

Frequently Asked Questions – Parole Board Rules

Q: What happens if I submit a report with a recommendation in?

Any report that includes a view or recommendation submitted on or after 14 July will be rejected by the Parole Board and must be rewritten. PPCS will request that the report writer amend the report and resubmits it to PPCS.

Q: Are HMPPS staff allowed to provide a view or recommendation outside of the parole report and oral hearing – for example, are we allowed to express a view in a MAPPA meeting?

You should continue to provide your assessment of risk and how that risk may or may not be safely managed as part of your usual practice. This includes in the course of discussing cases with colleagues as part of HMPPS and multi-agency risk assessment and management processes.

Q: What if the Parole Board or the prisoner's representative request copies of the record of any meeting where HMPPS Staff have expressed a view, for example MAPPA minutes or nDelius records?

For disclosure of MAPPA minutes staff should follow the MAPPA Guidance (chapter 13b).

For directions relating to other documents staff should follow the usual procedure for responding to Parole Board Directions.

It is important that staff do not change their practice other than as requested in this guidance. This means that staff should not change what they write in OASys or what they discuss in a MAPPA meeting because of concerns about what may be included in a parole dossier. This means that it is possible that the Parole Board will sometimes receive a dossier that includes these discussions and may evidence the views of HMPPS staff.

Q. What if the panel ask for 'MAPPA's view' on suitability for release?

There is not one single 'view' from MAPPA – MAPPA is a set of arrangements, rather than an entity or body that provides a single view. There is no 'MAPPA view'. There may be views or recommendations expressed by the professionals and agencies attending MAPPA meetings, but there is not one 'MAPPA' view as such. The outcome of the meeting is the risk management plan, with the purpose of MAPPA being to develop and agree this risk management plan.

Q. Can a Mappa Coordinator / Chair employed by the Police write to the Parole Board with their view or recommendation, as they are not HMPPS staff and therefore not bound by this policy?

The police are not a party to Parole Hearings and therefore are unable to submit views on release or join the proceedings, unless directed to by the Parole Board.

If a MAPPA chair felt strongly that the individual should not be released, then it is likely that would also be the view of the COM and others at the MAPPA meeting. In this situation the COM would draft their report clearly articulating the risks and issues that would enable the Parole Board to infer whether the individual may be effectively managed on licence in the

community. The focus should be on supporting the report writers to deliver good quality reports that bring the Parole Board on a journey to an effective decision.

Q: What does this mean for executive release?

The Probation Service should continue to complete Part B and C reports and submit these to PPCS. PPCS will continue to consider cases for executive release, where it is flagged in the covering email that the Part B or C report is submitted on, that release could be supported by the proposed risk management plan. Where PPCS consider that a case could be suitable for executive release, they will contact the offender manager to discuss this further.

Where executive release is not considered suitable, the case will be submitted to the Parole Board under the normal referral process.

Q: What should I tell the prisoner?

You can and should talk about release and have a full and frank conversation as you normally would. Reassure prisoners that you will continue to provide a full assessment of their risks and how they may be managed on release so that the Parole Board may decide whether they are safe to be released. You should discuss your assessment with the prisoner so that they know whether or not your assessment is optimistic.

Q: Where can I find the new reports?

The new Part B and C templates will be on NDelius where you would usually find them. The On/Post tariff PAROM1 templates and addendums will no longer be on the digital platform but will be available in a Microsoft word IWP template linked to NDelius. All the new templates are on nDelius here: [Parole \(justice.gov.uk\)](https://www.parole.gov.uk)

Q: How will I know if my case is a 'noteworthy' case where a single Secretary of State view is being provided?

PPCS will inform those staff involved and will provide additional support to these staff in what we anticipate will be a very small number of cases.

Q: Should practitioners be providing information to PPCS prior to writing a parole report or Part B / C to inform decision-making about cases being 'top tier' or 'Single Secretary of State view' cases?

PPCS work with the Secretary of State to initially identify cases considered to be noteworthy. If circumstances arise where practitioners think a case should be considered for a 'single view', they should contact PPCS immediately. We anticipate that there will be very few cases in this category.

Q: I have started my report in the template in NDelius that has a recommendation section. Do I need to move everything on to a new template?

Report writers should use the new templates for all parole reports, Part B and Part C reports. If you previously began these reports on an old template, you need to move the content over to the new report template in order to submit it.

Q: If an addendum parole report is due after 14 July, can it refer to what the

recommendation was in the original report that was submitted prior to 14 July?

No. You cannot make any reference in an addendum report to a view or recommendation about suitability for release or open conditions that you made in the PAROM1.

Q: Is the Parole Quality Assurance Framework changing?

The framework has recently been updated to reflect the new Parole Board rules and will be kept under review.

The process whereby practitioners no longer require the tool applied to their reports following 3 successive 'Good' ratings is not changing. With all parole reports, the SPO is expected to have a Touch Points Model conversation with the Probation Practitioner. This should now always include a check by the SPO for any language in the report which could be considered a 'view or recommendation about suitability for release'.

Frequently Asked Questions – Open Test

Q: Should report writers be considering the 3rd part of the test?

Decisions about whether the third element of the test applies in individual cases are a matter solely for the Secretary of State or his delegated official. However, HMPPS must continue to provide **information and evidence**, where available, to enable that decision to be made.

Q: Could witnesses be asked to provide a yes or no response as to whether the prisoner is low risk of abscond?

Yes. In this instance, witnesses are providing their professional assessment on risk and how it is managed.

Q: What about reports that have already been written without reference to the new open test?

There is no requirement for HMPPS to provide a further report where one has already been submitted, unless it is directed by the Parole Board or requested by PPCS.

Q: How do I apply the new open test?

We no longer *apply* the test and instead provide evidence and information to allow the Parole Board / Secretary of State to assess whether the test has been met.

Q: What criteria do the Parole Board apply when considering whether a prisoner is suitable for open conditions?

The Secretary of State's Directions to the Parole Board have been updated in line with the Parole Board rules. A copy of these is available via this link: [Secretary of State's Directions to the Parole Board - Transfer of ISPs to open conditions.](#)

Q: Do I need to automatically move an ISP currently in open conditions back to closed based on the new test?

No. The new test should not be used as a reason for a prisoner's removal to closed

conditions where an adverse development has NOT occurred. If an open prison considers that prisoners no longer meet the new criteria, this cannot be used as a reason to remove them to closed conditions.

Q: Should I apply the new test for a move to open conditions when completing a LISP4 for an adverse development?

Yes, but you should not offer a view or recommendation on continued suitability for open conditions. When completing the LISP 4, practitioners should only provide relevant information and evidence to enable PPCS to reach a decision on continued suitability for open conditions.

REMEMBER: When considering whether to raise an adverse development and move a prisoner back to the closed estate, prisons should consider whether the behaviour displayed by the prisoner can be managed within open conditions i.e., does not present an escalation of risk, and should be dealt with in line with local prison processes. In these cases, a LISP 4 does not need to be submitted to PPCS.

Please send any further questions to ppcs.policy@justice.gov.uk and we will endeavor to respond as quickly as possible as well as updating the guidance regularly.

Resources

Staff may wish to view the below when considering the impact of these changes. Please note, amendments are still being made to policy documents to reflect these changes.

- [Guidance: Enabling effective progressive transfers for indeterminate sentenced prisoners](#)
- [A Guide for the families and significant others of those serving indeterminate sentences](#)
- [Generic Parole Process Policy Framework](#) amendments are being made urgently to this document to account for the recent changes but may not go live at the time we publish this guidance – we will update accordingly
- [Managing parole eligible offenders on licence policy framework](#)
- [Root and Branch Review of the Parole System](#)
- [Indeterminate Sentence Operational Support HMPPS Intranet page](#)
- [Parole - HMPPS Intranet](#)
- [Recall, review and re-release of recalled prisoners](#)
- [Alternatives to ROTL - Guidance](#)