

RR3 Quarterly September 2025

Attendees:

- Anne Fox, Clinks
- Lisa Strelnikova, Clinks
- Rosie Melville, Head of Intensive Supervision Courts (ISCs)
- Ian Maris, Deputy Director for the Capacity Delivery Portfolio
- Joanne O'Connor, Junction 42
- David Dunn, Release Mates
- Maria McNicholl, St Giles Trust
- Jurga Kaucikienė, HMPPS
- Paul Grainge, Recoop
- Paula Harriott, Unlock
- Nicola Drinkwater, Women in Prison
- Richard Knibbs, St Giles Trust
- Tammi Owen, CUBE
- Steve Matthews, Shelter
- Jess Mullen, Alliance for Youth Justice
- Vicki Markiewicz, Change Grow Live
- Katrina Ffrench, UNJUST
- David Higham, Warrior Down CiC
- Matina Marougka, Together for Mental Wellbeing
- Josh Stunell, Bthechange CiC
- Thomas Scott
- Victoria Baird, Spurgeons

1. Welcomes and Introduction

- 1.1. Anne welcomed everyone to the session. She introduced Richard Rowley as the new RR3 seat holder for Employment, who sent his apologies for being unable to attend this meeting. She also reintroduced Vicki Markiewicz as the returning RR3 seat holder for Substance Misuse
- 1.2. She explained that the session would be divided into two main discussions. The first would feature Rosie Melville, Head of the Intensive Supervision Courts (ISCs), to discuss ISCs and their rollout. The second would be with Ian Maris, Deputy Director for the Capacity Delivery Portfolio at HMPPS, who is responsible for the implementation of the Independent Sentencing Review (ISR).
- 1.3. Anne began the session by inviting updates from several seat holders.

2. Member/HMPPS Updates

- 2.1. Maria McNicholl updated on the new Prison Education Service (PES) contracts beginning in October
- 2.2. Maria reported that her consultation with prison education staff revealed general concerns. Maria noted a general trend of being required to "do more for less." She reported that higher-level qualifications and creative programmes

- were being cut. She noted that staff transferring from FE colleges to private sector providers had expressed concern about pay, conditions, and pensions
- 2.3. She also referenced that voluntary sector organisations faced funding cuts, impacting their ability to operate
- 2.4. Anne noted these concerns and encouraged Maria to connect with Jon Collins (CEO, PET). Joanne O'Connor added that increased staffing costs have led to shorter delivery schedules, with some prisons planning deliberate closures to reduce the number of teaching weeks delivered annually. Anne expressed concern about these "planned closures" and said she would raise this with senior prison leadership.
- 2.5. Victoria Baird shared feedback from the Families Network on the Sentencing Bill. She summarised general support for the reduction in short custodial sentences but noted that clarity was needed on how supervision orders and rehabilitative requirements would align, especially for women. She also noted support for deferred sentences, as well as concerns regarding Electronic Monitoring (EM) and proposed financial penalties.
- 2.6. Paula Harriot added that Unlock, in its submission to the Sentencing Review, raised concerns about suspended sentences of up to three years appearing on DBS checks, harming women's employment prospects. Paula promised to provide Anne with additional notes.
- 2.7. Jess Mullen expressed concern that parts of the Sentencing Bill might inadvertently affect children. Jess highlighted the lack of a capacity crisis in the youth estate but raised concerns about safety, wellbeing, and sentence progression for children. Anne confirmed that she raised these concerns within the HMPPS Independent Advisory Forum and suggested Jess discuss them directly with Ian Maris later in the session.
- 2.8. Vicki Markiewicz noted that although the sector is generally enthusiastic about the Independent Sentencing Review (ISR) and the Sentencing Bill, there are concerns surrounding the availability of funding and recognition of the work of the voluntary organisations supporting people in the community. Vicki raised concerns that there is insufficient emphasis on psychosocial interventions
- 2.9. Vicki then reported that the Drug and Alcohol Expert Panel's work was ongoing with a focus on continuity of care and resettlement. She noted that officials want to work with the sector to create a timeline of a person's journey through the justice system from arrest onward. Vicki is keen for this work to encompass not just drug and alcohol treatments but also employability, housing, family interventions, and other support to assist people holistically.

3. Intensive Supervision Courts (ISCs) – Rosie Melville

- 3.1. Anne introduced Rosie Melville, outlining that she will be giving a presentation on the latest developments in ISCs, following the Expression of Interest (EOI) process that has gone out. Anne emphasised how the sector's support for the ISC rollout but warned about labelling these courts as "Intensive Supervision Courts" rather than "Problem-Solving Courts", and how the ISC label could make probation and courts think they will require a lot of time and personnel, which may hinder engagement with ISCs.
- 3.2. Rosie briefly explained the background of ISCs and that there are currently four of them - three sites focus on substance misuse at Liverpool, Teesside and Bristol Crown Courts, and one focuses on women with multiple complex needs at Birmingham Magistrate's Court. Key elements to the ISC model include regular judicial reviews every three to four weeks, multiagency support involving dedicated probation teams and support services. The model tests both punitive and rehabilitative elements and is backed by secondary legislation defining some attached sentences and punitive components. They are currently evaluating the ISC pilot.
- 3.3. In the process evaluation, staff reported positive impacts on the lives of people who have committed an offence, with some expressing a real desire to turn their lives around. Some participants on ISCs reported positive impacts on health, wellbeing, employment prospects, and positive feedback from participating prison staff. She emphasised the ISC focus need not be limited to substance misuse or women's needs, inviting interest in other issues faced by communities, such as 'prolific offenders.'
- 3.4. Jess Mullen introduced herself and asked whether the courts are also being considered for children and the youth system as well. She raised concerns on additional barriers the courts may create for children due to their maturity level and engagement challenges, worrying that the holistic approach proposed might have a negative impact on them. Rosie was grateful for Jess's comments and promised to follow up with her via email.
- 3.5. Vicki asked Rosie for HMPPS's view as to how the voluntary sector can get involved to support these expressions of interest and show support for the ISCs. Rosie clarified that the EOI form is meant to be completed by a range of partners and is meant to represent all the relevant partners' capacity and desire to be a part of the ISC. Rosie also clarified that there is not a cap on substance misuse ISCs, even though there are already some courts that address it. However, she is keen to see a range of issues to be covered by this kind of court.
- 3.6. Anne asked Rosie what we as a sector can do to get around the statutory partners hesitation to take on these courts, and what can we say to organisations that come to Clinks with questions about ISCs.
- 3.7. Rosie responded saying that it will be a long-term challenge for the MOJ to try to support areas who are not currently in a position to host an ISC, if the pilot

were to expand further. However, she emphasized that a lack of a courtroom is not a significant obstacle, since reviews do not need to be held in a court room. Rosie challenged the group to work with their local areas to think about what a suitable area for sessions could be, such as non-criminal courtrooms or a local family court, which may have more capacity.

- 3.8. Rosie noted that they can give areas a lead-in time for areas to prepare for ISC readiness. New ISCs do not need to be ready to go in Spring 2026 and the roll out is expected to be gradual.
- 3.9. Anne mentioned the Clinks Women's Network's collaboration with the Centre for Justice Innovation on women-focused ISCs and supported the longer-term readiness timeline, noting that it would allow many more areas to be able to deliver on it.
- 3.10. Rosie said the department is particularly interested in seeing applications for areas to address 'prolific offending,' and said they had seen a range of approaches so far from potential applicants, including a focus on mental health.
- 3.11. Anne asked Matina if she thinks a mental health-centred ISC would be useful and wondered how they might work. Matina agreed that such an ISC would be useful, noting that they have tried to run a mental-health supportive strategy previously, similar to a mental health ISC, but had trouble getting it off the ground.
- 3.12. David Dunn wondered if there is scope for the ISCs to sit in local Probation Delivery Units (PDU), given that there will need to be increased security in PDUs following recent events, which may make a judge more amenable to conducting an ISC session there. Rosie agreed, emphasizing that it would be down to local preferences how local judiciaries and others involved in running the reviews feel about it.
- 3.13. Steve Matthews raised concerns about the pilot scheme around housing representation, and that there seems to be an expectation for stable housing for ISC participants. Rosie confirmed that they see housing provision as an essential partner to the ISC. Anne encouraged Steve to share some of his work around housing and what might work in an ISC context with Rosie.
- 3.14. David Higham asked Rosie how they would incorporate Lived Experience Recovery Organizations (LEROs), and raised concerns commissioning, as there seems to be a high bar in terms of getting on the tender process that LEROs have difficulty achieving. Rosie did not have an immediate response and committed to coming back to David at a later date.
- 3.15. Anne highlighted the importance of niche and specialist organisations, particularly peer-led recovery housing, to desistance and employment support post-release. David echoed Anne's sentiment, and emphasised that the

sustainability of LEROs makes it vital for them to be involved with desistance efforts, keeping people off the streets and helping them find employment.

- 3.16. Anne mentioned that she is excited that there will be more voluntary sector organisations involved in conversations around ISCs. She wondered how resources will need to be allocated and which organisations will need to provide their support to ISCs. She emphasised that there are concerns from the sector that if ISCs are not properly organised, planned and resourced, we will not be able to give people functional community solutions, which will result in people being “up-tariffed.”
- 3.17. Rosie responded to Anne’s concerns by explaining that currently, the MoJ provides additional funding for women’s centres who support ISC participants. Wider support services funding is provided by other government departments, and conversations are ongoing about how to ensure support services are properly funded to support ISC participants. Applicants should make sure that any applications that come in are supported by support services that have the capacity to deliver, which she anticipates may be difficult for some areas. Anne appreciated the clarity, highlighting that across this team there is all the support and advice that she could need, and reiterated sector support for ISCs, despite reservations about the ISC name.
- 3.18. Tammi asked whether there had been any ISC considerations specific to Wales. Rosie responded by saying that she is interested to understand what more MoJ can do to support any potential applicants from Wales. Tammi requested that Rosie should get in contact with her in the future.

4. Independent Sentencing Review (ISR) – Ian Maris

- 4.1. Anne began the second half of the session by introducing Ian Maris, who spoke to the group about the ISR, focusing on implementation in light of the passing of the Sentencing Bill through Parliament. She explained that Ian, leading on operational implementation and coordination at HMPPS, would cover what implementation means in terms of prison and probation subject to the finalisation of the bill.
- 4.2. Ian began by sharing an overview of the measures, structures, timelines, and the significance of the ISR as a “once in a lifetime opportunity.” He explained that the ISR is intended to allow HMPPS to move away from the perma-crisis of running out of prison cells and the necessity of doing quick-fix measures. As the Bill goes through, this will provide the opportunity to move forward to a sustainable future, protecting the public, changing people’s lives and reducing reoffending.
- 4.3. Ian outlined the headline measures recommended in the ISR, including the earned progression model, where individuals on standard determinate

sentences spend a third of their time in custody, followed by a period of robust community supervision for the second third of their sentence. They will spend the final third of their sentence either under continued community supervision or under restricted orders.

- 4.4. He described changes to the recall model. Fixed term recall will be changed to 56 days, and work is progressing to provide a structured regime during this time. He also mentioned the presumption against short sentences, where the expectation is that the judiciary will be sentencing those currently on short custody sentences to community orders, since sentences of 12 months or less do not allow sufficient time to create substantial change to people's lives. In addition, there is a proposed extension of suspended sentence orders from 2 to 3 years plus a tightening in remand provisions. Altogether, these measures reduce future projected demand for prison places and work continues to expand the estate through the programme already underway.
- 4.5. Ian mentioned there will be a greater focus on victims as part of the Sentencing Bill, such as greater identification of people who have committed domestic abuse offences at the point of sentencing and an expansion of the use of Electronic Monitoring (EM), curfews, and inclusion zones.
- 4.6. Ian then explained HMPPS's delivery structure. They have an overarching capacity delivery portfolio board, on which Ian serves, which is chaired by the Director General Chief Executive Officer. They have 4 delivery programmes for taking over the operational implementation of these elements of the Bill, which are: Prison Implementation, Electronic Monitoring (EM), Our Future Probation Service (OFPS) Programme and the Community Accommodation Service (CAS). In the prison space, Ian described that people will be working on how the new recall model will operate, preparedness for release, expanding the Offender Management Units teams, and will be looking to introduce a digital sentence calculation, which will be a massive change for administrative work. For EM, the expectation is that there will be an expansion of tagging as people will be given community orders. Ian explained that they will be working extensively with the existing EM service delivery provider to establish an improvement plan to ensure there is capacity to expand services.
- 4.7. He emphasised ongoing work as part of the Our Future Probation Service programme. The Our Future Probation Service (OFPS) programme is about returning to the fundamentals that matter most—supporting rehabilitation, protecting the public, and enabling our staff to focus their time on building meaningful engagement with those they supervise. We recognise that the best outcomes are achieved when our people are properly supported, our processes are efficient, and our technology is modern and fit for purpose.
- 4.8. This programme is looking at how demand can be balanced with resources., This includes significant increases in recruitment, streamlining existing

processes, leveraging technology to remove some administrative burden away from probation officers, and looking at what the right level of quality of work against high-risk populations and more prolific cohorts, determined around flexibility for probation officers. Ian also mentioned that the RAR will be replaced with a slightly different order, the details of which is still a live discussion at the moment.

4.9. Ian moved on to talk about CAS, noting that they are expecting a significant increase in CAS3, ensuring that people, on release from prisons, who are going to no fixed abode or are homeless, will have accommodation where possible.

4.10. Ian concluded his presentation by setting out their operational implementation plan timeline. He noted that the Sentencing Bill commenced its parliamentary journey in September, with a Committee Stage scheduled for October and Royal Assent expected by sometime in the new year. Key proposed provisions like the presumption against short sentences, extended suspended sentence lengths, and the recall model should become operational around Spring 2026, with the progression model commencing Autumn 2026. Ian then handed over to Anne, who opened the floor to questions.

4.11. Jess Mullen introduced herself to Ian. She reminded him that ever since the Sentencing Review was announced, the Alliance for Youth Justice (AYJ) have been calling for a separate review for children on the basis that there is a crisis of safety and wellbeing in the youth estate rather than one of capacity. She and her members have had concerns about elements of the review and the Bill applying to children. In particular, they were concerned about short sentences, which they do not believe are compliant with the principles of custody as a last resort and for the shortest time possible, set up by the UN convention on the rights of the child, and the progression model.

4.12. Jess posed three questions to Ian. First, she asked what progress has been made on the review of the implications of the ISR and Sentencing Bill for the children's system. She expressed her concern that any lag will mean that children may be treated more punitively once the Bill comes into effect. Her second question related to clarity on the scope of the Bill, particularly since some components of the Bill lack distinct provisions for children versus adults. Lastly, she sought clarity as to if under the implementation for prisons, Allison Clarke will have this in her new role as Executive Director for the Youth Custody Service (YCS), and whether there was something happening in the YCS in response to this.

4.13. Ian Maris responded to Jess, thanking her for all her questions. He clarified that the specific slide in the presentation she was seeking clarity on was not updated after Allison Clarke took up her new role at YCS. He went on to further clarify that the expectation for a large part of the legislation is that it will

not be applied to people under the age of 18 and that there will be separate policy legislation work in the children's space. He mentioned that he is not certain what the timeline looks like for this work, and whether they want to do something in parallel to the Bill. He promised to get back to her on this question. To her final question, he mentioned that the idea that certain provisions that apply for both children and adults has been acknowledged and promised to provide some clarity in the future.

4.14. Jess thanked him for his response and reiterated that if there is no clarity soon, the Bill will create a two-tiered system where children are treated more punitively than adults. Anne echoed this concern. Anne emphasised that when working with adults, many organisations within the sector have wished that people's needs would have been addressed earlier, particularly for those who graduated from the youth justice system and went into the adult justice system.

4.15. David Higham asked Ian if there will be an uplift in funding to follow the cohort of people who will now be going into the community earlier than before, and how much of the £700M allocated for probation in the Spending Review will be going to the voluntary sector and for community-based organisations. He also raised the concern that the progression model appears to be more of a management model than a rehabilitation model. He urged Ian that we need to start thinking differently than we have in the past and really invest significantly more into the sector. He called for more recognition of the amount of work the voluntary sector does, citing concerns that most of the recognition and credit solely goes to the probation service.

4.16. Ian thanked David for his points and responded by reminding the group that the ISR was very strong on the recognition of the third sector, making recommendations about expanding and funding the third sector, particularly to be able to work alongside probation in the community. He clarified that rather than being strictly for probation, that £700M is for community solutions. There is work being done on the Spending Review (SR) allocations and how it the funding will be distributed, though he stresses that investment in the voluntary sector is being strongly considered.

4.17. Building off Ian's point, Anne explained that the £700M in the Spending Review will go beyond just probation and tagging. Anne urged participants, if they need funding for a specific initiative, programme or service they should reach out to her, as she is in regular conversations around funding. Although it is not legislative, she is adamant to frame just how central the voluntary sector is to the success of the Bill.

4.18. Vicki expressed that although the Bill is well-received in voluntary sector and the substance abuse sphere, there is anxiety around the number of additional people who will be in the community who will require support around drugs and alcohol, suspended sentences, and community punishments. She

also cited concerns around the rest of the Bill more broadly. She reiterated David's calls for joined up solutions around funding. She suggested that it would be very helpful if HMPPS and the Office for Health Improvement and Disparities (OHID) could collaborate and jointly consider where additional funding is necessary for specific community programs. Vicki moved on to highlight that the voluntary sector is very keen to find out how the progression model will account for people engaging well with recovery programmes and treatment interventions in places like recovery wings and incentivized substance-free living spaces. She asked Ian whether this will count toward earned progression, or if the model is purely about engaging in prison-based programmes and behaving well whilst in custody.

4.19. Ian thanked Vicki for her points and questions. He said that the focus of the progression model design will initially be on people not progressing for poor behaviour, where people will receive additional days to their sentence following adjudication. To Vicki's question regarding funding to drug and alcohol programming, Ian promised to get back to her, as the answer is contingent to Spending Review allocation decisions.

4.20. Ian asked Vicki if she is in active conversations with HMPPS drug and alcohol teams. Vicki confirmed that she was, and at every possible point, she brings up funding issues to them. To do a good job and to ensure people are being rehabilitated, Vicki emphasised that funding is essential. Ian said that when he next speaks to the HMPPS drugs and alcohol team, he will reference this discussion to them.

4.21. Building off Vicki's points, Anne took a moment to emphasise that it is the view of the sector that the management of behaviour and the judgement of behaviour in prison is massively problematic, particularly for people who are black or neurodivergent. The sector is also very concerned about prison staff getting the power would get to decide if a person gets out of prison early or not, since these people may not be best placed to make these assessments without proper training.

4.22. Matina mentioned that similar to what David and Vicki had said, in the mental health area, they are concerned that sufficient funding will not be available to voluntary sector organisations to support the wellbeing of people going through probation or the criminal justice system overall. Matina brought up that on remand, she has continually been seeing people with mental health needs who should be in hospital being in prison unnecessarily, due to shortages of beds or services. She called for there to be a more coordinated response between different departments on this to avoid this unnecessary traumatising, and to ensure that people are not placed in a place where their needs are not being met.

- 4.23. Nicola offered her support for Anne's comments on the earned progression model, providing words of caution around the impact of trauma for women and resulting behaviour, as well as racial disproportionality in adjudication outcomes and in the criminal justice system more broadly. She asked if there would be an independent oversight mechanism for what is to be considered good behaviour.
- 4.24. Nicola noted her support for RR3 colleagues' calls for investment in community provision. She referenced a lack of clarity around increased funding for women's centres
- 4.25. Nicola also mentioned that she is very interested in Electronic Monitoring and hearing more about ongoing conversations surrounding exemptions. She articulated that she is glad that Ian and his team are working on addressing situations such as homeless women being tagged, via the CAS3 expansion. Further, she raised concerns around people on work orders having their picture taken and their names publicised. It would also put women at a lot of risk, since around 70% of women have experienced domestic violence and abuse and may end up having their information made available to their abusers.
- 4.26. David Dunn explained that in partnership with Clinks, he has formed the Small Organisations Network. In Network, many organisations David spoke to felt dissatisfied with the rehabilitation grant scheme. He asked if it would be possible to have even smaller grants available to smaller organisations which provide these kinds of services. David also asked if measures could be put into place to improve HMPPS's relationships with smaller organisations.
- 4.27. Jess Mullen reiterated the points made by Anne and Nicola around racial disparities. She asked what is being done from an implementation point of view so that disproportionately poorer impacts of the progression model would not impact racially minoritised people. She also noted the absence of a comprehensive racial justice strategy for HMPPS and MOJ, urging that we need to ensure that policies do not make inequalities worse, since, as it stands, the earned progression model may further engrain inequalities.
- 4.28. Responding to Matina's point, Ian explained that it is a known challenge that people are potentially being put into custody rather than hospital, which is currently being considered and is something that they are looking to get better data on.
- 4.29. Ian moved on to recognise the importance of racial issues and equality and let the group know that these concerns are acknowledged by HMPPS. He explained that they are working on how they can put assurances in place around sentencing and outcomes from the Bill which would go beyond a mere impact and equality assessment. They are currently looking to agree this work with ministers.

- 4.30. Responding to Jess's point on the timeliness of funding, Ian emphasised that while he understands that organisations need to make planning decisions, he is hoping there will be more clarity on this soon.
- 4.31. To David's concern about the utility of the recent meeting they had with HMPPS, both Ian and Anne stated that they are happy to take concerns up to HMPPS directly.
- 4.32. Responding to Jess, Ian explained that the importance of understanding racial inequalities in adjudication processes is completely recognised. He noted that the Deputy Prime Minister (DPM) wants this understanding to be a key part of how they enact the Sentencing Bill and will be a key consideration moving forward. As a part of this, regarding the provision where number of days a person can have added will be double following adjudication, Ian explained that it will be important that these processes can be seen as fair, equitable and transparent.
- 4.33. Anne followed up on Ian's final point to ask where they are currently at with the independent advisory board that David Gauke referred to in the ISR, as it is a crucial area for them to keep an eye on. Ian responded saying that while he is unsure of the current stage of this board, he will find out for the group. She cautioned that this independent board would look at things from the perspective of what evidence suggests should happen rather than what the system requires. There are concerns about this becoming another iteration of the Imprisonment for Public Protection (IPP) sentence given that there will only be time added for bad behaviour rather any time taken away for good behaviour. She worried that this may lead to a disproportionality scandal.
- 4.34. Jess agreed with what Anne mentioned, stressing concerns that this will be yet another factor where we will see disproportionate outcomes and highlighting that there is not yet a plan to address this.
- 4.35. Anne built off what Jess stated, agreeing that adding further disproportionate outcomes is a major concern in the sector. In addition to the progression model, Anne shared that there are concerns surrounding the emphasis on the use of bail over remand, given that we know there is a disproportionate amount of people who are remanded who are also racially minoritized. Anne worried that this would mean that they will likely be denied bail, which would only worsen the minoritisation of people in prison.
- 4.36. Anne thanked Ian for attending the session and advised members of the RR3 to connect with Elizaveta Strelnikova from Clinks if there is anything that they would like to get back to Ian on. She let Ian know that the RR3 is very supportive of the kind of work he is doing.
- 4.37. Ian thanked the group for their comments and questions, noting that they were a clear reminder of all the areas they need to work on further.

5. AOB

- 5.1. Anne fox opened up the floor to any other business.
- 5.2. Nicola updated the group to say that she just held a Special Interest Group (SIG) session focusing on a “whole-systems approach” for women in the criminal justice system. She mentioned that she was hoping that the findings from this session will support the Women’s Justice Board and their upcoming strategy. She mentioned she was open to questions from the group and asked for anyone interested to get in contact with her and called for positive case study examples from members of the RR3 to substantiate her findings.
- 5.3. Paula Harriott let the group know that on October 1st Unlock are launching a campaign for votes from prisoners. She mentioned that if anyone wanted to support the campaign as an organisation, they could reach out to her.
- 5.4. Josh Stunnell emphasised that it was his ambition to make authorities really understand what independent scrutiny is. He clarified that independent scrutiny is not made up of people who are not involved with the prison day-to-day. With the appointment of David Lammy, Josh hoped that this understanding will be reached, and that the process of creating an independent board will be accelerated.
- 5.5. Katrina Ffrench asked whether there could be a push from the RR3 to pick up the recommendations that have been raised. She emphasised that a lot of the things the group discussed, particularly in terms of racial disproportionality, David Lammy would be aware of. As such, she wondered if there was appetite for writing him a letter as a collective to ask him what his plans are to address it.
- 5.6. Anne agreed with Katrina’s points, saying that there would have been no way he said yes to his appointment if he did not intend to address racial disproportionality, so she does not doubt that he will be receptive to this letter, and any potential solutions we can think of.
- 5.7. Building on his previous point, Josh mentioned that prior to the new Diversion and Early Resolution Framework (DERF) recommendations coming out, he wanted to highlight that his organisation and others were involve in about three quarters in the creation of these recommendations but have not seen any new information. However, he has heard that there will not be the independent scrutiny there, even though it was one of the ISR recommendations.
- 5.8. Anne agreed for Clinks to draft a letter to David Lammy. Katrina mentioned that she will share any information that she wishes to flag to be added to this letter.

- 5.9. Jess mentioned that they have already written to him and highlighted to Lammy that he said that youth was his biggest concern, and highlighted recommendation 34 from the ISR around criminal record reform. In this context, she agreed that a letter from the wider RR3, highlighting the broader context, would make a lot of sense.
- 5.10. Anne mentioned that considerations that are raised in this letter would need to go beyond the findings of the Lammy review, which didn't look to much at Gypsy, Roma and Traveller populations or women. The letter would also need to fit around current events.
- 5.11. Anne expressed that the Women's Justice Board found the impact assessment for the Bill quite weak, and that there are things in the legislation that if implemented in different ways, even drawing from the fact that some measures are non-legislative, will place people under additional risk.
- 5.12. Anne once again emphasised the importance of everyone getting involved in sending a letter to David Lammy, and to sign it once they are issued the draft, so that Clinks are able to send it out as soon as possible.
- 5.13. Anne thanked everyone for their membership on the RR3 and for all of their contributions, noting the value they have had for the broader sector. She closed by remarking on how the RR3 has grown significantly from what it once was, and how grateful she is for everyone being there and going so far beyond what she had asked of them.