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 involving the higher risks of serious harm.

- **Level 1** involves ordinary agency management (i.e. managed by the lead agency with no MAPPA formal meetings);
- **Level 2** is where the active involvement of more than one agency is required to manage the offender.
- **Level 3** is where risk management plans require the attendance and commitment of resources at a senior level.

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

## MAPPA-eligible offenders on 31 March 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Category 1: Registered sex offenders</th>
<th>Category 2: Violent offenders</th>
<th>Category 3: Other dangerous offenders</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>3061</td>
<td>1432</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3068</td>
<td>1438</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4513</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Category 1: Registered sex offenders</th>
<th>Category 2: Violent offenders</th>
<th>Category 3: Other dangerous offenders</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## RSOs cautioned or convicted for breach of notification requirements

| RSOs cautioned or convicted | 130 |

## RSOs who have had their life time notification revoked on application

| RSOs who have had their life time notification revoked | 20 |

## Restrictive orders for Category 1 offenders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHPOs, SHPOs with foreign travel restriction &amp; NOs imposed by the courts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHPO with foreign travel restriction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<p>| Number of people who became subject to notification requirements | 0 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Breach of licence</th>
<th>Category 1: Registered sex offenders</th>
<th>Category 2: Violent offenders</th>
<th>Category 3: Other dangerous offenders</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Breach of SOPO</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total number of Registered Sexual Offenders per 100,000 population**: 127

This figure has been calculated using the Mid-2016 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 2017 (i.e. they are a snapshot). The rest of the data covers the period 1 April 2016 to 31 March 2017.

(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 under ordinary agency (Level 1) arrangements rather than via 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.”) 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.

(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.

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

(f) Sexual Harm Prevention Order (SHPO) (including any additional foreign travel restriction). Sexual Harm Prevention Orders (SHPOs) and interim SHPOs replaced Sexual Offence Prevention Orders. They are intended to protect the public from offenders convicted of a sexual or violent offence who pose a risk of sexual harm to the public by placing restrictions on their behaviour. It 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 done 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.

Individuals subject to indefinite notification 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 applies from 1 September 2012 for adult offenders.

On 21 April 2010, in the case of R (on the application of F and Angus Aubrey Thompson) v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2010] UKSC 17, the Supreme Court upheld an earlier decision of the Court of Appeal and made a declaration of incompatibility under s. 4 of the Human Rights Act 1998 in respect of notification requirements for an indefinite period under section 82 of the Sexual Offences Act 2003.

This has been remedied by virtue of the Sexual Offences Act 2003 (Remedial) Order 2012 which has introduced the opportunity for offenders subject to indefinite notification to seek a review; this was enacted on 30th July 2012.

Persons will not come off the register automatically. Qualifying offenders will be required to submit an application to the police seeking a review of their indefinite notification requirements. This will only be once they have completed a minimum period of time subject to the notification requirements (15 years from the point of first notification following release from custody for the index offence for adults and 8 years for juveniles).

Those who continue to pose a significant risk will remain on the register for life, if necessary. In the event that an offender is subject to a Sexual Offences Prevention Order (SOPO)/Sexual Harm Prevention Order (SHPO) the order must be discharged under section 108 of the Sexual Offences Act 2003 prior to an application for a review of their indefinite notification requirements.

For more information, see the Home Office section of the gov.uk website: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/sexual-offences-act-2003-remedial-order-2012
GM Circles of Support and Accountability (CoSA)

The Greater Manchester National Probation Service volunteer scheme Circles of Support and Accountability (CoSA) substantially reduces the risk posed by child sex offenders. Trained volunteers form a ‘Circle’ which meets the offender to help them reintegrate into their community. This is achieved by supporting and challenging an individual – male or female - whose sexual offending is linked to social isolation.

Mr A is a MAPPA Category 1 Registered Sex Offender who was jailed for seven years for sex offences against pre-pubescent boys, who were the children of his neighbours and friends of his family. Mr A was assessed as posing a high risk of sexual harm to children.

Mr A was our ‘pilot’ study to adapt Circles for an individual with an Intellectual Disability. He was registered at a MAPPA level 3 due to the complexity of his case, risk concerns (including a high level of vulnerability himself), and subsequent difficulties with re-housing him.

The Circles project was adapted to accommodate Mr A’s learning needs. The Circle lasted over two years, longer than the usual 12-18 months, and meetings were adapted to include the use of visual aids to increase Mr A’s learning. Visits in the community were also encouraged to support Mr A in his new accommodation and to improve his ability to manage himself independently. All of this was completed with the view to manage, monitor and reduce his risk.

Across the lifespan of the Circle, Mr A was supported to help manage a potential relationship with a woman, potential risky situations with children that arose in the community, the transition from the Approved Premises to independent accommodation and secure voluntary work. He was also supported in gaining basic life and social skills such as budgeting, home management, and accessing appropriate community schemes to make adult social networks.

Mr A remains offence free after three years release from custody, while the volunteers were praised by the MAPPA panel for going ‘above and beyond’ in this Circle. In doing so they prevented further victims and allowed a complex individual to find a safe anchoring in the community and live a productive and fulfilling life after custody.

Polygraph Testing

Greater Manchester is now actively using polygraph testing as a further tool in the management of sex offenders. Polygraph testing uses sensors to measure breathing rates, pulse and blood pressure when a question is posed. The test is carried out in three stages, with an interview, followed by the polygraph test and a post-test discussion. Participation is voluntary (unless it’s part of an offender’s court order) and can assist sex offenders with their rehabilitation; participation is viewed as a willingness to engage with authorities. Polygraph testing assists Offender Managers to determine if a sex offender is reoffending, it contributes to assessing the risk the offender poses to the public and reduces the need for more intrusive and costly methods of monitoring. The Polygraph Examiners from Greater Manchester Police’s Sex Offender Management Unit are reporting excellent results.

A case study

Mr B, a MAPPA Category 1 Registered Sex Offender (RSO), had been assessed and categorised as presenting a low risk of harm to the public. He recently submitted an application for a review of the notification requirements after being in the community for 15 years. This review determines if he is removed from the sex offender register. Mr B was offered a voluntary polygraph to assist the decision making process.

On attending the polygraph, Mr B provided a number of worrying disclosures about his lifestyle, including providing details of children he had contact with. The risk that Mr B posed was re-assessed as high and his application to be removed from the sex offender register was refused. He continues to be closely monitored by his Offender Manager who is investigating Mr B’s lifestyle to identify if there are any further children at risk.
Managing offenders convicted of terrorism offences

Mr C is a MAPPA Category 2 offender who was convicted of “Engaging in conduct in preparation for acts of terrorism.” As his release date approached, his level of management was escalated to Level 3, to address the significant community impact of releasing a convicted terrorist.

In order to protect the public and rehabilitate the offender, it was essential for all agencies involved with Mr C to work closely together. One of the first tasks was to conduct a risk assessment. This was undertaken by a Psychologist who assessed that he did not require any further ideology work but that further work was required in relation to social reintegration. This is common to many prisoners who have served lengthy sentences. The assessment was that Mr C did not pose a significant risk to the community.

Despite this professional risk assessment, partner agencies were nervous about the risk Mr C might pose following release and initially focussed solely on the nature of his offending rather than on the presenting risk. However, as a result of information shared at MAPP meetings and inter-agency work outside the meetings, Mr C was released and is being successfully managed in the community.

The Probation Counter Terrorist Lead provided guidance and allowed the Offender Manager, Prevent Officers and CTU Officers to work together to address the concerns of partners by providing information and reassurance. Specifically, work was undertaken with his family to ensure they understood his licence condition in relation to internet use. In addition, Children’s Services were actively involved in devising a working agreement for Mr C’s interaction with a Looked After Child who was part of the extended family.

At first the Local Authority was resistant to providing Mr C with social housing, but following a presentation by the Offender Manager, Prevent and CTU to the Serious Offenders Panel, Mr C was allowed to bid for property.

Work was undertaken with his local Mosque to allow safe reintegration to worship. Mr C required ongoing medical treatment in the community; inter-agency work with Health partners facilitated Mr C’s access to healthcare, as well as managing the risk to staff and other patients.

Finally, work with Job Centre Plus has resulted in Mr C finding suitable employment and he is now working through his probationary period in a new job. Mr C is half way through his licence period and is offence free. He could not have been effectively managed by a single agency. By escalating the management level to Level 3, this ensured effective multi-agency participation in the Risk Management Plan. He is now managed at Level 1 by his Offender Manager who consults with CTU, Prevent and the PCTL lead as appropriate.

Lay Adviser

I have now been a lay adviser on the MAPPA programme for 5 years. My role is to be a representative of the general public who acts as an independent “critical friend” to the MAPPA programme and the agencies involved.

During the last year I have continued to regularly attend board meetings and I have been involved in serious case reviews. I feel my contribution ensures the public voice is heard and I am confident that my opinion is valued and respected.

In 2017/18 I will continue to develop my knowledge and understanding of the MAPPA programme through attending panel meetings, meeting with agencies and gaining an insight into how other initiatives and services interact with the MAPPA process. I will also look to other lay advisers within the North West region to share good practice and gain an understanding of how the MAPPA programme is delivered in their areas.

With all agencies and individuals involved in MAPPA I have experienced nothing but honesty, dedication, and commitment to the work of the programme. This is shown through continuous improvement action plans with the sole purpose of strengthening, refining and improving the risk management of MAPPA offenders.

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