



Multi Agency Public Protection Arrangements

# GREATER MANCHESTER



# Annual Report 2018/19

# What is MAPPA?

---

## MAPPA background

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

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

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

The Responsible Authority is required to appoint two Lay Advisers to sit on each MAPPA area Strategic Management Board (SMB) alongside senior representatives from each of the Responsible Authority and DTC agencies.

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

## How MAPPA works

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

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

There are 3 categories of MAPPA-eligible offender:

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

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

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

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

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

# MAPPA Statistics

<b>MAPPA-eligible offenders on 31 March 2019</b>				
	Category 1: Registered sex offenders	Category 2: Violent offenders	Category 3: Other dangerous offenders	Total
Level 1	3289	1552	0	4841
Level 2	6	6	5	17
Level 3	2	2	3	7
Total	3297	1560	8	4865

<b>MAPPA-eligible offenders in Levels 2 and 3 by category (yearly total)</b>				
	Category 1: Registered sex offenders	Category 2: Violent offenders	Category 3: Other dangerous offenders	Total
Level 2	24	35	26	85
Level 3	22	12	10	44
Total	46	47	36	129

<b>RSOs cautioned or convicted for breach of notification requirements</b>	303
--	-----

<b>RSOs who have had their life time notification revoked on application</b>	15
--	----

<b>Restrictive orders for Category 1 offenders</b>	
<b>SHPOs, SHPOs with foreign travel restriction &amp; NOs imposed by the courts</b>	
SHPO	284
SHPO with foreign travel restriction	0
NOs	2

<b>Number of people who became subject to notification requirements following a breach(es) of a Sexual Risk Order (SRO)</b>	2
---	---

<b>Level 2 and 3 offenders returned to custody</b>				
	<b>Category 1: Registered sex offenders</b>	<b>Category 2: Violent offenders</b>	<b>Category 3: Other dangerous offenders</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Breach of licence</b>				
Level 2	2	6	4	12
Level 3	5	1	4	10
Total	7	7	8	22
<b>Breach of SOPO</b>				
Level 2	0	0	0	0
Level 3	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0	0

<b>Total number of Registered Sexual Offenders per 100,000 population</b>	135
---	-----

This figure has been calculated using the Mid-2018 Population Estimates: Single year of age and sex for Police Areas in England and Wales; estimated resident population, published by the Office for National Statistics, excluding those aged less than ten years of age.

# Explanation commentary on statistical tables

---

## MAPPA background

The totals of MAPPA-eligible offenders, broken down by category, reflect the picture on 31 March 2019 (i.e. they are a snapshot). The rest of the data covers the period 1 April 2018 to 31 March 2019.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**(i) Lifetime notification requirements revoked on application**

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

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

# Case Study - 'Andrew'

---

*This case was worked and led by the team from the Rochdale Probation Office.*

*Individuals' names have been changed to protect their identities, and locations have been anonymised.*

Originally from Greater Manchester, 'Andrew' was made homeless whilst he was still a teenager. He had been known to Children's Social Care and there was information that indicated an abusive family background, however Andrew had never wanted to engage with support services and ran away to the North East of the country. Years later he would disclose that he had suffered physical and emotional abuse at the hands of his mother, and that his step-father had sexually assaulted him.

Andrew lived rough in a major city, spent a short time in the Army before dropping out, and then began to talk to teenage girls online. This contact developed and led to him meeting girls aged 13 and 14 years old, and in 2013 'Andrew' committed a number of sexual offences against the girls.

Andrew was arrested, charged and convicted of these offences. He was subsequently sentenced to 54 months imprisonment, made subject to a 10 year Sexual Harm Prevention Order and indefinite Sex Offender Registration.

Sent to serve his sentence at HMP 'North East', Andrew struggled in the custody environment; he made a number of attempts to kill himself and was self-harming on a regular basis. He was hospitalised and at this time had been the subject of a number of mental health assessments. He was diagnosed with a Personality Disorder rather than a psychiatric condition, which in real terms meant that 'Andrew' could not be detained under the Mental Health Act and that he would be released back into the community. 'Andrew' was extremely unstable and as a result no intervention work could be completed during his time in custody.

Recognising the significant risk that was posed by 'Andrew' to himself and others, the team at Rochdale Probation Office referred the case to MAPPa. Due to his complex psychological needs, age, offending history and the risk he posed, a coordinated response from a number of agencies was needed.

An emergency referral was made to an approved premises in the Greater Manchester area, who would be able to offer a more enhanced package of care to support Andrew's needs post release. Stringent licence conditions were also set with the intention of managing the risk that Andrew presented, but unfortunately this was not effective.

Immediately after release Andrew began self-harming to a dangerous level. He was admitted to hospital for assessment and for treatment to his injuries, but he ran away. When he later returned to the approved premises, his self-harming worsened.

It was clear that the risk Andrew posed was significant and escalating. He was not cooperating with the support being offered by probation or medical staff, so the difficult decision was made by the manager of the Approved Premises that despite everyone's best efforts they could not effectively manage Andrew's risk in the community and his place was removed. With no other suitable alternative accommodation and a complete lack of engagement by Andrew, he was recalled to prison.

Andrew continued to struggle in custody with further self harm incidents, however through the MAPPa framework the multi-agency collaboration could still continue. A mental health specialist team working within the custody environment were then able to support Andrew's transfer to HMP 'Midlands', where he entered their Psychologically Informed Planned Environment (PIPE) programme. This allowed for a considered course of treatment aimed at stabilising his behaviour and in turn mitigating some of the risk he posed.

Over the twelve months that followed, Andrew showed a great deal of improvement in his behaviour and attitude towards help and support with his condition. He engaged effectively in the programme, even turning the news of his mother's death whilst he was on recall to motivate further one-to-one psychotherapy.

Whilst this recall period ran its course, the MAPPa panel met again in order to assist in devising a credible risk and resettlement plan for Andrew's release. Stabilising Andrew's mental health had been given the appropriate priority during his time in custody, due to the severity and risk of his self harm and suicide attempts, but as a result no intervention work could be completed with regards his sexual offending.

The dilemma presented was either to release Andrew on licence, or petition the parole board to keep him detained until his sentence end date, meaning he would be released without any statutory oversight from the National Probation Service and there would be no means of restrictive or rehabilitative control.

The decision was taken to support his release on licence, so that if there was an escalation in risk there would be recourse to manage it effectively.

On the day of release, Andrew was taken to the train station by staff from HMP 'Midlands' with a travel warrant to get him to his secured placement at the approved premises in the Greater Manchester area. An exceptional example of inter-agency co-operation saw officers from the British Transport Police monitor the progress of Andrew throughout the course of his journey, providing regular updates to the MAPPA Chair.

Andrew settled well at the approved premises and was allocated a community psychiatric nurse from the local Mental Health Trust. He began to develop a professional rapport with his key worker and remained in regular contact with his probation officer. At this point, due to successful interventions and with a robust risk management plan in place, with all partner agencies effectively working together, Andrew was deescalated from Level 2 management to Level 1.

As a part of this onward planning, the approved premises had agreed to accommodate Andrew for a short period beyond his licence end date whilst his arranged move-on accommodation was made available. Unfortunately this provision was then rescinded, putting Andrew at risk of becoming homeless again. This in turn began to adversely affect the stabilisation of his mental health, also increasing the risk. Recognising this, the MAPPA panel was reconvened and took to task the issue of finding suitable accommodation for Andrew. His probation officer had submitted numerous and extensive referrals, but they all came back to the issue of securing external funding. Through the MAPPA process, the local community mental health team and occupational therapists were supported to deliver Andrew through the necessary assessment interviews for staffed supportive accommodation, and the MAPPA panel was able to navigate the issues around ownership of the duty of care to Andrew. As a result of this, the community mental health team was able to secure funding in principle for Andrew so that when he then subsequently passed the assessments he could be moved on safely.

Through the co-ordinated multi-agency work enabled by the MAPPA framework and the dedicated interventions and efforts of all parties involved, Andrew continues to be stable in the community.

Author: Rochdale Probation Office

## Housing Pathways for Offenders

---

Greater Manchester SMB has supported other areas' Strategic Management Boards to review their housing pathways for offenders.

At the end of June a request was posted on the MAPPA website from West Mercia SMB asking for any help, advice or good practice in helping to house offenders. GM's housing authority member responded offering advice and examples of good practice from Manchester, and was then surprised to be contacted by another dozen SMB areas asking for help and support.

Consequently GM's housing authority member produced a detailed advice note to share with all the interested SMB areas. That was followed up with many individual contacts responding to specific questions which included some very detailed thoughts and advice on how to address major barriers to housing offenders. Some areas have expressed interest in visiting Manchester to learn more and observe some meetings first hand. Our SMB Member has been to talk to the North West Lancashire SMB.

This was a great example of using the MAPPA website to join-up SMBs across England and Wales and to benefit from an open-minded attitude of learning and sharing for the benefit of offenders and our wider communities.

You can register on the MAPPA Website at: [www.mappa.justice.gov.uk](http://www.mappa.justice.gov.uk)



# Case Study - Employment

---

*Individuals' names have been changed to protect their identities*

Ben, a Category 1 MAPPA/Registered Sex Offender, was being managed in the community at Level 1 by an offender manager from the National Probation Service (NPS). He took advantage of every opportunity offered to him to assist his rehabilitation and complied with all of his offender manager's directions. However, despite being well-qualified and pro-actively looking for work, Ben's conviction was making it very difficult for him to secure employment. He was faced with a lack of response from employers following application, and rejection from the limited interviews he was able to secure.

Ben approached his local Jobcentre Plus for help. He was assigned a work coach who worked extensively with him to help maintain motivation. Simultaneously, a manager from Jobcentre Plus worked closely with Ben's offender manager to identify the type of work he could undertake without posing a risk to the public. Due to both MAPPA agencies sharing relevant information about limitations on the type of work Ben could undertake, it allowed Jobcentre Plus to properly support Ben's return to work and the offender manager to formulate a robust risk management plan.

An employer advisor from Jobcentre Plus sourced a "sector-based work academy" for an employer who had a suitable vacancy available. A sector-based work academy provides a short training course, delivered by a training provider, tailored to the job role available, followed by a guaranteed job interview with the end employer. Again it was important that Jobcentre Plus shared relevant information about any limitations on the type of work Ben could undertake with its partners in the work academy.

Whilst the job role was not in the sector Ben was ideally looking for, he was open to trying other avenues in order to gain paid employment. He successfully completed the sector based work academy and at interview disclosed his conviction. The interviewer passed the information to the HR department for their consideration and four days later Ben was delighted to report he had been offered the job. Ben has not re-offended and remains in the community. This provides a great example of how MAPPA agencies work together to rehabilitate offenders and secure employment, which reduces the risk of further harm to the public.

Authors: Work Coach and Employer Advisor (Department for Work and Pensions)

## **Footnote:**

Having stable employment is proven to reduce reoffending. Most offenders want the opportunity to turn their backs on crime and having a job helps them get their lives back on track. If you think your business could benefit from hiring a prisoner or ex-offender, more information is available at:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/unlock-opportunity-employer-information-pack-and-case-studies/employing-prisoners-and-ex-offenders>

# Case Studies – Electronic Monitoring Service

---

The Electronic Monitoring Service (EMS) provides a location monitoring capability for the criminal justice system. It means that an offender can be released from prison with a licence condition to wear an electronic monitoring device (known as a “tag”). This enables an offender manager to more effectively supervise the offender whilst in the community.

Here are the key capabilities of the service:

- Compliance with exclusion zones (single or multiple). Zones can be tailored to be active for specified days and times.
- Attendance to programmes, activities or appointments.
- Monitoring a subject’s whereabouts, known as trail monitoring. Data can be requested retrospectively from the monitoring centre to support rehabilitative conversations with subjects.
- A curfew can be monitored alongside a location monitoring requirement.

## Helping to rehabilitate subjects

### Case context

This subject had a history of alcohol-related offences. The nature of the subject’s drinking pattern meant exclusion from a town centre or similar would have likely dispersed the drinking elsewhere; trail monitoring was therefore ordered, along with monitored attendance to an alcohol rehabilitation programme.

### Outcomes

The offender manager was able to use trail monitoring to monitor the subject’s location at times when he would usually be drinking; where it became apparent that the subject was not getting into the same drinking routines. The data from the tag also illustrated to the offender manager that the subject was attending the alcohol rehabilitation programme, and that he was staying for the full length of appointments. The subject reported that the tag gave him the opportunity to evidence that he was dealing with his drinking issues to his loved ones.

## Supporting subject compliance

### Case context

This subject had a long history of offending linked to drug abuse, as well as non-compliance on licence. On release from prison, he was ordered to attend a drug treatment and an anger management programme; however his offender manager was advised shortly after release that the subject had missed various appointments. The subject’s licence was varied to impose a tag to monitor attendance to appointments, with a curfew.

### Outcomes

As a direct result of the new restrictive condition to wear the tag, the subject was compelled to attend the next three appointments. However on the fourth week, he arrived late, claiming that he had been caught in traffic on the bus. The Offender Manager was concerned about the subject’s commitment due to previous poor compliance and was considering enforcement action, however trail monitoring data from the tag confirmed that he had been stuck for a 20 minute period of time on an access road.

Author: Excerpts from the EM Programme, Business Change Team’s presentation on location monitoring case studies.

# Case Studies – Electronic Monitoring Service

---

## **Flexibility in the service**

### Case context

A subject was given a monitored exclusion zone as part of the conditions of his release. However he regularly travelled via a certain route for work, which contained a main road within the exclusion zone. To solve this issue the offender manager liaised with the subject and Parole Board to amend the zone to allow travelling via that route at certain times during the day.

### Outcomes

By amending the exclusion zone, the offender manager was able to accommodate the work patterns of the subject, whilst still enforcing the conditions of his release. This allowed the subject to complete his normal work routine, whilst ensuring that the offender manager would not receive persistent non-compliance notifications on an ongoing basis.

## **Confirming subject non-compliance**

### Case context

The subject committed two sexual offences and had a history of similar offending. Through discussions between the offender manager and a police risk assessor, the decision was made to recommend a Suspended Sentence Order with a tag to monitor two exclusion zones of areas where the subject was known to frequent to target potential victims.

### Outcomes

The subject breached his exclusion zones on a few occasions. The data from the tag showed that he had been standing for a period of time on the edge of an exclusion zone but had not gone further into the zone. Having this information confirmed was invaluable in managing his challenging behaviour, which ultimately led to successful completion of the order period.

## **Supporting rehabilitation**

### Case context

The subject was serving an Indeterminate Public Protection (IPP) sentence. His offence and previous offending behaviour was linked to his turbulent relationship with his partner. His offender manager recognised the risk that he would rekindle the relationship once released; the Parole Board approved the release, however with the addition of trail monitoring & monitored exclusion zones for greater assurance.

### Outcomes

The trail monitoring data allowed the offender manager to have better rehabilitative conversations. However, the ex-partner reported to her liaison officer that the subject had followed her from a supermarket car park. The offender manager was considering recalling the subject, however sought confirmation on the subject's location using trail monitoring data, and was subsequently able to confirm that this was a chance meet and that the subject had not been following the victim. The victim was also reassured by the Police that she had not been followed by her ex-partner.

Author: Excerpts from the EM Programme, Business Change Team's presentation on location monitoring case studies.

# Lay Adviser's Report

---

I was appointed as Lay Adviser to Greater Manchester MAPPA Strategic Management Board in April 2018. A speedy 18 months has passed which has brought some really interesting opportunities. I have observed several Level 2 and 3 MAPPA meetings at various locations in Manchester. I have also been able to take part in a serious case review, participate in the process and contribute to the outcome and recommendations that have been made in the final report. This was in addition to a Domestic Homicide Task and Finish Group that I was involved in early in 2019. This was set up to look at the recommendation in the DHR and report back to SMB.

There has been a really positive development alongside all of this as a result of my Lay Adviser role. In my 'day job' as a senior lecturer in Social Work at Manchester Metropolitan University, we are always looking to develop robust and interesting placements as a central part of the students' training. In collaboration with Greater Manchester Police, six placements are in the final stages of development for our final year Social Work students on the BA or MA route and will commence late 2019. Plans are afoot for further development of this for the first level students too. It has been a great 18 months and I have enjoyed contributing to the Strategic Management Board[?].

Author: Claire Bellamy

## **Footnote:**

MAPPA Guidance states that Lay Advisers are appointed to be consulted in the respect of the review of MAPPA functions. They must be consulted in monitoring the effectiveness of MAPPA and any changes made in order to bring about improvement. They do not have a role in decisions about, or the management of, individual cases assigned to MAPPA. Lay Advisers will operate as full members of the area's Strategic Management Board (SMB), participating in the SMB itself and any relevant sub-groups or working parties. Lay Advisers are voluntary public appointments and are unpaid.

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

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

National  
Probation  
Service



GREATER MANCHESTER  
**POLICE**

