



RR3 Quarterly March 2026

Attendees:

- Anne Fox, Clinks
- Sam Julius, Clinks
- Summer Alston-Smith, Clinks
- Lisa Strelnikova, Clinks
- Alice Adamson
- Anne Trudgian, Open Road
- Bettina Crossick
- Catherine Marriott
- Catrina McHugh, Open Clasp Theatre Company
- Helen Carter
- Ian Maris (HMPPS Implementation lead on the Sentencing Act)
- Jess Mullen, Alliance for Youth Justice
- Joanne O'Connor, Junction42
- Jon Collins, Prisoners' Education Trust
- Jon Royle, The Bridge Project
- Josh Stunnell, bthechange CIC
- Katie Aston
- Louise Williams (Police Governance Reform Policy Lead, Home Office)
- Lydia Plant, Bristol Drugs Project
- Martha Blom-Cooper (Head, Our Future Probation Service Programme)
- Matina Marougka, Together for Mental Wellbeing
- Paul Grainge, Recoop
- Paula Harriott, Unlock
- Richard Knibbs, St Giles Trust
- Rebecca Friel, Odd Arts
- Richard Rowley, Working Chance
- Rokaiya Khan, Together Women
- Rosanna Carbutt
- Sarah Home, Willodene
- Sarah Jarvis
- Stephen O'Connor (Deputy Director for Probation Policy, MoJ)
- Stephen Polly
- Tammi Owen, CUBE
- Vicky Baird, Spurgeons
- Will Haydock, Collective Voice

1. Member/HMPPS Updates

- 1.1. Anne briefly introduced Rebecca Friel as the new Arts seat holder, and thanked Catrina McHugh for her time as the previous Arts seat holder. She introduced Christine Line as the new seat holder for Women, and Summer Alston-Smith as Clinks' new CEO.
- 1.2. Anne thanked the group for their participation in the 2025 State of the Sector research, highlighting that the launch event for the report and accompanying financial analysis will take place on the 31st of March.

- 1.3. Anne introduced the two main discussion items for the session, including a discussion on the abolition of PCCs with Louise Williams and Katie Aston, and a discussion on the Sentencing Act with Stephen O'Connor, Ian Maris and Martha Blom-Cooper.
- 1.4. Richard Rowley commented on the new risk assessed access for personnel with lived experience of the criminal justice system framework, noting that while it represents a move to more transparency, certainly within the fixed category, it created a lot of questions around how decisions are made and the rationale behind the selected excluded offences. He cited concerns with the framing of individuals with an excluded offence as being an 'unmanageable risk' and queried where this wording came from and who signed this off.
- 1.5. Anne responded to Richard, suggesting checking in with Paula Hariot and Dave Higham, as lived experience seats on their views on it.
- 1.6. Jess Mullen commented on the policy paper 'A Modern Youth Justice Service: Foundations Fit for The Future,' noting that in the previous week, Minister Richards stated that he will soon be setting out plans for Youth Justice reform. She is expecting a White or Green paper including changes to the sentencing framework for children. She also explained that there have been recent plans announced around criminal record reform, and there will be further plans on out of court resolutions. The Alliance for Youth Justice has been doing a lot of engagement around what this should look like and remains hopeful that it will be positive. She asked for anyone who is interested in feeding to this, who is not already a part of their membership, to reach out.
- 1.7. Rebecca Friel explained that she had sent out an anonymous survey to her network to gather feedback to present to the group. She mentioned that nationally, there were several common challenges that arose. For example, regime changes, staffing shortages and clearance issues made it difficult to deliver services. She also noted that people were quite upset about the arts being cut in education provision, citing that many thought there was a post-code lottery as to whether people in prison received art-based services. She explained that the sector requested wanted to push that there should be a baseline expectation that prisons engage in creative, cultural or arts-based activities.
- 1.8. Rebecca noted that the criminal justice arts sector wanted more transparency and training around wider themes including supporting staff witnessing increased physical violence in prisons and sexual offences. She also noted that the sector had requested that the criminal justice sector and prison staff could have more training to understand the value of arts and trauma informed practice to support buy-in for their services.
- 1.9. Her network thought that in many cases, hubs where work would begin in the prisons and continue into the community, arts were quite well-embedded. In

some other areas, however, through-the-gate arts-based support was very limited.

1.10. Anne noted that the issues Rebecca raised had a lot of overlap with issues raised in numerous other areas, such as education and drugs and alcohol.

1.11. Bettina responded to Rebecca, noting that there will be an Arts Alliance meeting coming up soon where they can discuss the issues that Rebecca raised further, and that Rebecca's suggestions can interlink with the work to do with purposeful activity and that they can look at how this work can be a part of it under the prison regime. Bettina noted that they can take these ideas away together, and do more work with Rebecca to address the points she raised.

2. Louise Williams (Police Governance Reform Policy Lead, Home Office) – discussion on abolition of Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs)

2.1. Anne introduced Louise Williams as the Police Governance Reform Policy Lead at the Home Office, noting that she will be presenting on the recent reforms announced in the White Paper. Anne explained that for this agenda item, the group will be joined by a selection of other organisations who have worked with police and crime commissioners in the drug and alcohol space and specialist women's organisations. These organisations included Collective Voice, Willowdene, Together Women, the Bridge Project, Bristol Drugs Project and Open Road.

2.2. Louise thanked Anne for her introduction and handed over to Stephen Polly to begin their presentation.

2.3. Stephen explained that as noted in the policing White Paper, from May 2028, the PCC model will be abolished, and policing governance will transfer to Mayoral Strategic Authorities or Policing and Crime Boards, where Mayoral Strategic Authorities are not possible. He explained that they expect Policing and Crime Boards to comprise local authority leaders and/or Strategic Authority Mayors across the force area and two independent members to improve the diversity of thought on these boards. Boards will appoint a Policing and Crime Lead to exercise most of the police governance functions on a day-to-day basis (with the exception of existing functions currently reserved to PCCs). This role will be akin to that of a Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime.

2.4. The Police and Crime Board model aims to be scalable to cover potential larger forces. He noted that they are considering governance for new Local Policing Areas, with reforms planned across England and Wales, and that discussions with Welsh stakeholders are currently taking place to design the Welsh construct. They will need primary legislation to make changes, possibly in the second session, subject to Parliamentary time.

- 2.5. Stephen explained that a Police Governance Reform Project has been established to lead on refining the design and implementation of the new governance model. Partnerships and commissioning is a key workstream of this. Policing sector stakeholders and other government departments are represented across this work.
- 2.6. He outlined an indicative timeline, explaining that in July 2026, the Police Reform Bill will be introduced. Between July 2026 and March 2027, they expect this bill to pass through Parliament, receiving Royal Assent in Spring 2027. From Spring 2027 to Spring 2028, he explained that the plan will be to work with local areas to progress implementation, and in May 2028, they will aim to go live on these new arrangements.
- 2.7. Stephen handed back over to Louise, who spoke to the group about partnership and commissioning proposals. She explained that they intend to provide Mayors and PCBs with sufficient enabling powers and frameworks to support delivery of their “& crime” priorities and responsibilities to victims. She expects that transferring policing governance responsibility to local government leaders will enable further collaboration and co-commissioning across shared agendas.
- 2.8. Louise explained that they also expect Mayors and PCBs to have flexibility to allocate their local and centrally provided funds across their priorities and in response to local needs. She also expects Deputy Mayors for Policing and Crime and the Policing and Crime Lead to provide day-to-day leadership and chairing of relevant local partnerships.
- 2.9. They will need to operate a more efficient model of governance therefore we are exploring opportunities to do things differently whilst also strengthen commissioning approaches. She explained that they recognise the importance of having a skilled and experienced workforce to deliver commissioning and facilitate partnership working. The voluntary and community sector will remain an important partner within the future model (e.g. bringing in the views of lived experience, co-commissioning, delivery of services.) She noted that they are committed to ensuring continuity of partnerships and services through the transition period.
- 2.10. Louise moved to a discussion of interdependencies and considerations within this project, including the new Violence Against Women and Girls (VAWG) Strategy, health and ICB changes, probation reform, out of court resolutions, Sir Brian Leveson’s Independent Review of the Criminal Courts, Local Resilience Forums, the Independent Sentencing Review, and so on. They are aiming to determine how the police governance arrangements will operate in all of these different scenarios.
- 2.11. Louise then handed over to Anne, to begin the discussion portion of their session. Anne began by asking the group what the strengths and weaknesses are of the current PCC model.

- 2.12. Josh Stunnell responded to Anne's question, explaining that in most of the local criminal justice boards, there are voluntary sector representatives who work closely with PCCs who would be an excellent source of information to tap in to. He went on to explain that he sits on two local criminal justice boards, one in Devon and Cornwall, and one in Wales, noting that one of the biggest strengths he sees is this sense of partnership working and local arrangements and responsiveness. The negatives, however, include the bureaucracy and decision making around funding and commissioning.
- 2.13. Jess Mullen reflected that lots of the current PCCs have youth-voice structures plugged into their strategic plans and asked if there had been any thought given to this in the future model and how there may be youth-voice elements in the Boards. Jess also noted that when police and crime commissioners were introduced, there was a massive project run to engage the voluntary sector with them, which she led on in her role at Clinks at the time. She wondered how much of this engagement is happening now with the new reforms.
- 2.14. Lydia Plant noted that for them, as a smaller drug and alcohol provider, the PCC model has really enabled a lot of innovation and has been a real test bed for new projects. She explained that it will be interesting to think about how moving away from the PCC model might facilitate innovation and trialling new ideas. Building off of Lydia's point, Anne highlighted that there needs to be some form of consistency in approaches and in engagement with and accountability to the wider community. She asked how we can ensure that Deputy Mayors will be accountable in the same way and how it will be possible to include this accountability in the new model.
- 2.15. Tammi Owen noted that in Wales, there are 5 Police and Crime Commissioners. In certain aspects of funding, they have been able to form alliances if there is a particular issue present across Wales, they are able to come together and use different pots of funding, which has been a big strength, since funding opportunities in Wales have been, at times, hit-or-miss. She asked if the Mayors across Wales will be able to have a similar structure to that of PCCs.
- 2.16. Anne agreed with Tammi's observation, noting that the partnership working in Wales has been brilliant, working consistently to achieve shared goals.
- 2.17. Stephen Polly responded to the group's questions, noting that he agrees with Tammi on facilitating co-commissioning. He explained that the plan for Wales will be to create police and crime boards in each of the four police forces. They are looking at how they come up with a way to strengthen this to have a pan-Wales forum and ensure collaboration is possible. They are currently looking at how they can strengthen the model in its entirety and how they can

use supporting structures to come up with guidance and necessary support to make things work for any local policing body. He noted that there is an awareness that there are 43 incredibly different PCCs across England and Wales, and as such, they are looking to see how they can bring a bit more consistency into the new approach.

- 2.18. On the youth-voice, he explained that they are looking into having some independents on the board. They will not be determining who they are but will be appointed based on local need. They are also looking into whether boards can have an advisory group alongside them. Although this group may not have a formal role, it would be able to advise the board, and expects that youth-voice, among other voices, will be able to be a part of this
- 2.19. On transition and youth engagement, he noted that this was a very good point. From now until May 2028, he noted that are planning out who to engage with, at what time, recognising that there will be a lot more they will need to say and communicate and will need to consider how they can retain current PCC staff. Another one of their considerations about making people aware in the community what the new model will look like and how the transition to it will happen.
- 2.20. Louise added to what Stephen said, noting that they have been focused quite heavily on primary legislation needed for the arrangements. This session represents a start of an engagement piece with this group. They have previously done some engagement activities with the victims' sector as well and will focus on ramping up engagement with the voluntary sector moving forward. They will look at their transition project to make sure they build in certain points via which they will be able to communicate with the sector and update them on progress. As a part of the transition, there will be more local transition as well. Once they get to a point where they know what they will have in each area, they will be working with localities and groups of localities to plan transitions in May 2028, and there will be a big lead-in time to this.
- 2.21. Responding to Lydia's point on innovation in the model, Louise explained that as a part of the primary legislation, they are looking at which kind of powers they can introduce which will enable the boards and mayors to have real clarity about what they can do and support the innovation.
- 2.22. Katie Aston shared some of the most common topics that have come across her desk so far. These included: money/commissioning/grants, AI, technology and predictive policing in this area (they have been engaging largely with the organisation Liberty in this area), disproportionality, (including race, women and young people, and disability), and community scrutiny. She explained to the group if they would like to learn more, they can reach out to her.
- 2.23. Anne encouraged her to reach out to Sam Julius, since people may not know this will affect them until it does.

- 2.24. Anne then moved to ask the group what the Home Office should seek to strengthen through their reforms.
- 2.25. Matina Marougka explaining that it would be a good opportunity to strengthen relationships between ICBs and criminal justice agencies. Any opportunity to bring this to the forefront would be very helpful.
- 2.26. Anne then asked the group what their primary concerns are about the changes, and what key risks would the Home Office need to manage through the transition period.
- 2.27. Anne explained that for her, where we have seen very good innovation in the PCC space around diversion, alternatives to custody, funding and supporting community services/alternative spaces to custody. However, while these changes are happening, there could be a disinvestment. She noted that she would like to see what could happen to ensure there is no disinvestment and that there needs to be real accountability and scrutiny here. Anne also noted that the presumption against short custodial sentences had begun on March 30, which may have been poorly timed, since we run the risk of assuming that there is extra money for the things that PCCs have been funding, which we know there isn't. She queried how we could try to manage this, urging caution.
- 2.28. Jon Royle noted that he has previously experienced this transition in 2021 when they moved from the PCC to the Mayor, Allision Lowe, who had previously been a chief executive in the voluntary sector and had experience working with people involved in the criminal justice system. She was able to influence policing and crime in West Yorkshire. Her understanding of the voluntary sector was instrumental to creating opportunities for funding to help reduce reoffending.
- 2.29. Vicki Markiewicz noted that they are interested in understanding plans to maintain dedicated budgets in the new model. This has been an area of concern for voluntary sector drug and alcohol providers. Where PCCs take a lead on specific projects that meet the needs of their local community, she wondered how this will work under the new model. She also asked how it will be possible to ensure local areas are properly represented and recognised in a mayoral structure. She further queried how to maintain an element of consistency, while also ensuring a targeted and locally relevant approach.
- 2.30. Jess Mullen noted that from a youth justice point of view, there is slightly less risk around different pots of money and assumptions that there is money elsewhere, but they are seeing a range of other changes in strategic structures, such as young futures hubs and prevention partnerships. It will be essential to ensure there is join up across all of these changes. She also emphasised that it will be important to ensure that the needs of local youth will need to be considered.

- 2.31. Rebecca Friel noted that the risk that this model is based on personalities and preferences of the proposed Mayors. Although the current model is working quite well in Manchester, however, if there was a different pairing in personalities, there would be a huge impact on whether an organisation like hers, Odd Arts, is able to thrive.
- 2.32. Anne noted that it is important to consider what currently works and what will need to be addressed in the new model.
- 2.33. Stephen Polly responded to Jon's point on learning from experience, noting that they are looking to engage with areas who have gone through transfer before, especially around Yorkshire, to see what they can learn from their experiences, and to ensure that they can set up the boards to succeed.
- 2.34. Responding to Vicki's points, Stephen noted that these changes are not looking to remove commissioned budgets. Instead, they are looking to see how they can ensure the money going to PCCs can be used to ensure the optimal service delivery mechanism. He noted the new model would involve local government leaders and will be involved if PCCs are not adequately involved. He hopes that with a board, they will be able to eliminate some issues and ensure that they are able to scrutinise one another. On localised approaches, he noted that they will need to think about what they need to do to make local policing boards work. They will be taking this away and will consider how they can do this.
- 2.35. Louise added to Stephen's response, noting that they are working really closely with the chief executives of PCC offices, and not just PCCs, to ensure they are able to see some continuity over the transition period.
- 2.36. Stephen built upon this and noted that they are working to see how they can put in place monitoring officers which can oversee the system.
- 2.37. Richard Rowley asked if there is any scope for independent board members to include a person with lived experience in each region. Anne added to his question, explaining that looking at the makeup of these boards will be essential to ensure that they include people who have been most disadvantaged and over-policed.
- 2.38. In closing the session, Anne thanked the guests who attended and encouraged the group to send any further questions to Sam Julius, so that he can forward them onto Stephen and Louise.

3. Sentencing Act – Stephen O'Connor (Deputy Director for Probation Policy, MoJ)

- 3.1. Stephen commenced his session by introducing himself and his co-presenters: Martha Blom-Cooper, the Deputy Director of the Our Future Probation Service Programme and Ian Maris, the strategy deputy director at HMPPS. He explained

that his goal for the session was not to be a one-off session on the Sentencing Act, but to bring the group up to a common level of understanding of what is happening in terms of the recent announcements related to the Sentencing Act, progress on its implementation, and what is yet to come. He encouraged the group to send any further questions that may arise following his session on to Sam Julius.

- 3.2. Stephen explained that on Thursday 19 March, [there was a written ministerial statement on probation](#) setting out a package of reforms. He reflected on previous announcements on the allocation of an additional £700M for the probation service over the course of the current spending review. Off the back of this funding, there was a commitment made by the previous Lord Chancellor in March 2025 to invest significantly in expanding electronic monitoring. Stephen explained that there are four elements to this expansion.
- 3.3. The first of these elements is an implementation of a presumption towards electronic monitoring on release from prison. This will take effect when the Progression Model comes into effect, which allows certain people in prison to be released into the community at the one-third point of their sentence, as opposed to the forty percent mark. He stressed that this is only a presumption towards electronic monitoring upon release. It will not be used in cases where probation practitioners deem it unsuitable. For example, if a person being released from prison lacks stable accommodation it may render electronic monitoring impractical. In cases where it will be used, the duration for which electronic monitoring will be applied will be from the one-third point to point where they would have otherwise been release (e.g. the 40% or 67% point).
- 3.4. The second of these elements is an expansion of the Domestic Abuse Perpetrators on License (DAPOL) Scheme. He explained that in short, this Scheme means that where probation may have a domestic abuse concern on release from prison, they are able to deploy GPS-type DAPOL tagging for up to a year. At the time of the meeting, this Scheme was in 8 out of 12 regions, but Stephen explained that this will shortly expand to all probation regions.
- 3.5. The third of these elements is Acquisitive crime tagging for people who are released from prison having committed burglary and robbery offences. This will now expand to all police force areas and will be available across all probation areas.
- 3.6. The final one of these elements is an intention to pilot proximity monitoring. He explained that this would involve monitoring an individual's proximity to another person. Although some victims' groups have campaigned for this for some time, and is present in some European jurisdictions, the ideal would be for the electronic monitoring control centre to receive an alert when a person on probation would get within a certain proximity of a victim. He explained that despite their ambitions, they are starting off with a relatively blank page. As

such, they want to sit down with victims' groups especially to determine where this technology could help and in what way it could operate.

- 3.7. Anne asked Stephen to clarify what he means by 'victims' groups,' as they can significantly vary.
- 3.8. Stephen thanked Anne for her question, noting that he would be keen to learn from the group who they think should be involved in this process. Stephen explained that they will be taking some time to determine where this will be done and what shape this could take, which will allow plenty of time to gather input into this. For the sake of transparency, he explained that he will be beginning with representatives including the Victims' Commissioner, the Domestic Abuse Commissioner, and their organisations, also reaching into other representative bodies, including groups which are aligned with victims themselves.
- 3.9. In addition to electronic monitoring, the second part of the announcement on Thursday 19 March referenced by Stephen was on supervision in probation. He reiterated his earlier point on resource gaps, explaining that the recent NAO report, for example, illustrated that there is a resource gap equivalent to over three thousand full-time staff in the probation service. Although his colleague, Martha Blom-Cooper has been deploying a range of initiatives to close this gap, including process and digital optimisations, they are still not able to close this gap fully. As such, they are considering a slightly different approach to tiering and supervision moving forward. They plan to create a new tiering model, splitting supervision from the current A-D model to an A-G model rather than an A-D model which they currently use.
- 3.10. He explained that this model will help them dismantle large clusters of individuals who are currently under categories B and C, which is where most of their supervision exists, given that there is a large spectrum of need across these two categories.
- 3.11. Alice Adamson clarified that this tiering system has been created based on risk-need-responsivity principles.
- 3.12. Stephen explained that this new tiering approach will be instituted when the Progression Model comes in, later in 2026. It will help rebalance expectations placed on probation in terms of supervision contacts. Broadly, there will be higher levels of contact at higher tiers, and lower levels of contact on lower tiers.
- 3.13. Stephen then handed over to Martha to present an implementation update on the Sentencing Act and the Our Future Probation Service (OFPS) Programme.
- 3.14. Martha began by outlining a timeline of OFPS programme changes. She explained that even before the Sentencing Act, probation already had a significant gap between demand and capacity, and that the sentencing reforms

in the Act will further add to this demand. However, within this, there are opportunities to ease pressures on probation. The programme has been trying to maximize these opportunities by deploying a range of process optimisation changes, such as streamlining the preparation of pre-sentence reports and induction process, and deploying a range of digital tools, including Justice Transcribe, an AI tool which records and transcribes supervision sessions and reduces the administrative burden placed on probation staff. Further to what Stephen mentioned, Martha explained that there are also operational policy and operating model changes, including supervision packages, which they are currently preparing to implement. They are implementing across probation but are working very closely with the Prison Implementation Programme (PIP), particularly around the implementation of cross-cutting measures such as the Progression Model and changes to what used to be the offender management in custody model, which will become the custodial sentence management approach.

3.15. Martha explained that they have planned implementation in two phases. The first of these phases began in February 2026 and will run through to May 2026 to help ease immediate pressures on probation capacity, alongside select measures in the Sentencing Act, including the presumption to suspend short sentences and the ability for judges to extend suspended sentence orders and deferred sentences. She explained that there will be a number of measures implemented in early May, including removing the requirement for unpaid work to be completed within 12 months and the early termination of cases where the sentence plan has been completed. In the period from March to early May 2026, they will be rolling down the use of post sentence supervision. They will then have a pause in changes over the summer months, which will allow them to be better prepared for the changes coming in early September, including the Progression Model and the implementation of supervision packages. There will be further changes that follow up to March 2027, which will help further close the gap in probation capacity.

3.16. She wanted to note that they have put in a lot of thought into how they sequence the proposed changes, both in terms of how this is experienced by operational probation staff and frontline delivery partners, and in making sure that they can get ahead of the Sentencing Act reforms which will add to Probation's workload. She explained that it has also been important to think about these changes in terms of how they operate in combination with each other, which allow probation practitioners to focus more on the quality of work they are able to deliver. Martha explained that she is happy to share further details to the group.

3.17. Martha then passed over to Ian Maris to speak about changes to recall under the Sentencing Act, which will begin on the 31st of March 2026. The new

approach will bring a lot more consistency from how recall is currently done. He explained that most people who are recalled will now be recalled for 56 days, which will replace current 14- and 28-day fixed term recalls. Standard recalls will still be in place for individuals who have: been recalled because they have been charged with a further offence are subject to MAPPA levels 2 and 3, pose a terrorist risk, are a national security offender, are serving a sentence for offenders of particular concern or have been repatriated to the UK following a sentence for murder. He clarified this will not apply to children and youth.

- 3.18. He explained that this new model will have a wider eligibility compared to the current fixed-term recall model. People currently in prison will be released under this scheme over 6 tranches, over the course of 7 weeks from the 31st of March to the 12th of May.
- 3.19. Ian explained that the 56-day period will allow for more time for probation colleagues and partners to consider individuals' needs and risks prior to release.
- 3.20. Ian further touched on electronic monitoring, explaining that although there have been some challenges with the mitigation to a new provider, they have been working with the provider on an improvement plan, and recently, the performance has significantly improved. They have also had a pilot in place to tag people in prison prior to release. This appeared to be going well in terms of efficiency and effectiveness. An evaluation of the pilot will provide learning and determine the feasibility and plan for further expansion to a greater number of prisons.
- 3.21. Stephen confirmed that EM will be used between the one-third point and the 40% point of the sentence. He explained that although this will not be the case for everyone, there will be certain people who could be tagged for 12 months, such as people whose offences fall under the categories of burglary, robbery and people who present domestic abuse concerns under DAPOL.
- 3.22. Anne asked, further to a meeting she and Summer Alston-Smith had with HM Chief Inspector of Prisons Charlie Taylor, what people will actually be receiving under FTR56, what their status will be in prison and what their regime will be like. She explained that the sector is concerned about people not having access to services or support for 56 days, which will be unhelpful to reducing reoffending.
- 3.23. Alice Adamson responded to Anne and noted that they are working on solutions to create stability for a person and help prevent them from being recalled. Alice acknowledged that rehabilitation may not be achieved in 56 days, but that HMPPS is working through what the expectations will be, what the offer will be and what can feasibly be achieved in these 56 days.
- 3.24. Richard Knibbs noted a slight frustration that there is a big gap in releasing people on tags, in that there is a lack of wraparound service support. Richard

explained that there needs to be support for services, and maintain statutory services lack capacity to deal with complexity. Richard asked Stephen if people who do not have stable accommodation will not get tagged and will stay in custody, or, if they will be released early without a tag.

- 3.25. Richard Rowley asked, if the aim of FTR56 is to give probation staff and support services time to prepare for safe re-release, ensuring risk is managed and the person's needs are addressed, is this not something that can be done in the community without recalling a person. He asked if there is confidence in the prison system that they can manage this and prepare a person for re-release successfully.
- 3.26. Vicki Markiewicz cited that there are deep concerns in the sector, similar to what Richard Rowley mentioned, around comprehensive support in the community. Without getting to the source of a person's reoffending, or adequately investing in drug and alcohol services, people risk being released into the same situation, creating a cycle of reoffending. Vicki also asked, with community support for men, and women coming on board, how much of a crossover will there be between this provision and mainstream drug and alcohol support services. She wondered how we can work collaboratively between HMPPS and the voluntary sector to ensure this model works in the community.
- 3.27. Alice responded to Vicki's point, noting that they are looking at the community interventions piece as a totality, including both CRS and community support in the future. They are looking over what HMPPS, the CFO, the voluntary sector and other services provide. They have not previously done such a holistic step back to consider what the community should look like and how should they work together. Consequently, this is not being done to the same timeframe as the Sentencing Review outcomes. She explained that she would be very keen to have a discussion with the group as to how this is looking.
- 3.28. Bettina Crossick commented that they have put more funding into the infrastructure grant this year in terms of the regional side of working, looking closely at what is happening in local areas, thinking about where third sector organisations are working in partnership with probation. This is something they are keenly focusing on. She also noted that women's grants will be coming on board soon, which allow us to look at the women's sector more holistically. She noted that on CRS, she is aware of many of the concerns that have been raised by Vicki and others and are looking at where they can think about their partnership work. She explained that they know they cannot do this work without the support of the sector. She explained that there are a number of decisions they are making at the moment related to how the future will look like in 2 years, 5 years, and so on.
- 3.29. Anne reminded the group that the RR3 has very recently done a community provision SIG, which produced two report papers. She

recommended Bettina and her team to do a deep dive into the recommendations from this report and to reach out to the group for any clarity she may need.

- 3.30. Paula Harriott asked about the way in which the levels of monitoring support from probation will drop down through the new tiered model, and about clearly communicating this at the outset of a person's order and establishing a clear set of expectations. Although some people would welcome less support, some others would appreciate having some clarity as to what they can expect from probation, since they may require higher levels of support. She suggested that in cases like this, these individuals could be referred to third sector organisations, to prevent anyone from slipping through the gaps.
- 3.31. Tammi Owen noted that there is a huge appetite in Wales to look at restorative approaches around community engagement and support people coming out of custody and people on license. She explained that she has received a lot of feedback from community members on the dissemination of appropriate information. She explained that people were only seeing limited information about release, rather than any community information on it. She wondered if it would have been possible to do some community engagement around what prison releases look like and what communities could expect. She wondered what kind of impact they would've been able to have, and if more communities were able to be involved, whether restorative approaches would have been more attainable.
- 3.32. Alice suggested her team will get in contact with Tammi.
- 3.33. Stephen noted that the Deputy Prime Minister has been quite taken by some of the things the group has been discussing, including public understandings of the Sentencing Act's measures. This has been a theme he has come back to with Stephen, and they have been considering how they can make more visible some other things that are happening, such as in ISC courts. He would be very keen to talk to Tammi further about this.
- 3.34. Anne drew the meeting to a close, noting that the next RR3 Quarterly in June will be chaired by Clinks' new CEO, Summer Alston-Smith. She thanked the group for all of their efforts and contributions over the years.
- 3.35. Sam Julius thanked Anne on behalf of Clinks, expressing how brilliant she has been.
- 3.36. Tammi shared that their business sharing date has moved from March to Thursday, June 18 due to uncertainty around funding and the upcoming Senedd elections. She noted that if anyone that is doing work in Wales is interested in what they do, they are keen to collaborate and talk about how they can work more effectively. They have also been sharing some of their research around restorative approaches and the new evaluations they have had done

independently by Swansea University. She encouraged anyone interested in attending to reach out to her.

3.37. Paula Harriott echoed Sam's sentiment, honouring Anne for her long legacy at Clinks. She noted that Anne is the new Chair of Unlock and will help Paula roll out the next five-year strategy of Unlock.

3.38. Bettina noted that Minister Timpson will attend the next RR3 Quarterly meeting, and the focus will be on diversity. She noted that she will work with Sam to ensure that the right officials are present during this discussion. Jess Mullen echoed the importance of this and asked that youth justice is also included in this discussion.

3.39. Stephen also thanked Anne for her advocacy, transparency and passion. He noted that he deeply appreciates the legacy she has created.