RR3 Quarterly June 2026

Attendees:

- Lisa Chandler, *Clinks*,
- Summer Alston-Smith, *Clinks*,
- Sam Julius, *Clinks*,
- Alana Ajani, *HMPPS*,
- Ann-Marie Jordan, *MoJ*
- Bettina Crossick, *HMPPS*,
- Chris Gunderson, *HMPPS*,
- Christina Line, *Nelson Trust*,
- David Higham, *Warrior Down LERO*,
- Dion Lee, *Change Lanes*,
- Gayle Edwards, *Empathy Souls CiC*,
- Hannah Thompson, *HMPPS*,
- Ian Maris, *HMPPS*,
- Jake Ferguson, *Black Men 4 Change*,
- Jeremy Crook, *Action for Race Equality*,
- Jess Mullen, *Alliance for Youth Justice*,
- Joanne O'Connor, *Junction 42*,
- Josh Stunell, *bthechange CiC*,
- Jurga Kaucikiene, *HMPPS,*
- Katrina Ffrench, *UNJUST*,
- Khatuna Tsintsadze, *Zahid Mubarek Trust*,
- Lesley Waltham, *HMPPS*,
- Martin Blake, *HMPPS*,
- Matina Marougka, *Together for Mental Wellbeing*,
- Meka Beresford, *Action for Race Equality*,
- Ohene Nyanin, *HMPPS*,
- Paul Grainge, *Recoop*,
- Paula Harriott, *Unlock*,
- Pratik Doshi, *Breakthrough*,
- Rebecca Friel, *Odd Arts*,
- Richard Knibbs, St Giles Trust,
- Rosie McNamee, *HMPPS*,
- Sam Worrall, *Friends, Families and Travellers*,
- Shaun Mongan, *Traveller Movement,*
- Stephen O'Connor, *MoJ*,
- Tammi Owen, *CUBE*,
- Tracy Hughes, *HMPPS*,
- Vicki Markiewicz, *Change Grow Live*,
- Vicky Baird, *Spurgeons*,
- Yvonne MacNamara, *Traveller Movement*,

1. Welcome and introductions

1.1. Summer Alston-Smith opened the meeting and welcomed members and guests. She confirmed that Patsy Joyce (Mokkha CIC) and Dion Lee (Change Lanes) had been recruited to the small organisation seat and would rotate

attendance. Summer noted that Josh Stunell would be stepping down from the racially minoritised seat holder role, thanked him for his contribution, and confirmed that he would remain connected to Clinks as a trustee. She also confirmed that recruitment for accommodation and racial justice seat holders was being finalised.

2. Rehabilitation strategy

2.1. Summer introduced Tracy Hughes, Rehabilitation Strategy Lead in HMPPS, who presented on developing areas of work to support implementation of the rehabilitation strategy. She shared an update and invited feedback on how the voluntary sector could contribute.

2.2. Tracy explained that HMPPS was developing a more coherent internal strategic approach to rehabilitation, focused on hope, evidence and partnership. This approach would provide greater clarity around priorities and enable HMPPS to work more effectively across government departments and with the third sector. The strategy sought to broaden rehabilitation beyond attitudes, thinking and behaviour to include relationships, social integration, structural barriers and access to essential support.

2.3. Tracy said the strategic approach aimed to answer what HMPPS should be doing, why, and how. She emphasised that rehabilitation works best with a whole-system approach that treats people as individuals, values relationships and recognises the importance of organisational culture. She noted that HMPPS was also considering how services could align around a shared ambition, underpinned by hope, evidence and partnership.

2.4. Tracy explained that, over time, the concept of rehabilitation had become narrowly focused on attitudes, thinking and behaviour. While these are critical, this had come at the cost of thinking more broadly about people's experiences with HMPPS, what they need during their time in the system, and what matters when they return to society. HMPPS was now refocusing on these core messages and broader thinking around rehabilitation.

2.5. Tracy outlined the core principles guiding HMPPS's work. She explained that HMPPS was trying to balance being science and evidence led, using public money well and delivering value for investment, with being transparent and credible about priorities. She stressed the importance of remembering that HMPPS is a people-oriented agency and that the best change happens when people are treated as individuals first.

2.6. Tracy explained that a set of principles underpin how HMPPS intends to work, with special consideration for culture, environment and relationships. These form the foundations for good rehabilitation. Using these foundations, HMPPS

can then consider services in a simple, themed way: helping people as individuals (understanding how they think, perceive the world, and the factors shaping skills, attitudes, motivations and values); supporting social life and integration (social groups, belonging and identity); and addressing structural considerations (environment, housing, benefits, support, healthcare, internet access).

2.7. Tracy said HMPPS was also considering who is best placed to deliver services and how to ensure the system has clear focus and alignment around shared goals and priorities. As a strategy team, HMPPS was also considering how to manage system risks to rehabilitation. One of the biggest challenges is working together under tight investment constraints, collaborating and aligning around shared ambitions to be as purpose-driven and efficient as possible.

2.8. Tracy acknowledged feedback from the voluntary sector that it can be difficult to communicate with and deliver in prison and probation. HMPPS was considering how to improve this. She also noted that people's needs were becoming more complex, demand for services was increasing, and there was a challenge in balancing capacity and service quality. Tracy said it was easy to forget the importance of how HMPPS works, who staff are as individuals, how they treat people, and how significant those relationships can be, both within organisations and between partners.

2.9. Tracy explained that HMPPS had been thinking about what "good" looks like when working across organisations and with people. This included considering what this would mean for frontline and middle managers across HMPPS in the adult estate, how they work with people, and creating a section in their handbook on working with the third sector. She invited members to advise what good practice should look like for HMPPS staff working with the voluntary sector and whether a specific document for third sector organisations would be helpful to provide information the sector feels it is lacking from HMPPS.

2.10. Summer thanked Tracy and opened the floor to discussion.

2.11. David Higham welcomed the strategic direction but cautioned that significant culture change would be needed within prisons and probation if staff were to move from risk-averse practice towards more relational, community-based work. He asked what work was being done with staff to achieve this shift. David also raised concerns about evidence requirements for lived experience recovery organisations and emphasised the need for clear commissioning routes that work for smaller local organisations.

2.12. Tracy agreed that HMPPS needed to be clearer about what counts as useful evidence, including interim evidence, lived experience and service-level learning, rather than relying only on reconviction outcomes. She explained that this was not a one-service, one-outcome approach; it needed to be a whole-system approach. She said HMPPS was considering how to help smaller

organisations demonstrate the evidence behind their services without pressure to produce reconviction studies, including highlighting lived experience evidence. She reiterated that she was eager to hear the group's views on how HMPPS could work better with the voluntary sector.

2.13. Bettina Crossick explained that she and Tracy are part of a larger team managing the process around HMPPS staff and how they are supported. She agreed with David, noting that she had observed increasing risk-aversion over a number of years. She said she wanted this discussion at RR3 because the process could not be undertaken solely in-house when a third of the workforce is made up of third sector organisations. It was important to share what HMPPS had been doing with the sector and consider how to learn from the sector's work. Bettina reflected that commissioning had been a big-picture issue and noted that she and Summer had been speaking about this, with a number of meetings coming up through the third sector strategic partnership board they had been setting up. She highlighted that Rosie McNamee was working on what these meetings might look like and the work that could be done in partnership with Clinks. She reflected that she understood it had become much more difficult for small organisations and that their Chief Executive was very supportive of the sector letting him know of any blocks encountered.

2.14. Vicki Markiewicz welcomed the collaborative approach in HMPPS's strategic ambitions. She asked for clearer roles and responsibilities between probation and the voluntary sector, clearer expectations about consultation and decision-making, guidance on good practice and minimum standards, clarity on ways of working, sharing outcomes, and improved information sharing around service users' support needs. Vicki emphasised that information should be shared in ways that support holistic provision while respecting appropriate boundaries.

2.15. Rebecca Friel said HMPPS should make a clear cultural statement that prisons require meaningful engagement with the voluntary sector to function properly and achieve successful outcomes. She said it would be important to have small and medium-sized VCSE organisations leading some of this work to show the evidence base and impact of their services. She said voluntary organisations should not feel they are battling to access prisons and asked for clearer guidance on which decisions are governed nationally and which sit with individual prisons, highlighting that her organisation frequently receives conflicting information.

2.16. Paul Grainge suggested that market stewardship principles could help structure stronger relationships with smaller providers, including time for constructive quarterly reviews, shared risk, shared responsibility and strategic dialogue.

2.17. Matina Marougka highlighted that "good" looks like timely information sharing during service users' journeys, especially where changes in circumstances or recall risks arise, as this would allow the voluntary sector to establish stronger relationships with HMPPS. It would be useful for voluntary sector organisations to have insight into people's experiences receiving services from HMPPS and how the sector can shape a person's journey. She said it would also be useful to have clearer information about risk, referrals and continuing to work with the voluntary sector, ensuring support is holistic and all parties are informed and involved in a timely manner. In terms of a companion document for the voluntary sector, Matina said it would be useful to understand how decision-making takes place, especially around risk and safeguarding, where responsibilities lie, how decisions are made in practice and how data is used and collected. Summer added that it would be helpful for voluntary sector organisations to have more insight into how recall decisions are made.

2.18. Joanne O'Connor suggested strengthening links between prisons and the voluntary sector, including highlighting good practice and insights in a more strategic way. She also suggested introducing optional HMPPS staff training delivered by third sector organisations, including on neurodiversity or drugs and alcohol awareness, to supplement current training programmes. She noted that prison governors could be encouraged to ask voluntary sector organisations to provide short presentations at prison staff meetings offering a snapshot of good practice and what is happening in the community. She also suggested offering shadowing opportunities for HMPPS staff to see what the voluntary sector does, providing clearer commissioning timelines, and using recall and reconviction data as an additional outcome measure for smaller organisations. Finally, she asked whether the third sector would have access to HMPPS AI justice data tools to ensure security and increase efficiency.

2.19. Dion Lee emphasised the importance of relationships, belonging and a renewed social contract when considering rehabilitation.

2.20. Jess Mullen asked whether the rehabilitation strategy covered youth justice, which was confirmed that it does, and highlighted the need for continuity of voluntary sector support for children transitioning into the adult system, particularly support led by organisations with relevant community expertise.

3. **Race equity and the Sentencing Act**

3.1. Summer explained that this item would explore proposals for a cross-HMPPS Race Equity Board, a strategy developed through that Board, and mechanisms to oversee implementation of the Sentencing Act so that existing racial

disparities are not worsened. The discussion was intended as the starting point for engagement with MoJ and HMPPS officials.

3.2. Summer noted that the presentation would be led by Jeremy Crook (Action for Race Equality), Pratik Doshi (Breakthrough) and Yvonne MacNamara (Traveller Movement). The accompanying paper set out a broader long-term vision, but the immediate discussion would focus on establishing a Race Equity Board to monitor and scrutinise the impact of the Act on racial disparities.

3.3. Jeremy Crook began by highlighting that race equality and by-and-for organisations had been on a long journey with HMPPS and that, although much good work had taken place, systemic change had not yet been achieved. Despite the Lammy Review, the Young Review and the Race Action Programme, there remained further work to do.

3.4. Jeremy explained that Freedom of Information responses confirmed a strategic gap: HMPPS currently had no dedicated cross-HMPPS race equity strategy, no single accountable framework coordinating existing race equality initiatives, and no overarching implementation plan to reduce racial disparities.

3.5. Yvonne MacNamara noted that disparities are persistent, affect multiple communities and are visible across the system. Black and brown people, wider Muslim communities, and Romani Gypsy, Roma and ethnic Traveller communities experience significant disparities. Gypsy, Roma and Traveller communities are too often missing from the narrative despite experiencing some of the starkest inequalities. She emphasised that this was not new information and that patterns remained structurally embedded.

3.6. Pratik Doshi provided context around the risk that AI poses increasing inequality, raising concerns about tools such as OASys where machine learning may be trained on historic data that already reflects inequality. He noted that if data systems are not audited, if people with lived experience are not involved in design, and if procedural justice is not built in, AI will automate inequality rather than reduce it.

3.7. Jeremy set out two core asks: first, a system-wide cross-HMPPS race equity strategy covering adults and children, with measurable targets, a fully funded implementation plan, commissioning reform, transparent reporting and independent scrutiny. Second, a Race Equity Board supported by a public ministerial commitment for both adult and youth systems, co-produced with by-and-for organisations and lived experience leaders, empowered to scrutinise implementation and escalate risks to ministers.

3.8. Pratik said the proposed roadmap moved the conversation from concern to action. The first three months should include a public ministerial commitment and the creation of a co-produced Race Equity Board.

3.9. Pratik explained that between months three and six, the focus should be on consolidating existing HMPPS race equity activity, engaging communities and

establishing a baseline of disparities. From months six to eighteen, the strategy should be drafted and published, supported by quarterly reporting, expanded monitoring and clear accountability. The long-term aim is to embed race equity into commissioning, inspections, policy, workforce expectations and independent evaluation.

3.10. Yvonne emphasised that success would mean a publicly accountable cross-HMPPS race equity strategy; measurable reductions in racial disparities; increased investment in commissioning for by-and-for organisations; transparency, independent monitoring and meaningful scrutiny; and sentencing reform that reduces prison numbers and racial disproportionality. She highlighted that there was not an evidence gap, but an implementation gap.

3.11. Yvonne clarified that this ambition is achievable, pointing to the women's sector as an example of work that has driven real change. The missing elements are political will, leadership from the top, lived experience and key partners being brought in, and implementation of a strategy rather than continued discussion alone.

3.12. Summer thanked Jeremy, Yvonne and Pratik and explained that the key takeaway was the need for a central nucleus to generate momentum and change, aligned with objectives to reduce the disproportionately high number of racially minoritised people in prison which the sector would like to see HMPPS and MoJ, along with wider criminal justice system partners, agree to.

3.13. Stephen O'Connor introduced himself as Deputy Director for Probation Policy in MoJ. He explained that the timing of this conversation was useful because implementation of the Sentencing Act was at an early stage. He emphasised that the system was entering a new world, including the presumption against short sentences, the progression model, earlier releases and powers for probation to terminate orders early.

3.14. Stephen shared that an equalities impact assessment had been put out alongside the Sentencing Act, which acknowledges some of the issues raised. Some measures were already taking effect. A good starting point would be the early indicators of how the changes are taking effect and focusing on some priority areas that pose the biggest opportunities. Proposals for a public facing board would be for ministers to consider.

3.15. Ian Maris introduced himself and noted that he had a role in the operational implementation of the Sentencing Act. He reflected that the Sentencing Act represented the start of something significant after many years of discussion. The presumption against custodial sentences under 12 months was a fundamental change already in place, as was the progression model. Ian explained that equality impact assessments had been worked through alongside legislation and within programmes relating to electronic monitoring, probation, prison changes and community accommodation. Although the

legislation was new, the disparities being discussed were existing challenges and should not all be attributed solely to the Sentencing Act.

3.16. Summer responded, noting that the Sentencing Act provided an important opportunity to get things right. She explained that the group recognised that disparities start before prison and probation, but that the Act introduces subjectivity that could exacerbate disparities. Summer said the aim was to create a space for accountability. She noted that the Zahid Mubarek Trust would track disparities during implementation and that a single place for findings would improve connectivity between the voluntary sector, HMPPS and MoJ.

3.17. Rebecca Friel urged officials to make public and bold statements of intention on equality, diversity and inclusion. She explained that the climate was frightening for marginalised communities and that some organisations were seeing challenges to EDI language and priorities.

3.18. Jake Ferguson thanked Stephen, Ian and HMPPS colleagues. He explained that he had helped convene co-signatories and develop the briefing. He thanked those who co-signed and said the level of solidarity was important.

3.19. Jake stated that the group was on the same side as officials. He welcomed the opportunities in Stephen's response but said transformational change would require ministerial commitment, the right public narrative, and a clear focus on measurable outcomes.

3.20. Ann-Marie Jordan introduced herself and said that standard publications would begin to provide high-level data on implementation from the following month, including prison statistics covering April to June. She noted that the longer-term evaluation programme was not yet fully scoped and offered to attend a future meeting to discuss plans.

3.21. Jess Mullen picked up Stephen's point about joining up adult and youth justice work. She said the Sentencing Act and youth justice reforms create opportunities but also risks of new disparities. She called for a distinct youth justice subgroup that recognises children's rights, needs and intersecting race inequalities.

3.22. Summer said the join-up described by Jess was necessary. She acknowledged the volume of work facing officials and said it would be important to get the foundations right so work could proceed at pace once there was more clarity.

3.23. Responding to a question about consultation on the progression model, Ian said the model came into force following Royal Assent on 22 January, and that consultation related to implementation. Conversations had taken place with RR3, the third sector group in Wales and local groups.

3.24. Khatuna Tsintsadze asked whether there was consultation with third sector organisations on operational delivery and said it would be helpful to see relevant documents and share them more widely than RR3.

3.25. Ian said he had discussed implementation through these forums and was happy to take particular questions offline.

3.26. Summer said Clinks was doing significant work on the Sentencing Act during the year, looking at the Act from different lenses including resettlement and women, and taking an intersectional approach to how race fits into those conversations.

3.27. Jeremy explained that race equality organisations were deeply concerned about how some politicians were portraying the justice system. Commitments to race equality were under severe challenge, and MoJ and HMPPS needed to be on the front foot.

3.28. Summer thanked Stephen and his team and thanked the co-signatories. She said the group was passionate and expert and wanted to support officials.

3.29. Stephen said he would summarise the discussion and provide clear next steps. He reflected that there was a profoundly aligned objective around a system in which everyone experiences fairness.

3.30. Stephen proposed exploratory work over the summer to understand how the proposed Board would operate, including architecture and practical issues. This would help officials engage ministers. He said the group should also engage over the summer on issues about to be implemented under the Sentencing Act. Ministerial views on the proposed Board would likely need to be considered after September.

3.31. Summer said Clinks would take the next steps away with Sam Julius and speak to Jake about coordination. Stephen thanked everyone and committed to being clear about what is achieved.

4. **Prison implementation programme: fixed-term recall 56 days and progression model**

4.1. Summer introduced the item on the Prison Implementation Programme, explaining that the discussion would cover prison-based provision within the Sentencing Act, including the 56-day fixed-term recall (FTR56) and the progression model initially set to come into effect in September (later delayed to 1 October). She introduced Chris Gunderson (Programme Director of the Prison Implementation Programme for the Independent Sentencing Review), Ohene Nyanin (Business Change Lead) and Lesley Waltham (Business Change Lead for the progression model and Independent Sentencing Review).

4.2. Chris thanked members for their time and said the programme wanted to use the session to gather initial thoughts about how a 56-day recall period could be

used to best effect in custody. The ambition was to develop HMPPS's first clear articulation of how recall time should be used well in custody and to create standards or expectations that drive performance.

4.3. Chris explained that Ohene Nyanin was leading on the design of the future fixed-term recall model and that Lesley Waltham was working on both fixed-term recall design and the operational impact assessment. He said the sentence structure would change significantly from September, with a shorter default period in custody for most people serving standard determinate sentences, and that the programme needed to understand what this meant for services and provision at each phase of custody.

4.4. Chris explained that the progression model changes standard determinate sentences from a 40% custodial period and 60% in the community to a sentence of thirds: a custodial third, a middle third of intensive supervision in the community, and a final third in the community. Standard determinate plus sentences, which historically involved two-thirds in custody, would move to a 50% custodial period. Earlier release would be the default except where added days had been awarded and where exclusions apply.

4.5. Exclusions include prisoners serving sentences for:

- Rape
- Child sexual offences
- Offences relating to unlawful killing
- Indecent assault

Additionally, those found by the court to be the most dangerous – those on indeterminate sentences like life or Extended Determinate Sentences – are excluded. They will not be released any earlier than they are now and will remain subject to Parole Board review. The full list of exclusions is on GOV.UK.

4.6. The programme was responsible for delivering the prison elements of these changes (the first third of the progression model), including applying the new model to people already in custody and those entering custody from 2 September. This required reviewing around 40,000 to 45,000 standard determinate sentences over the summer. He explained that this did not mean there would be 45,000 releases and that releases would take place in ten monthly tranches from autumn through to June, with two tranches in October, followed by one tranche per month from November.

4.7. Routine operational use of Home Detention Curfew (HDC) would end in the adult estate from 2 September, although it would remain in statute and continue to be available in the youth estate. Electronic monitoring would expand significantly, with a presumption that people released earlier under the new sentence of thirds would be electronically monitored from the new release point (33%) to the previous release point (40%) unless exclusions apply.

4.8. Added days powers would be strengthened from 2 September, with independent adjudicators able to award up to 84 days rather than 42. This was now the main incentivisation element in custody after other ideas, such as behaviour credits, did not make their way through the legislative process. The final major element was the redesign of OMIC, the sentence management model covering sentence plans, targets, key work and related activity. OMIC will be replaced by the Custodial Sentence Management (CSM) model which is expected by July 2027. The focus of the programme in its first year is to deliver the release changes, creating critical spaces in prisons. Next year we will build upon this stabilisation and develop new operating models which articulate how the system supports the new sentence of thirds – key deliverables include a new Offender Flows model stating how prisoners will progress through the prison system, CSM the new sentence planning model, the future recall model and operational priorities for each different type of prison.

4.9. Releases were set to begin on 2 September (since changed to 1 October) and that prisons had received operational guidance requiring them to prioritise cases and determine release tranches. Prisons had until mid-September to complete calculations for the first three tranches and hand those cases to probation for pre-release activity. Calculations for later tranches are due by 2 October.

4.10. Victim contact was a critical part of each recalculation phase. Thousands of letters had been sent to victims registered on the Victim Contact Scheme to explain that sentencing review changes would affect sentences. He said this was difficult and potentially traumatising information for victim liaison officers to provide, but that the programme wanted victims to hear directly from HMPPS rather than second-hand. Tailored letters would follow once calculations confirmed whether a release point was affected and, if so, what the new release date would be.

4.11. Ohene introduced himself and said he was leading the prison-side workstream on fixed-term recall 56 days. He explained that the work had moved beyond initial release tranches and was now considering how the 56-day custodial recall period is used in practice. This work sits alongside wider recall work in probation and policy, including recall thresholds, practitioner decision-making and wider recall policy. His focus is on what “good” looks like in custody during those 56 days.

4.12. Ohene shared that learning was being gathered from a range of sources, with Humber as one of the main pilot/operational learning sites and engagement also taking place with prisons such as Birmingham and Exeter. He said the programme was engaging governors, prison group directors, operational colleagues and an evaluation prototyping team using a test-and-learn approach. He emphasised that the aim was to bring these different

perspectives together to identify what adds value, what is deliverable and what could form the basis of a future fixed-term recall 56 operational model.

4.13. Ohene explained that early learning suggested the first few days after recall are particularly important. He noted that early engagement, helping people understand why they have been recalled and starting release planning quickly can make a difference. Some people do not fully understand their licence conditions, the reasons for recall or what they need to do before release, which can lead to confusion and make positive engagement harder.

4.14. Ohene said release planning remained challenging, with issues such as accommodation and support sometimes unresolved until late in the recall period. He shared that frequent moves between prisons can disrupt support, engagement and relationships. Joined-up working between prisons and probation, with clear roles, good coordination and effective information sharing, appeared to support better outcomes. He explained that there is early indication that the 56-day recall period may create more time and opportunity for meaningful engagement and release preparation where local conditions allow.

4.15. Ohene opened up the floor for discussion, asking the group what approaches or support they have seen work well with short-term recall populations.

4.16. Rebecca shared learning from a legislative theatre event held in December, which was developed with 24 men with prison experience. The performance explored the biggest systemic barriers the men faced to successful reintegration into the community. She said two strong themes were the need for trauma-informed practice and understanding and lived experience practitioners on panels making decisions about recall. The criminalisation of mental ill health was a major issue, with people unable to access mental health support in the community, struggling to manage and then being recalled.

4.17. Vicky Baird said that, from on-the-ground prison experience, a strengths-based approach can be positive because not all recalls relate to the same level of behaviour or risk as the original sentence. She shared that where a person had previously been sentenced for a violent incident but had been recalled for being in an excluded area rather than for violence, practitioners could draw out the progress made and build on it. She said this helped people avoid losing hope and reduced the sense that going back and forth to prison was inevitable.

4.18. Vicki Markiewicz shared that, from a drug and alcohol perspective, people are often recalled for reasons that are different from the original offence and frequently relate to compliance. She said that if people have been making progress in the community, the 56-day period in custody should build on that work rather than start again from the beginning. She said community-based drug and alcohol support can be disrupted by recall and that prisons should use

the 56-day period to understand why a person struggled to comply, whether due to accommodation, relationships or other factors outside their control, and develop a clear plan to support release.

4.19. Paul Grainge explained that Recoop works specifically with older and long-sentenced cohorts. He shared that many older people returning to the community are not prepared for changes in technology or for practical resettlement needs such as health and social care pathways, photo identification, GP and dentist registration, and risks such as cuckooing. He said this cohort is among the least likely to reoffend and that bespoke resettlement support could create quick and effective improvements. Ohene encouraged Paul to get in touch with him to provide some further information.

4.20. Dion said his work supporting people under the Integrated Offender Management (IOM) scheme in the East of England involved a complex cohort often described as a revolving door group. He said the strategic lead for IOM in the East of England had promoted use of the Clik system to collate data between prisons, police and probation through a lifestyle and associates' lens. He said this had helped identify the real drivers behind recalls and enabled providers to align services to need, producing strong results. Dion offered to share the strategic lead's details.

4.21. Matina said her experience delivering mental health support within IOM reflected similar issues. She emphasised the importance of continuity of support, whether a person goes into prison or returns to the community. She said services should not be pulled away, particularly where mental health needs are present, because doing so can increase trauma. She said voluntary sector providers should be involved as early as possible in recall risk discussions because they may hold important contextual information and be able to support people to remain in the community.

4.22. Sam Worrall said Friends, Families and Travellers had recently held prison community engagement workshops with around 150 Romani Gypsy and Irish Traveller people. She said participants described a lack of cultural understanding among people working in probation and release roles, particularly around heritage, history and way of life. She said licence conditions and exclusion areas can prevent people from visiting graves or attending family and community events, which can cause significant stress and anxiety and set people up to fail. She also highlighted literacy barriers and the lack of specialist organisations working in criminal justice to support these communities.

4.23. Ohene acknowledged the importance of cultural understanding and said similar issues can arise where staff do not fully understand a person's neurodiversity or support needs, leading to a risk of people getting lost in the system.

4.24. Vicki suggested providing plain-language information when people are released, explaining how recall works and what could lead to recall. She said people can be tripped up by conditions they did not fully understand or retain, particularly where information is delivered verbally, where people are neurodiverse or where there is information overload. She said written information in plain English could help reduce recall risk. Vicky explained that people can be set up to fail when release conditions are not explained early or clearly enough.

4.25. Hannah Thompson shared that she worked in probation operations on the probation and community element of the project. She said probation colleagues were exploring how to make licences easier to read, help people understand them better and adapt licences for people with neurodiversity or other needs.

4.26. Dion highlighted transitions for young people moving into adult custody and from youth community orders to adult community orders. He said expectations can change suddenly overnight when someone turns 18 and that young people aged 18 to 21 may struggle to process breaches, consequences and the adult system's more rigid expectations if they have previously been managed through a child-centred system.

4.27. Summer reflected several points from Clinks members. She noted that sustainable funding for community-based voluntary sector providers, particularly through-the-gate organisations, is essential. Statutory and local authority provision can be more limited than probation staff assume, giving the example of domestic abuse provision where thresholds may be high and support not universally available. She shared that release into the community can therefore lack the "community cushion" assumed by statutory partners.

4.28. Summer also described an example of a niche pilot in which a voluntary sector organisation, supported by a trust and foundation, was developing a supported accommodation offer as an alternative to recall for women who were close to breaching licence conditions. She said this could allow probation and a local provider to manage risk more confidently in the community where recall would otherwise be likely. Hannah asked Summer to share more information with her on this example.

4.29. Ohene asked the group what they think is important to be mindful of as prison functions and the flows of people through the criminal justice system continues to evolve.

4.30. Vicki explained that proximity to home was important, particularly where people are receiving therapeutic or community-based support. She asked whether people on recall would return to prisons close to home so support could continue.

4.31. Ohene shared that his understanding was that people would generally remain in reception prisons during the recall period to help keep them closer to

home, although capacity pressures might mean some people move to Category C prisons. Chris said Ohene's understanding was right and that there was a delicate balance: reception prisons are closer to home but often have weaker regimes, while Category C prisons may offer better regime opportunities but can affect proximity. He said the programme needed to develop national standards that can operate in a capacity-pressured system while still meaning something in practice. The national model will create principles including a principle on prisoners being sent to the prison that best meets their needs on recall, but this will always be a balance and we need to maintain sufficient flex in the system to ensure we can still accommodate those sent to Reception prisons.

4.32. Rebecca said housing must be considered at every point because many people are released into homelessness or rough sleeping, which can lead to inevitable recall. She gave an example of supported accommodation evicting residents before new no-fault eviction laws came into effect and said the housing context should be considered alongside prison capacity and recall.

4.33. Lesley shared that the estate configuration team within the programme was considering who should be located in which prisons and when, taking account of reception, training and resettlement functions and the resources available in different sites. She asked the group to reflect on shortfalls for particular cohorts, including young adults, older people and sex offenders, both before release and in relation to recall.

4.34. Christina Line highlighted the specific challenges for women, especially Welsh women, as there are no women's prisons in Wales. She said women have to travel to prisons in England, while justice and health arrangements differ in Wales, which creates additional challenges for reintegration, prison pickups and gate pickups. She also said many through-the-gate contracts that existed several years ago had been moved into Commissioned Rehabilitative Services with limited resource and asked that actual money flow to services be considered.

4.35. Martin Blake introduced himself and said that future contracts being recommissioned would include more investment in meet-at-the-gate provision. He said this would not be a silver bullet because the issue is costly, but that learning had been taken on board, particularly for women and the most vulnerable.

4.36. Paul revisited the needs of older people and long-sentenced people. He said that before the significant changes being discussed, thousands of people convicted of sexual offences did not receive resettlement preparation because they did not reach resettlement prisons. Many will be released to new towns and cities because of their index offences, and that bespoke resettlement and orientation support could reduce fear and anxiety. He noted that nearly one in three people in prison are now over 40.

4.37. Chris thanked members for their contributions and explained that the aim was to produce a suite of expectations and principles by December setting out how recall should be used, so that prisons can be asked in January to articulate in their annual business and regime plans what provision they have for the recall cohort. Although this would not immediately create excellent regimes everywhere, it would embed a focus on recalled prisoners and the use of the 56-day period into annual planning.

4.38. Dion made a practical suggestion that prisons ring-fence interview rooms or workspaces for third sector organisations, Commissioned Rehabilitative Services and other external organisations working with people on recall. He shared that providers could find it difficult to access appropriate space to meet people and dedicated space would make a significant difference.

4.39. Summer noted that prisons that have departure lounges just outside the gate have seen success and that creativity would be needed in the coming months to work around the issues and limitations identified.

4.40. Tammi Owen highlighted that in Wales, and elsewhere, third sector organisations already have community spaces, such as hubs close to prisons, that could be used to support people leaving custody. She said that additional funding for community spaces could support voluntary organisations with running costs while bringing more third sector organisations together and making better use of existing resources.

4.41. Summer thanked Chris, Ohene, Lesley and Hannah and said Clinks would coordinate any follow-up. Chris said the programme's contact details had been shared in the chat and invited members to get in touch.

5. **Member and HMPPS updates**

5.1. Summer opened the final item and invited member and HMPPS updates from the group.

5.2. Vicky said the families network was discussing children and parents affected by imprisonment, including how to recognise children who have a parent in prison. She said pilot work was planned to explore how best to do this, but that the families network had many questions because information shared so far contained gaps. She said the network was providing a platform for organisations to share concerns and ask questions.

5.3. Paul said work on the older people in prison national strategy was progressing, with publication still hoped for in the autumn. He said fieldwork was ongoing and that a health and social care expert panel meeting was due the following month. He said the scope would include people going on licence into approved premises, but not wider probation work because of scale and complexity.

5.4. Rebecca asked whether national information could be provided on prison education budgets and whether, unintentionally or otherwise, arts provision was

being reduced compared with other areas. She said Odd Arts was hearing that education budgets are subject to local prison decisions but that it would be helpful to understand national patterns.

5.5. Summer shared that Clinks could take the question about prison education budgets back to officials to see whether any information could be provided, including wider context and benchmarking.

5.6. Jess mentioned that, following the Youth Justice White Paper, there were many reviews and plans underway, which felt like a “Russian doll” of reviews. Work was ongoing with officials in the Youth Justice Policy Unit and Youth Custody Service to understand timelines for those reviews, planned legislation and engagement with organisations. She shared that a table was being developed and would be shared when populated.

5.7. Joanne O'Connor suggested asking MoJ for analysis of Dynamic Purchasing System opportunities by category and value, including number and income. She said previous analysis of DPS opportunities and budgets had helped the sector understand trends. She said many budgets are undisclosed, but sector experience suggests some opportunities are being issued at much lower financial value while expecting similar delivery.

5.8. Jess added that any DPS analysis should distinguish between the adult and youth estates. She explained that she had been told previously that DPS did not cover the youth estate but knew of organisations contracted through DPS to deliver in the youth estate. Joanne noted that Weatherby had recently issued a significant tender for youth work.

5.9. Summer reflected that commissioning is often opaque and that clearer guidance would help organisations understand the landscape, prioritise limited fundraising capacity and avoid investing time in opportunities where they cannot meet financial thresholds. She said more clarity would help the sector make informed decisions.

5.10. Vicki asked for an update on the new intensive supervision courts, including timelines for the six additional courts that had been announced. She suggested this could be scheduled for the September meeting or shared as a briefing so organisations can prepare ahead of implementation.

5.11. Christina said timelines appeared to differ by area, with some areas working towards October and others still waiting for communication and partnership work. She noted that more information would hopefully be available in the coming weeks. Sam Julius said Clinks had been in a recent meeting with officials where details but not timelines were discussed and that Clinks would follow up to seek dates.

5.12. Summer said it would be useful for RR3 to stay up to date with intensive supervision courts, particularly because the focus is primarily on women and

specialist provision, and because the sector could support momentum where there are successes to build on.

5.13. Summer closed the session, noting that the next RR3 Quarterly meeting would take place online on Tuesday 29 September.