitigations are implemented and followed.

4.7 Any non-vetted individual who does not hold a role-specific risk management plan is not permitted to work for HMPPS in any manner.

## **5. Constraints**

5.1 A role-specific risk management plan does not guarantee the same level of access to HMPPS assets as a member of staff who holds HMPPS EL1/EL2 vetting. Appointees may be subject to restrictions or required to adhere to mitigations and will be required to undergo an annual review as standard, or more frequently if there is a change in role or circumstances.

5.2 Eligibility for one of the schemes is not a guarantee that appointments will be approved. Where intolerable risks are identified, applications must be declined.

5.3 It will not always be possible to facilitate opportunities under this policy framework within the High Security Estate (HSE) where additional security measures may need to be in place or,

equally, in the youth estate where there will be additional limitations and welfare measures to meet the specific vetting requirements for working with children and young people.

## **6.0 Clearance and Access Requirement**

- 6.1 All individuals who cannot be granted HMPPS EL1/EL2 (PSI 07/2014 – AI 05/2014 – PI 03/2014) due to their lived experience of the criminal justice system will only be allowed to work for HMPPS (in a directly or non-directly employed capacity) where a role-specific risk management plan is agreed.
- 6.2 Directly employed (DE) staff are any individuals working directly for HMPPS in any capacity, including in prisons, probation or in HQ.
- 6.3 Non-directly employed (NDE) staff are any individuals working for a HMPPS service provider and include:
- a. General Contractors.
  - b. Consultants.
  - c. Agency staff.
  - d. Sessional workers.
  - e. Fee Paid workers.
  - f. Voluntary workers.
  - g. Locums.

### **Restricted access for visitors and guests**

- 6.4 Visitors and guests who enter HMPPS premises or engage with HMPPS staff, prisoners and/or people on probation as a one-off or in totality three times in a twelve-month period will not be expected to gain HMPPS EL1/EL2 or a role-specific risk management plan where all the following apply:
- a. The individual is not categorised as DE or NDE staff as per the definition set out in this policy;
  - b. There will be no access to HMPPS information that is not in the public domain;
  - c. There will be no unescorted access to secure areas at any HMPPS site which would require access via fob/key/biometrics or areas where the public would not have access;
  - d. Any contact with staff, prisoners and/or people on probation will be always supervised;
  - e. The relevant LRO has agreed to hold any known risk associated with the individual.
- 6.5 Examples of where this is likely to apply include:
- a. Guest speakers at a one-off event;
  - b. Individuals sharing their experience of being in prison and/or on probation as part of staff training.

For either of the above situations it would be expected that the person would be present to deliver a talk, presentation or participate in a panel event sharing their insight and

experience within a scheduled speaking slot often with use of a microphone, stage or at the front of the room to a group of attendees and not on an individual one to one basis.

- 6.6 Where such activity is expected to occur on a regular basis, defined as more than three events within a twelve-month period, and/or will be unescorted, and/or where the Local Risk Owner has requested a Risk Management Plan (RMP), and/or a potential risk has been identified, an appropriate level of standard EL1/EL2 vetting or a role-specific RMP must be in place.

## **7. Lived Experience Entry routes**

### **7.1 Going Forward into Employment (GFIE).**

The GFIE scheme is a Cabinet Office led initiative which directly sources candidates, and offers them job opportunities, within various job roles at different grades, on a two-year fixed-term appointment across the Civil Service. The relevant schemes to this policy are:

- a. The GFIE Life Chance Employment Scheme - the central Cabinet Office led scheme for individuals who face barriers to employment into civil service roles due to their lived experience of the criminal justice system.
- b. The Probation Employment Pathway (PEP) - an accredited scheme which allows the Probation Service the opportunity to provide job opportunities to a wider group of applicants. PEP is only accredited for use with Probation Service roles.

More information about eligibility and applying for a role through GFIE can be found on the scheme's website at [GFIE Scheme Prison leavers](#)

Offences and factors which would exclude an individual from applying from a role with HMPPS through the GFIE scheme are set out at Annex A. Applicants for HMPPS roles will be managed by the MoJ Life Chance Recruitment Team who will make an initial determination of a candidate's eligibility for the scheme. Where a candidate appears to be eligible based on the information provided, the case will then be passed to the Personnel Security Countermeasures team to conduct a risk assessment.

### **Lived Experience Appointment Pathway (LEAP)**

- 7.2 LEAP replaces the provisions previously in place via Standard Plus. It is designed to facilitate non-directly employed appointments for individuals who would not be granted HMPPS EL1/EL2 due to their lived experience. Only roles within rehabilitation, facilities management and the supply chain can be considered for this route. Roles not currently defined may also be considered in future, where they are assessed as suitable and the associated risks are deemed manageable through the agreed process. LEAP is now the sole route for non-directly employed lived experience (LE) candidates.

- 7.3 There is no predetermined or fixed timescale for when a person with lived experience may be considered for a role under LEAP. Eligibility is assessed on a case-by-case basis, considering factors such as the nature and recency of the offence, progress under supervision, current risk assessments, and the specific requirements of the role. Decisions

will be informed by safeguarding considerations and organisational risk tolerance, rather than a set duration of time.

- 7.4 LEAP appointments are generally location specific due to the differing risks posed by the layout, physical security, staff and prisoners/residents of each site. The initial application must be for one location. Where access to additional sites is required, this will need to be managed as a change to role and will require additional approval from the relevant LRO. For specific roles requiring regular access to multiple sites within a region, upon submission of the application a Regional Role-Specific Risk Management Plan (R-RMP) can be requested.
- 7.5 Offences and factors which would exclude an individual from applying from a role with HMPPS through the scheme are set out at Annex A. These exclusions are based on the level of risk posed and the ability to manage that risk within the HMPPS environment.

#### Rehabilitative roles

- 7.6 This route can be used to facilitate greater flexibility for organisations engaged with reducing re-offending and delivering rehabilitative activities to deploy individuals with lived experience of the criminal justice system within a prison or in the community to work with current supervised individuals where appropriate safeguards are in place.

#### Supply chain/Facilities Management

- 7.7 Most roles within facilities management and in the HMPPS supply chain can be considered, based on a robust risk assessment and role-specific risk management plan. Each application will be considered on a case-by-case basis.
- 7.8 However, there are some roles that present higher levels of risk and as such are unlikely to be suitable, particularly for someone who has recently been released from prison. These are outlined within the vacancy manager guidance.
- 7.9 Individuals who participated in work activities under Release on Temporary Licence (ROTL) can be considered for LEAP appointments after their release. However, ROTL participation is not a guarantee that LEAP appointment would be appropriate. There are additional risks and factors that must be considered such as additional licence conditions, restrictions on work locations, associates and changes in risk likelihood.

#### Applicants who are currently supervised individuals

- 7.10 Individuals currently under supervision are defined as those who remain actively serving a community order, a suspended sentence order, or on licence following release from custody. This definition also includes individuals subject to a Post Sentence Supervision (PSS) period. Under this policy, such individuals may be considered for roles, subject to appropriate safeguards and permissions.

### Eligibility and Risk Criteria for Supervised Individuals

- 7.11 To ensure the integrity and safety of roles involving supervised individuals, the following criteria must be met. These apply specifically to individuals being considered under the LEAP category.
- 7.12 The Supervised Individual must not be currently assessed as presenting a high or very high Risk of Serious Harm. The Supervised Individual must not be currently subject to Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA) at Level 2 or Level 3.
- 7.13 A Supervised Individual who is currently serving their licence or Post-Sentence Supervision period must obtain permission from his Supervising Officer/Supervisor before undertaking any role. Such permission is a standard licence condition and post-sentence supervision requirement regarding employment.
- 7.14 The role must not place the individual in contact with victims or individuals connected to their index offence.
- 7.15 Any change in circumstances (e.g., new offences, change in risk level, MAPPA status) must be reported immediately and will trigger a reassessment of suitability.

### Process

- 7.16 Where a provider identifies a role that they wish to fill, an application for vetting must be submitted.
- 7.17 Where it is known that a candidate is unlikely to be granted HMPPS EL1/EL2 due to their lived experience, the provider can request that the local vetting contact point (VCP) notifies PSC that employment via LEAP would be desirable if standard vetting cannot be granted.
- 7.18 A VCP can also refer a candidate back to PSC where HMPPS EL1/EL2 has already been declined due to lived experience, and the employer has later advised they would still be interested in employing the individual.
- 7.19 PSC will confirm whether the role and the candidate are eligible for LEAP:
  - a. If the candidate and/or role is not eligible the application will be declined.
  - b. If the candidate and role are eligible, the application will be accepted and move to the risk assessment phase.

### **Legacy CRC Staff Transfer Scheme (STS)**

- 7.20 When community rehabilitation companies were integrated into HMPPS former CRC staff were required to acquire HMPPS clearance via the standard vetting process. Where this was not granted candidates could continue their employment on a role-specific risk management plan with individual agreement from the relevant Regional Probation Director.

- 7.21 Individuals on a CRC STS role-specific risk management plan were unable to apply for other roles without acquiring standard HMPPS vetting.
- 7.22 These individuals now fall under the scope of this policy including the requirement for annual review and the ability to seek opportunities for progression.

### **How are applications processed?**

- 7.23 All candidates will be subject to the same pre-employment process. This will comprise of:
- a. Standard pre-employment checks, including identity, nationality and right to work checks.
  - b. Digital vetting checks
  - c. Risk assessment casework.
  - d. A role-specific risk management plan detailing the specific risk of the role.
  - e. A character assessment completed by their prison key worker or their probation practitioner. (GFIE only)

### **Risk Assessment**

- 7.24 A risk assessment of the role must be completed by the recruiting business unit.
- 7.25 Personnel Security Countermeasures will carry out a full risk assessment using:
- a. A copy of the job description for the proposed role.
  - b. The local risk assessment of the role
  - c. A security questionnaire completed by the candidate
  - d. A personal statement completed by the candidate
  - e. A supporting statement completed by the candidate's proposed employer and/or Probation practitioner).
  - f. A copy of the candidate's criminal record.
  - g. Other checks (as required).
- 7.26 The risk assessment will include an analysis of the risk factors associated with the appointment of the applicant into the job role. Additional checks may be conducted where relevant based on known information or where it is appropriate to the nature of the role or offence(s) committed.
- 7.27 Advice around the anticipated date an applicant may be eligible for HMPPS EL1/EL2 based solely on their criminal history will also be given.
- 7.28 Advice may also be given on mitigations.
- a. Where the role involves certain duties, for example visiting a prison or accessing systems that contain records relating to individuals who have been, or are currently subject to custody or under supervision, there may be mandatory mitigations that must be put in place to facilitate appointment.
  - b. Where the responsibilities of the role are in line with previously agreed appointments, guidance can be given around what mitigations were put in place.

- 7.29 All information will be recorded on a Risk Assessment Form (RAF). This will be sent to the recruiting area to enable them to complete the role-specific risk management plan.
- 7.30 If PSC identify any excluded offences or excluded factors at any point during their checks, the case will be declined, and the LRO will be advised.

### **Risk Management Planning**

- 7.31 Holding a role-specific risk management plan does not guarantee the same level of access to HMPPS assets as a member of staff who holds standard HMPPS vetting. Where there are known risks or vulnerabilities, it may be appropriate to put some mitigations in place.
- 7.32 The recruiting/local business unit and Personnel Security Countermeasures must ensure that each identified risk or vulnerability has been considered and, where appropriate, action to mitigate this has been set out.
- 7.33 PSC will refer the case to the recruiting area for a risk management plan. Local areas will be provided with a completed RAF and the role-specific risk management plan.
- 7.34 Vacancy managers must ensure that all risks flagged by PSC are addressed and a viable, proportionate mitigation is proposed. They should also consider whether there are any additional risks, and ensure these are recorded and a viable, proportionate mitigation is in place.
- 7.35 If vacancy managers feel that they are unable to mitigate any of the identified risks, this should be recorded.
- 7.36 The LRO must then review the RAF and role-specific risk management plan and complete the 'Approval' section of the role-specific risk management plan. This form should then be returned to PSC. Where insufficient mitigation has been recorded PSC may return the role-specific risk management plan to the business unit for further work.
- 7.37 The risk associated with all appointments sits with the LRO of the candidate's business unit. If the LRO is not content to hold the risk and/or is not content that they can sufficiently mitigate any risks identified, then the case should not be progressed.

## **8 Decision Making**

- 8.1 The Lived Experience Risk Assessment Panel (LERAP) is a meeting of leaders, business unit representatives and stakeholders who will convene to review risk information to decide upon whether applicants can be employed into the role for which they have applied under a role-specific risk management plan. The panel will ensure that all appointments into HMPPS roles through lived experience schemes are robust, and all the risk considerations have been made. The candidate will be asked to submit a personal statement to the LERAP. Boards will include members who bring diverse perspectives and relevant experience to support fair and balanced decision-making.
- a. The routine LERAP is chaired at Security Deputy Director level and will make decisions on new appointments, extensions, conversion to permanency, annual reviews and change requests.
  - b. Where appropriate, the Security Deputy Director may delegate this responsibility to a suitably senior and informed individual within the Directorate.
  - c. An exceptional LERAP is chaired at ED level. It will make all decisions on cases which may carry an exceptional risk.

8.2 Exceptional risk can be defined as:

- d. a case where an exclusion factor applies which has been agreed internally but not yet written into policy.
- e. a case with the potential to cause significant reputational damage.

8.3 Cases can be escalated from the routine panel to the exceptional panel if the chair determines that that a higher grade of decision maker would be appropriate.

8.4 Where appropriate, decisions which are assessed to carry minimal risk may be made by correspondence. A recommendation can be made, but the decision will sit with the panel chair whether to approve a case or request a panel meeting. The panel will consider the risk information and proposed mitigations and decide on the appointment of the applicant:

- a. Where the risks are deemed manageable and the suggested mitigations are deemed sufficient, appointment will be approved.
- b. Where the panel feel that the risks are potentially manageable however the suggested mitigations are insufficient, the case will be deferred, and the business unit will be asked to carry out further work.
- c. Where the risks are deemed unmanageable, or the business unit is unable to accommodate the mitigations required to manage any risks, the application will be declined.

8.5 Consideration must be given to the balance of the benefits that people with Lived Experience can offer and our commitment to the rehabilitation against the potential risks posed to the business.

8.6 The decision made is final and there is no appeals process, however if applicants, providers or business units believe there has been a procedural error a case review can be requested. This review will be limited to assessing whether the appropriate procedures were followed and will not re-evaluate the original decision itself. It will be conducted by a staff member who was not involved in the initial decision, and the outcome will be approved by a staff member at Band 7 level or above.

What happens when an application is declined?

8.7 Where any unmanageable or intolerable risks are identified applications will be declined and PSC will reject the applicant on recruitment systems.

8.8 The applicant and recruiting business unit will be informed of this decision.

8.9 Where applications for direct employment are declined, applicants must not be allowed to take up post.

8.10 Where applications for non-direct employment are declined, it will be the responsibility of the employer to identify whether there is an alternative role that the individual can carry out. The individual will not be permitted to have access to HMPPS sites, information or undertake any work, paid or otherwise, on behalf of HMPPS.

*What happens once a role-specific risk management plan has been granted?*

- 8.11 Once LERAP have approved the role-specific risk management plan, the applicant will be progressed on recruitment systems.
- 8.12 The applicant and the recruiting business will receive confirmation that the role-specific risk management plan has been agreed.
- 8.13 If mitigations to the role have been agreed within the risk management plan, these must be worked through and implemented by the vacancy manager ahead of the applicant starting in post.

**Reporting a change of circumstances**

- 8.14 All individuals who hold a role-specific risk management plan must report any changes in their personal circumstances to Personnel Security Countermeasures. This includes, but is not limited to, changes in marital status or civil partnership, name or address, further cautions and convictions and financial status (such as a county court judgment or participation in a debt management plan). Failing to report such changes may result in an individual's role-specific risk management plan being withdrawn.
- 8.15 GFIE and CRC STS appointees are accountable and governed by the same staff policies and processes as other directly employed members of staff. This includes if the member of staff commits an offence or is charged with an offence whilst in post. If it becomes known that a further offence has taken place PSC (and Life chance recruitment team for GFIE cases) should be informed immediately, verbally and in writing. Pertinent updates should be provided throughout the process also. The line manager should also seek MoJ Casework support. Any further criminal activity discovered during this search may result in suspension and disciplinary procedures as per departmental Conduct & Discipline policy.
- 8.16 LEAP appointees will be governed by the conduct and discipline processes of their employee. Where a role-specific risk management plan is withdrawn, it will be the responsibility of the employer to identify whether employment can continue, and a different role can be found for the individual. No further access to HMPPS sites and assets will be permitted.

**Reporting a change in responsibilities**

- 8.17 GFIE/PEP scheme appointments fall outside of civil service fair and open competition and are role specific. This means that successful applicants cannot be given a permanent contract and do not have access to internal civil service job opportunities for the duration of their fixed-term appointment.
- 8.18 Therefore, any GFIE scheme appointee's must:
  - a. Remain in their appointed role throughout their fixed term appointment.
  - b. Seek approval from the Civil Service Commission, via the MoJ Life Chance recruitment team, for any alteration to the appointment.
  - c. Seek a revised role-specific risk management plan, via Personnel Security Countermeasures, for any alteration to the duties undertaken.

- 8.19 LEAP appointees must also seek a revised role-specific risk management plan, via Personnel Security Countermeasures, for any alteration to the duties undertaken.
- 8.20 If the new activities carry additional risk, it may be appropriate to seek a decision from LERAP as to whether these new risks are manageable and/or whether additional mitigations are required.
- 8.21 If LEAP appointees require regular access to multiple prison or probation sites, the relevant LRO will be required to review the RAF and role-specific risk management plan. If they are content that the risk is appropriately managed, then this will be added to the appointee's approved locations.

### **Regional Role-Specific Risk Management Plans (R-RMPs)**

- 8.22 Where an individual requires access to multiple prison sites within a specific region, a Regional RMP may be considered. This arrangement is not intended for all applicants and is typically relevant to roles such as those in drug and alcohol rehabilitation services where the individual regularly attends or delivers sessions across multiple local sites  
This must be:
- Supported by one consolidated risk assessment covering all relevant sites.
  - Approved by the Prison Group Director (or designated authority) for that region
  - Reviewed by the LERAP with representation from identified sites (this can be undertaken via written correspondence)
- 8.23 For Regional RMPs, the LERAP must include input from the PGD or their delegate. The PGD must confirm that:
- Risks across all regional sites are understood and manageable.
  - Access to multiple sites within that region is needed to undertake the role
  - Mitigations are consistent and enforceable across the region.
  - Local Governors are informed and have no objection based on a site-specific risk.
- 8.24 The following parts of the prison estate in England and Wales are managed nationally as specialist operational groups within HMPPS, rather than being grouped into regional prison areas. These estates are not aligned to regional PGD areas.
- Women's Estate.
  - Long-Term High Security Estate (LTHSE) Split into LTHSE North and LTHSE South
  - Youth Custody Service (YCS).
  - Privately operated prisons.
- Within the High Security Estate (HSE), additional security measures are likely be required due to the nature of the environment. Similarly, establishments within the youth estate are subject to enhanced safeguarding and vetting requirements, reflecting the need for robust protections when working with children and young people.

### **Annual review**

- 8.25 All appointments are recorded on a central log. PSC should use this log to identify where individuals require an annual review.

- 8.26 A blank security review questionnaire should be sent to the individual for completion. The business unit should be asked to confirm whether the job description remains the same.
- 8.27 HMPPS Personnel Security Countermeasures will review and update the risk assessment, carrying out any relevant checks and analysis to be able to provide an updated assessment of risk. Any additional information will be recorded on the Risk Assessment Form (RAF).
- 8.28 PSC will refer the updated RAF to the business unit with a copy of the role-specific risk management plan.
- a. Where no new risks have been identified, the business unit should confirm whether they are content with the existing role-specific risk management plan, or if any new risks have been identified locally.
  - b. Where PSC have identified additional risks, these must be added to the role-specific risk management plan and a viable, proportionate mitigation proposed.
  - c. Where no additional risks are identified and there are no changes to the role-specific risk management plan, no further action is required
- 8.29 If additional risks are identified or changes to the role-specific risk management plan are proposed, it may be appropriate to convene a LERAP if there is concern around whether the risk is manageable.
- a. Where the risks are deemed manageable and the suggested mitigations are deemed sufficient, the extension will be approved.
  - b. Where the panel feel that the risks are potentially manageable however the suggested mitigations are insufficient, the case will be deferred, and the business unit will be asked to carry out further work.
  - c. Where the risks are deemed unmanageable, or the business unit is unable to accommodate the mitigations required to manage any risks, then the request to extend will be declined.
- 8.30 Where the risks are deemed unmanageable, or the business unit is unable to accommodate the mitigations required to manage any risks, then action should be taken. And the role-specific risk management plan will be withdrawn.
- 8.31 Where significant concerns such as further criminality or misconduct are identified, this will be shared with the LRO of the recruiting area with advice that the case should not proceed. Unless a compelling reason to continue employment is provided, the role-specific risk management plan will be withdrawn.

### **Applying for standard HMPPs vetting EL1/EL2**

- 8.32 All appointments are recorded on a central log. PSC should use this log to identify where individuals may now be eligible for EL1/EL2 based on their criminal history alone.
- 8.33 As soon as an individual has the potential to be granted EL1/EL2 based on their criminal history, a new vetting application form should be issued and the case should be considered as a normal application for vetting, including all checks conducted as part of the vetting level appropriate to the role.
- 8.34 Where EL1/EL2 is granted, the individual will no longer be subject to the Risk Assessment process and consideration should be given to removing any mitigations in place. Where

there are continued vulnerabilities, PSC will give advice, and these should be managed locally

- 8.35 Where EL1/EL2 is declined, the individual will remain subject to the Risk Assessment process until such a time when clearance can be granted. Any additional risks identified must be recorded on the role-specific risk management plan.
- 8.36 If additional risks are identified, it may be appropriate to convene a panel if there is concern around whether the additional risks are manageable.
- a. Where the risks are deemed manageable and the suggested mitigations are deemed sufficient, continued appointment will be approved.
  - b. Where the panel feel that the risks are potentially manageable however the suggested mitigations are insufficient, the case will be deferred, and the business unit will be asked to carry out further work.
  - c. Where the risks are deemed unmanageable, or the business unit is unable to accommodate the mitigations required to manage any risks, then action should be taken. Unless a compelling reason to continue employment is provided, the role-specific risk management plan will be withdrawn.

What happens when a role-specific risk management plan expires?

- 8.37 Local managers must consider whether they would like to:
- a. End the period of employment.
  - b. Request an extension.
  - c. Request a conversion to permanency.

## **Extensions**

### Eligibility

- 8.38 Employment through GFIE/PEP can be extended by the CSC for up to four years. This extension may be used as an extended period to assess the applicant's suitability for permanency, enable continuity of work to cover budgeted work or if the applicant is not eligible for conversion to permanency due to their grade.
- 8.39 As LEAP appointees are not employed by the Civil Service, there is no restriction to the number of extensions that can be requested. Where an employer wishes to continue employment, they can continue to request updated risk assessments indefinitely.

### Process

- 8.40 A blank security vetting questionnaire should be sent to the individual for completion. The business unit should be asked to confirm whether the job description remains the same.
- 8.41 HMPPS Personnel Security Countermeasures will review and update the risk assessment, carrying out any relevant checks and analysis to be able to provide an updated assessment of risk. Any additional information will be recorded on the Risk Assessment Form (RAF).
- 8.42 PSC will refer the updated RAF to the business unit with a copy of the role-specific risk management plan.

- a. Where no new risks have been identified, the business unit should confirm whether they are content with the existing role-specific risk management plan, or if any new risks have been identified locally.
  - b. Where PSC have identified additional risks, these must be added to the role-specific risk management plan and viable, proportionate mitigations proposed.
  - c. Where significant concerns such as further criminality or misconduct are identified, this will be shared with the LRO of the recruiting area with advice that the case should not proceed. Unless a compelling reason to continue employment is provided, the role-specific risk management plan will be withdrawn.
- 8.43 Where no additional risks are identified and there are no changes to the role-specific risk management plan, the request to extend will be approved.
- 8.44 If additional risks are identified or changes to the role-specific risk management plan are proposed, it may be appropriate to convene a panel if there is concern around whether the risk is manageable.
- a. Where the risks are deemed manageable and the suggested mitigations are deemed sufficient, the extension will be approved.
  - b. Where the panel feel that the risks are potentially manageable however the suggested mitigations are insufficient, the case will be deferred, and the business unit will be asked to carry out further work.
  - c. Where the risks are deemed unmanageable, or the business unit is unable to accommodate the mitigations required to manage any risks, then the request to extend will be declined.

## **Conversion to permanency**

### Eligibility

- 8.45 Under CSC rules, GFIE appointees at HMPPS band 4 / Probation band 3 or below can be converted to permanency through exception 10 to the Civil Service Commission Recruitment Principles. To be considered for permanency individuals must;
- a. be within the final 6 months of their fixed-term appointment.
  - b. meet the GFIE eligibility criteria (including offence exclusions) at point of application.
  - c. Under CSC rules, GFIE appointees at band 5 and above cannot be converted to permanency, however the CSC can extend a contract up to a maximum total 4 years.
- 8.46 For LEAP appointees, it is the decision of the employer to decide about offering permanent employment. If the employer chooses to award a permanent contract the individual will remain subject to regular review of the role-specific risk assessment for the duration of any contract with HMPPS.

### Process

- 8.47 A blank security vetting questionnaire should be sent to the individual for completion. The business unit should be asked to confirm whether the job description remains the same.
- 8.48 HMPPS Personnel Security Countermeasures will review and update the risk assessment, carrying out any relevant checks and analysis to be able to provide an updated assessment of risk. Any additional information will be recorded on the Risk Assessment Form (RAF).

- 8.49 PSC will refer the updated RAF to the business unit with a copy of the role-specific risk management plan.
- a. Where no new risks have been identified, the business unit should confirm whether they are content with the existing role-specific risk management plan, or if any new risks have been identified locally.
  - b. Where PSC have identified additional risks, these must be added to the role-specific risk management plan and a viable, proportionate mitigation proposed.
  - c. Where significant concerns such as further criminality or misconduct are identified, this will be shared with the LRO of the recruiting area with advice that the case should not proceed. Unless a compelling reason to continue employment is provided, the request to convert to permanency will be declined.
- 8.50 A LERAP will be held to decide on whether conversion to permanency can be approved.
- a. Where the risks are deemed manageable and the suggested mitigations are deemed sufficient, conversion to permanency will be approved.
  - b. Where the panel feel that the risks are potentially manageable however the suggested mitigations are insufficient, the case will be deferred, and the business unit will be asked to carry out further work.
  - c. Where the risks are deemed unmanageable, or the business unit is unable to accommodate the mitigations required to manage any risks, the request to convert to permanency will be declined.
- 8.51 Conversion to permanency is role specific and does not automatically allow for freedom of movement between roles. The role-specific risk assessment must continue to be reviewed on an annual basis.

#### Progression within the organisation

- 8.52 Where any directly employed individual on a role-specific risk management plan receives a provisional offer of employment from HMPPS through fair and open competition a renewed role-specific risk management plan can be considered. To be considered for progression individuals must;
- a. be currently working for HMPPS with a role-specific risk management plan in place.
  - b. have been working for HMPPS for at least eighteen months.
  - c. meet the eligibility criteria at point of application.
  - d. have a statement of support from their current LRO.

#### Process

- 8.53 A request for change form should be sent to PSC along with a copy of the new job description.
- 8.54 HMPPS Personnel Security Countermeasures will review and update the risk assessment, carrying out any relevant checks and analysis to be able to provide an updated assessment of risk. Any additional information will be recorded on the Risk Assessment Form (RAF).
- 8.55 PSC will refer the updated RAF to the recruiting business unit with a copy of the role-specific risk management plan

- a. Where no new risks have been identified, the business unit should confirm whether they are content with the existing role-specific risk management plan or if any additional risks have been identified locally.
- b. Where additional risks have been identified, these must be added to the role-specific risk management plan and viable, proportionate mitigation proposed.
- c. Where significant concerns such as further criminality or misconduct are identified, this will be shared with the LRO of the recruiting area with advice that the case should not proceed. Unless a compelling reason to continue employment is provided, the request to move roles will be declined.

8.56 Progression decisions (e.g. movement to a new role or level) for staff with lived experience must be considered through the Lived Experience Risk Assessment Panel (LERAP), in line with existing processes for appointment, extension, and review. Where progression requires Executive Director-level approval, the case should be escalated to the Exceptional Lived Experience Risk Assessment Panel (E-LERAP) for consideration. Where there are no issues or significant decisions to be made, the matter may be handled through correspondence and does not require discussion at a panel.

8.57 The Authorising Director will consider the risk assessment, the role-specific risk management plan and any supporting statements made by the appointee and/or their current business unit.

- a. Where the risks are deemed manageable and the suggested mitigations are deemed sufficient, the application will be approved.
- b. Where the Authorising Director feel that the risks are potentially manageable however the suggested mitigations are insufficient, the case will be deferred, and the business unit will be asked to carry out further work.
- c. Where the risks are deemed unmanageable, or the recruiting business unit is unable to accommodate the mitigations required to manage any risks, the request to application will be declined.

8.58 Where applications are approved, the role-specific risk assessment must continue to be reviewed on an annual basis until the appointee is eligible to apply for EL1/EL2 vetting.

### **Equality**

8.59 All applicants are subject to a risk assessment and the same evaluation of suitability. Any consideration of employment under this framework will be based on an assessment of risk against the benefit of rehabilitation.

### **Data Protection**

8.60 The framework adheres to provisions of the General Data Protection Regulation. All personal information will be held securely and in line with the PSI 03/2018 - The Data Protection Act 2018 and General Data Protection Regulation .

## **Annex A: Eligibility criteria for GFIE**

Not all people with lived experience will be suitable for employment with HMPPS through our schemes. One central exclusions list has been developed, in line with the Cabinet Office's central exclusion list for GFIE and additional exclusions set centrally by MoJ, which are based on the unique risks faced by the department.

The MoJ and HMPPS offence-based exclusions are:

- Life Sentences
- Arson
- Terrorism-related offences
- Offences under the sexual offences act 2003.
- Hate Crimes where hostility was based on race, religion, sexual orientation, disability, or transgender identity.
- Misconduct in a public office/abuse of position of authority.
  
- Significant breach of trust/deception
- Stalking
- Any offences linked to firearms.
- Offences relating to physical harm, neglect, exploitation, or endangerment of children.
- False Imprisonment
  
- Kidnapping
- Supply controlled drugs within a prison setting.
- Serious violent offences which resulted in life changing injuries and/or trauma

In addition to the excluded offences there are several excluded factors. These are:

- Organised crime associated offences
- A history of domestic violence

Applications will not be accepted from any applicant who has been convicted of an excluded offence or meets an excluded factor. If an excluded offence becomes known during the recruitment process, the applicant will be removed from the process.

### **Eligibility criteria for Lived Experience Appointment Pathway (LEAP)**

LEAP replaces the provisions previously in place via Standard Plus and introduces a fixed, flex offence model. This model allows for a more nuanced approach, enabling contextual review of certain offences while maintaining public safety and organisational integrity

The LEAP scheme applies a more nuanced approach through the Fixed, Flex, Free offence model, as outlined below. the introduction of discretionary offences (flex) where some offences previously considered prohibited will undertake an initial review of offence circumstances to determine whether any apparent risks are considered unmanageable

## **Fixed, Flex, Free Offence Model for LEAP.**

### **`Fixed` Offences**

Offences in the Fixed category are those that are always excluded from consideration for the LEAP scheme. These offences are deemed to pose an unmanageable risk to the organisation and/or public safety. Individuals with convictions for these offences are not eligible for consideration under the LEAP scheme.

Fixed Offences:

- Terrorism-related offences
- Offences under the sexual offences act 2003.
- Hate Crimes where hostility was based on race, religion, sexual orientation, disability, or transgender identity.
- Misconduct in a public office/abuse of position of authority.
- Stalking
- Any offences linked to firearms.
- Offences relating to physical harm, neglect, exploitation, or endangerment of children.
- False Imprisonment
- Kidnapping
- Unauthorised conveyance of articles into or out of prison, including drugs.

In addition to the excluded offences there are specific excluded factors. These are:

- Organised crime associated offences
- A history of domestic violence

### **`Flex` Offences**

Offences in the Flex category require contextual review. These offences are not automatically disqualifying, but they necessitate a thorough assessment of the circumstances surrounding the offence and the applicant's rehabilitation progress.

Flex Offences include:

- Arson
- Offences which have resulted in a Life Sentence
- Serious violent offences which resulted in significant physical harm, psychological trauma, or risk to life
- Significant breach of trust/deception

### **`Free` Offences**

Offences classified under the *Free category* are generally suitable for consideration within the LEAP scheme and are assessed as manageable through established risk assessment protocols. These offences do not present a significant threat to public safety or organisational integrity, provided that appropriate safeguards are implemented.

All offending not covered by the above, will be considered under this category. While not falling within the categories previously outlined, these offences may still be of sufficient seriousness or recent occurrence to disqualify the applicant from progressing through standard vetting procedures.

## **Annex B: Required mitigations**

There are some risks which, when identified are subject to required mitigations as below:

### **Visiting a prison**

Line re local security - All visits to prison establishments must align with the site's Local Security Strategy (LSS), including any specific protocols for supervision, entry procedures, and conveyance of unauthorised items or information.

Any prison-based roles will have been supported by the Governor. For roles not based in prisons, where there is a need to visit a prison for work purposes, the following mitigations must be applied:

- **Governor Approval**  
Any visit must be approved by the prison Governor or designated authority on their behalf
- **Escort or Supervision**  
Visitors may be required to be escorted by prison staff during their visit, particularly in secure or sensitive areas

Governors should consider any local risks and identify whether:

- The visit can take place as per regular staff processes.
- The visit can take place if certain mitigations/limitations are put in place (for example, not permitting access to wings where known prisoners are housed).
- The visit cannot take place due to unmanageable local risks.

Governors should facilitate visits wherever it is possible without compromising local security.

### **Conflict of interest**

All HMPPS staff including those working for partner organisations, must declare any personal interests that could affect how they undertake their employment.

Declaring known offenders - Applicants with lived experience may have personal or community connections to individuals who fall within the scope of offender identification. While such insight can contribute positively to understanding risk and rehabilitation, it is essential that any known associations are declared in line with conflict-of-interest procedures. This includes, but is not limited to, familial ties, friendships, or shared community involvement.

HMPPS recognises the value of lived experience in shaping inclusive and informed practice. However, safeguarding and transparency must remain paramount. Any potential conflicts will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis, with appropriate support and guidance provided where needed.

### **Areas of Vulnerability.**

In some cases, areas of vulnerability may be directly or indirectly linked to an individual's lived experience. While such experience is recognised as an asset that can enhance empathy, insight, and engagement, it may also present specific challenges. Line managers and the LRO should remain alert to circumstances or behaviours that may compromise a staff member's ability to perform their duties reliably, or that could make them vulnerable to undue pressure, influence, or manipulation.

These may include

- Renewed contact with individuals or environments as part of their role linked to previous offending behaviour
- Emotional responses triggered by past traumatic events or prior involvement with the justice system
- Challenges in maintaining clear professional boundaries due to a shared lived experience of the criminal justice system
- Heightened sensitivity to workplace issues that may reflect past personal circumstances

#### Disclosure Requirements Under the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act (ROA) Exemptions

Most roles in HMPPS are exempt from the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act (ROA) 1974 due to their inclusion in the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act 1974 (Exceptions) Order 1975. This means that applicants for these roles must disclose both spent and unspent convictions and cautions. However, individuals are not required to disclose any convictions or cautions that are filtered under the relevant legislation. Filtered offences are removed from DBS certificates and do not need to be declared, even for roles covered by the Exceptions order

Guidance on what level of disclosure is required can be found at [DBS filtering guide - GOV.UK](#).

**Annex C Request for Information to Consider Lived Experience Appointment Pathway (LEAP) – Prison/Probation**



**HM Prison & Probation Service**

**REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION AT LEAP – Prison/Probation**

This applicant is likely to be refused vetting under the Enhanced Check procedure due to their previous offending history. We wish to consider if LEAP access will be appropriate as their prospective job role relates to rehabilitation activities, supply chain or facilities management.

Personal Details of Applicant Non-Directly Employed Worker <i>(this section must be completed in all cases)</i>	
Surname (enter in box)	
Forename (enter in box)	
Title (enter in box)	
National Insurance Number (AANNNNNA) e.g. ZZ123456D	
Date of Birth (Enter DD MON YYYY) e.g. 23 Jun 1984	
Name of Provider Organisation, or voluntary organisation (where appropriate)	
Job Role (enter in box)	
Which rehabilitative activities is this linked to?	
Full Name Governor/ Probation Manager (enter in box)	

Job Role	
Location of Business Unit/Establishment	

**FOR COMPLETION BY Personnel Security Countermeasures**

--	--

Date Received	
---------------	--

**Has additional information been sent**

**Examined by Personnel Security Countermeasures**

Name in BLOCK CAPITALS	
------------------------	--

Date	
------	--

## Annex D Request for Renewal of LEAP – Prison/Probation



HM Prison &  
Probation Service

### REQUEST FOR RENEWAL OF LEAP – PRISON/PROBATION

The following non directly employed worker has been subject to LEAP under the rehabilitative activities, supply chain or facilities management. After local review, we wish to renew the LEAP – Prison/Probation for another year.

#### Personal Details of Applicant Non-Directly Employed Worker (*this section must be completed in all cases*)

Surname (enter in box)	
Forename (enter in box)	
Title (enter in box)	
National Insurance Number (AANNNNNA) e.g. ZZ123456D	
Date of Birth (Enter DD MON YYYY) e.g. 23 Jun 1984	
Name of Provider Organisation, or voluntary organisation (where appropriate)	
Job Role (enter in box)	
Which Reducing Re-offending Pathway or activity is this linked to?	
Full Name Governor/Assigned Probation Manager (enter in box)	
Job Role	

<b>Location of Business Unit/Establishment</b>	
<b>Date Received</b>	
<b>Examined by Personnel Security Countermeasures</b>	
<b>Name in BLOCK CAPITALS</b>	
<b>Date</b>	

## **Glossary of terms**

### **Cambridge Crime Harm Index**

An evidence-based tool used to rank offences by the harm they cause to victims, based on sentencing guidelines. It supports proportionate decision-making in vetting and exclusion processes.

### **CRC STS (Community Rehabilitation Company staff transfer scheme)**

Refers to staff transferred from Community Rehabilitation Companies into HMPPS, some of whom were unable to gain standard vetting and continue employment under a role-specific risk management plan.

### **Enhanced Level 1 (EL1)**

A vetting level used by His Majesty's Prison and Probation Service (HMPPS) for non-directly employed workers

### **Enhanced Level 2 (EL2)**

A vetting level for directly employed staff within His Majesty's Prison and Probation Service.

### **Exceptional Risk**

A level of risk that goes beyond what is typically manageable through standard procedures or vetting. This may include risks that are complex, unpredictable, or have significant potential impact on safety, security, or public confidence. Exceptional risk usually requires bespoke mitigation measures, senior-level oversight, and/or exclusion from certain roles or environments.

### **Excluded Offences / Excluded Factors**

Specific offences or personal circumstances that automatically disqualify individuals from employment under the LEAP or GFIE schemes.

### **Fair and Open Competition**

A Civil Service recruitment principle ensuring that appointments are made transparently and based on merit. GFIE appointments fall outside this principle.

### **Fixed Offences**

Offences that are always excluded from consideration under LEAP due to the unmanageable risk they pose.

### **Flex Offences**

Offences that require contextual review. These are not automatically disqualifying but need a thorough assessment of circumstances and rehabilitation progress.

### **Free Offences**

Offences generally suitable for consideration under LEAP, assessed as manageable through standard risk protocols

### **GFIE (Going Forward into Employment)**

A Cabinet Office-led scheme offering fixed-term employment opportunities to individuals facing barriers due to their lived experience of the criminal justice system.

### **High Security Estate**

Eight prisons in the UK that are officially classified as part of the High Security Estate

Appointments under this policy may be limited and subject to additional restrictions in these settings.

- **HMP Belmarsh**
- **HMP Frankland.**
- **HMP Long Lartin.**
- **HMP Full Sutton.**
- **HMP Whitemoor.**
- **HMP Manchester**
- **HMP Wakefield**

### **LEAP (Lived Experience Appointment Pathway)**

A recruitment and support framework designed to enable individuals with lived experience of the criminal justice system to access meaningful employment within HMPPS, while ensuring appropriate risk management.

### **LERAP (Lived Experience Risk Assessment Panel)**

A decision-making panel that reviews risk information and proposed mitigations to determine whether individuals with lived experience can be appointed to roles within HMPPS. It includes representatives from PSC, HR, safeguarding, and operational leads

### **LRO (Local Risk Owner)**

The designated individual responsible for assessing and managing risks within a specific operational area or team. They have the authority to request additional safeguards based on local context.

### **LSS (Local Security Strategy)**

Site-specific protocols governing access, supervision, and security procedures within prison establishments

### **MAPPA (Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements)**

A statutory framework for agencies to jointly manage certain individuals who pose a serious risk of harm. Individuals subject to MAPPA Level 2 or 3 are excluded from LEAP consideration.

### **Mitigation**

A safeguard or control put in place to reduce or manage identified risks associated with a candidate's appointment.

### **PEP (Probation Employment Pathway)**

A scheme under GFiE, specifically for roles within the Probation Service.

### **Personal Statement (Candidate)**

A submission by the applicant outlining their lived experience, rehabilitation journey, and suitability for the role.

### **PSC (Personnel Security Countermeasures)**

The team responsible for conducting risk assessments, maintaining central logs, and overseeing the implementation of role-specific risk management plans

### **PSS (Post Sentence Supervision)**

A statutory period of supervision following the end of a custodial sentence, during which individuals remain under probation oversight

**RAF (Risk Assessment Form)**

A document completed during the risk assessment process, detailing identified risks and proposed mitigations for a candidate.

**RMP (Risk Management Plan)**

A tailored plan developed to identify, assess, and mitigate specific risks associated with an individual's involvement in a role or activity. It may include supervision arrangements, access restrictions, or other safeguards.

**R-RMP (Regional Role-Specific Risk Management Plan)**

A consolidated risk management plan that covers multiple sites within a region, used for roles requiring access across several establishments.

**ROTL (Release on Temporary Licence)**

A scheme allowing prisoners to work or engage in activities outside prison prior to release. Participation may inform LEAP eligibility but does not guarantee it.

**Security Questionnaire**

A form completed by candidates as part of the vetting and risk assessment process, detailing personal history and relevant disclosures

**Supervised Individual**

Someone currently serving a community order, suspended sentence, or licence following release from custody, including those under Post Sentence Supervision.

**VCP (Vetting Contact Point)**

The designated individual within a business unit who coordinates vetting processes and communicates with PSC regarding candidate eligibility.

**Youth Estate**

The Youth Estate comprises custodial establishments that house children and young people under the age of 18. Due to the age and vulnerability of those in custody, roles within these settings require enhanced safeguarding and vetting procedures. The following establishments are currently part of the Youth Estate

- **HM YOI Wetherby**
- **HM YOI Werrington**
- **HM YOI Feltham A**
- **HMP Parc (Juvenile Unit)**