

HO – SO/VO MB (2016)

Home Office: Sexual Offender and Violent Offender Management Board

Home Office, 2 Marsham St, London  
Tuesday 13 September – 13:15-14:45

Attendees:

Will Jones (Chair) – Home Office, PPU  
Jaimie Cooper – Home Office, PPU  
Michelle Skeer - National Policing lead, DCC Cumbria Police  
Helen Harkins - (Staff officer to DCC Skeer, Cumbria Police service  
Geoff Tachauer - Metropolitan Police Service  
Mark Bishop - Metropolitan Police Service  
Nick Troon - Metropolitan Police Service  
Nigel Griffiths - Hampshire Police Service  
Steve Cook - Hampshire Police Service  
Andy Fox - Avon and Somerset Police  
Noorie Toora - Youth Justice Board  
Heather Sutton - National Offender Management Service  
Douglas Naden - National Offender Management Service  
Lee Featherstone - North Yorkshire Police Service  
Jasmin Norton - HMCTS)  
Sharon Stratton – College of Policing (by phone)

Apologies:

Alan Morgan - Metropolitan Police Service  
Janet McIntyre - CEOP  
Tony Hirst - HMCTS  
Tamsin Stubbing – Home Office Legal Adviser

**Actions:**

| Action  | Owner       | Date | Update |
|---|-------------|------|--------|
| <b>Sensitive/Irrelevant</b>   |             |      |        |
| To seek input from Legal Advisers on the consideration of formal management of SROs and consider what powers we have to make changes. | Home Office | ASAP |        |
| To seek Legal advisers to consider whether the police can adopt the NI model on notification orders under current legislation         | Home Office | ASAP |        |
| <b>Sensitive/Irrelevant</b>   |             |      |        |

# Sensitive/Irrelevant

## Management of those individuals on SROs

5.

### **Gist:**

'The different operational approaches to managing the SRO, and Parliament's vision for how this should work, were outlined.

6.

It was suggested that greater clarity on managing SROs might be useful, with consideration for how they should be managed in relation to convicted sex offenders.

7.

The resource implications of different approaches to managing the orders were discussed.

**The importance of police acting within the limits of their legislative powers was also highlighted.**

**An action was created for the Home Office to consult lawyers over the scope of legislation and different approaches to managing the order.'**

#### **Supporting the Police to use the Notification Order**

8. At present the police serve a summons and provide 3 days for an individual to respond. Difficulties were being experienced specifically with foreign travellers who were being found and issued a summons and then absconding, presumably to their country of origin.
9. This was presenting the police with the difficulty of having to try to locate the offender for a second time. As a result the police are keen to adopt the Northern Ireland model where the police can apply for notification in the subject's absence which negates the impact of trying to find an individual for second time.

**Action: HO:** To take forward with Legal advisers to consider whether this is something we can do under current legislation or if a new piece of legislation is required.

#### **Court/Judge issues**

Unfortunately the judicial college were unable to attend this meeting but the group discussed touched on issues relating to the variation of orders for transient offenders and a perceived reluctance by judges in changing orders made by other judges.

10. The issue of judges issuing notification requirements in cases where it was not required and vice versa continues to be issue of concern. The CPS, it was felt, were not picking up on these errors. The judicial college had recently issued new guidance on the process and requirements for issuing notification orders to address this problem but it was still a recurring theme.

**Action: HO:** Invite the Judicial College to the MOSOVO working group meeting on 29 November.

**Sensitive/Irrelevant**

**Sensitive/Irrelevant**

Date of next meeting: Tbc