

*BRITISH BROADCASTING CORPORATION*

*RADIO 4*

*TRANSCRIPT OF "FILE ON 4" – MAPPA*

*CURRENT AFFAIRS GROUP*

*TRANSMISSION: Tuesday 7th February 2006 2000 - 2040*

*REPEAT: Sunday 12<sup>th</sup> February 2006 1700 - 1740*

*REPORTER: Gerry Northam*

*PRODUCER: Liz Carney*

*EDITOR: David Ross*

*PROGRAMME NUMBER: PMR606/06VY3036*

THE ATTACHED TRANSCRIPT WAS TYPED FROM A RECORDING AND NOT COPIED FROM AN ORIGINAL SCRIPT. BECAUSE OF THE RISK OF MISHEARING AND THE DIFFICULTY IN SOME CASES OF IDENTIFYING INDIVIDUAL SPEAKERS, THE BBC CANNOT VOUCH FOR ITS COMPLETE ACCURACY.

“FILE ON 4”

Transmission: Tuesday 7<sup>th</sup> February 2006

Repeat: Sunday 12<sup>th</sup> February 2006

Producer: Liz Carney

Reporter: Gerry Northam

Editor: David Ross

---

NORTHAM: Two official inquiries are expected to report this month on events leading up to two gruesome murders. One, the repeated brutal stabbing of the City investment specialist John Monckton, has received extensive national attention. The other has had little notice – the repeated brutal stabbing of a single mother, Naomi Bryant, in Winchester. The crimes had similarities, and so did the criminals. Both had been released early from previous prison sentences and were supposed to be under supervision in the community as a matter of public protection. Five years ago, the government introduced new systems for assessing and managing the risks posed by offenders let out into society. They are recognised as a marked improvement on past schemes. But this week’s File on 4 reports on serious weaknesses that still bedevil supervision plans and can leave the public needlessly vulnerable.

SIGNATURE TUNE

ACTUALITY ON FARM

BOFFEY: We’re at my father’s farm where he was killed. Just looking down to the bottom of the yard and the pig buildings, the building here is the office, and they were stood in the office when the Squires brothers came into the yard.

NORTHAM: On a remote lane at the border between Leicestershire and Warwickshire, William Boffey recounts the events at his father Michael's farm last August, when two young men, Ashley and Frederick Squires, arrived on the lookout for vehicles.

BOFFEY: The Land Rover was parked just to the side of the office, but unfortunately the window's blocked where the Land Rover was, so Ashley Squires was able to get into the Land Rover without anybody seeing them, so it was only when they heard the Land Rover start up that they realised that somebody was trying to steal the Land Rover.

NORTHAM: Michael Boffey's farm was at least the sixth the two brothers had visited that morning. Michael's assistant was working with him that day, and she was the first to try to stop them taking the Land Rover. The prosecuting QC, Steven Linehan, used her account of the incident in court to demonstrate the ruthlessness of the driver, Ashley Squires.

LINEHAN: Mr Boffey and his employee, Christine, realising that someone was going to take the Land Rover, ran out of the shed. Christine came out first. She saw the Land Rover being reversed. She ran into its path and stood with her arms outspread, trying to stop it being stolen. Ashley Squires, who was driving it, drove it directly at her. As she described it in her witness statement, she said this: 'He did not steer away from me at all. I feel that if I hadn't moved, when he got within five feet of me, I would be dead. There was space either side of me that he could have steered into. As he got within five feet of me, I sidestepped to the right and ran out of the way.' And there appears to be no doubt that had she not done so, she would have suffered death or very serious injury herself.

NORTHAM: Michael Boffey wasn't so fortunate. When he too tried to stop the Land Rover, it was to cost his life.

BOFFEY: Ashley Squires was in the Land Rover and just reversed it out and was just driving up the yard. Whatever happened I don't know, but my dad was knocked down.

NORTHAM: He was severely injured.

BOFFEY: The Land Rover had knocked him down and had run over his head, just the side of his head, so he had got a broken skull and it had obviously caused some brain damage, and that's what had actually killed him. It would have hit him so hard that it would have been as good as instant.

NORTHAM: And what did the driver do?

BOFFEY: The driver just carried on, just drove off and they dumped the Land Rover in a local village, Wolvey. I mean, it's a just huge impact really. It's just a massive blow, it's just been really really difficult for us. We've just been devastated.

NORTHAM: Ashley Squires pleaded guilty to manslaughter. One of the things that most angers the Boffey family about his case is that he'd been released early from a previous sentence – as required by law. If he'd served the full time, he'd still be in jail now and couldn't have killed Michael Boffey with the Land Rover last year. For his son William, this brings the principle of early release into question.

BOFFEY: You know, you have to be realistic about things, you've got to release people at some point. But I think that you have to give them a sentence which fits the crime and it's no good simply allowing people out early purely and simply because you want to keep overcrowding down.

NORTHAM: Ashley Squires was sentenced to twelve years for this manslaughter. How long will he spend in prison?

BOFFEY: Potentially he could be released in six years. That's the minimum sentence he has to serve.

NORTHAM: And what do you think of that?

BOFFEY: Six years, you know, I think is too short. When the judge read out that the sentence was twelve years, we sort of thought, well that's not too bad. We felt that that was a reasonable sentence, especially considering his past history. But later, when we found out that potentially it could be six years, we were just distraught really that somebody who had done this could get out in such a short time.

NORTHAM: The defence of early release is that it allows the criminal justice system to maintain supervision and control of an offender once they are back in society rather than just close the gate after them at the end of their sentence. Crucial to this is the judgment of the level of risk they will pose to the public after release. Ashley Squires was thought to be low-risk, and so was supervised by just one agency, the Probation Service. The Home Office say that, overall, this was well done in his case. But the fact that the unforeseen actually happened illustrates a remarkable discovery. Analysis of the statistics of prisoners released early who go on to commit further serious crimes shows that offenders in the highest risk category account for only about 20% of these further crimes. The other 80% are committed by people who came out as medium or low on the risk assessment. People like Ashley Squires. The Chief Inspector of Probation, Andrew Bridges, is concerned that those responsible for supervising ex-prisoners may have missed this vital finding.

BRIDGES: I think that over the years there has been a tendency not to give enough attention to the medium and low risk. There is a tendency to think that if it's not a high risk case, I don't have to do any control work. You don't do anything like the amount of control with a low risk case as you do with a high risk case, but you do have to do something.

NORTHAM: And at the moment that's not happening enough?

BRIDGES: It doesn't happen often enough. And when it doesn't happen often enough that leaves the service exposed.

NORTHAM: To the Chief Inspector's evident concern, financial pressure has seen the Probation Service actually reduce the attention it requires officers to give to low-risk cases in its national standard. In a report published just before Christmas,

NORTHAM cont: Mr Bridges says that the scrutiny of some offenders has been cut to 'an unwise level'. In official parlance, this is the conclusion that the public may be at increased risk.

BRIDGES: Because resources were getting stretched within the Probation Service, a decision was made that perhaps in certain lower priority cases that not necessarily a full offender assessment needed to be done. And also in some cases they didn't need to be undertaken so regularly. What we wanted to highlight to ministers was that there was a risk to the service by making that decision, it is possible for someone under the supervision of the Probation Service to commit a serious further offence and the assessment might not be there because, under current national standard it wasn't required. And we thought that wasn't a position that the ministers or public would want the Probation Service to be in.

NORTHAM: And in your view, that meant that the scrutiny of some offenders has been reduced to an unwise level?

BRIDGES: I do think that the regular assessment of some offenders in the community has been reduced to an unwise level and we know that the heart of the decision making was about resource allocation.

NORTHAM: At the Home Office, the Minister responsible for Probation is Fiona MacTaggart. Does she accept the implication from the Chief Inspector that, because of budget constraints, the Probation Service is now unable to carry out full assessments of some offenders and protect the public as well as it should?

MACTAGGART: I don't think he's saying that the number of assessments has gone down - that's not my impression generally from the system.

NORTHAM: But he's saying it's a strain on resources, which means that scrutiny has been reduced to an unwise level.

MACTAGGART: Well we've substantially increased the resources available to probation.

NORTHAM: But the new national standard that came in last year said that in certain cases offenders no longer need to have a full assessment. That's what the inspector is saying is unwise.

MACTAGGART: We've enormously increased the resources which are available so that we have 55% more resources in probation than we used to have. We need to make sure that the resources follow the risk, and if the chief inspector of probation believes that there are risks which aren't properly being resourced, then we need to make sure that they are.

NORTHAM: Will you make sure, given that he's now said exactly that?

MACTAGGART: Well, I'm confident that we will be able to deliver that.

NORTHAM: The menace that can be posed by an offender released early and categorised as low-risk also became hideously real in the most notorious recent case - the murder of John Monckton and the attempted murder of his wife at their home in Chelsea.

#### ACTUALITY ON UPPER CHEYNE ROW

NORTHAM: This is Upper Cheyne Row, just down from the Thames - a short, quiet, elegant street dominated by the huge Catholic church which John Monckton attended. Residents here seem security-conscious - along just 150 yards I've counted five CCTV cameras guarding the 18<sup>th</sup> century houses. Near the end of 2004, two men, Damien Hanson and Elliot White, tricked their way into John Monckton's home to rob him. It's been widely reported that Damien Hanson had been recently released from prison and was categorised as low risk. The two were pretending to be postal workers delivering a parcel. Once the door was opened and the men pushed their way inside, John and Homeyra Monckton were vulnerable. As their relative, the journalist Dominic Lawson, explains, the attack began almost at once.

LAWSON: She tried to rush upstairs. And Hanson followed her, stabbed her twice, it was a very very severe injury, and then said very coldly, 'Give me your jewels, give me your rings, give me your money.' Then Hanson, having stabbed Homeyra, went over to John and stabbed him about seven or eight times with huge force, I mean, two or three of the stab wounds were in the chest and lung and there were hilt mark abrasions at the point where the knife in, so you can imagine the physical force he used and there was blood, well I shouldn't really say this, but I mean, you know, eight feet high on the walls. And John collapsed to the ground, and when Homeyra who had become unconscious at that point, I think, became conscious again and she remembers feeling the cold air of the street outside as the two men ran out.

NORTHAM: Miraculously, Mrs Monckton survived. As they come to terms with the shock of this frenzied attack, relatives like Dominic Lawson are left wondering how the murderer, Damien Hanson, could ever have been thought to be a low risk.

LAWSON: What we know is that he had served just over six years of a twelve year sentence for attempted murder where his weapon he was carrying at that time was a machete. He'd also served earlier time for a stabbing and for many burglaries that he had made an earlier parole application which had been turned down. That at the second parole hearing, his application for the parole board would have contained the information that he had gone to anger management sessions. He had apparently said that he wanted to work with under-privileged children to tell them how to go straight. In other words, having failed the first parole board hearing, he understood what he had to do to pass, because he's not a stupid person. When he was released, he was released on a scale of three, of the lowest risk offender, and the police are very angry about this because they weren't notified about his release. And the police say that it beggars belief that he was not registered as a potentially dangerous offender.

NORTHAM: How do you know that's what the police say?

LAWSON: Because they've told me.

NORTHAM: Police officers have said that?

LAWSON: Yes.

NORTHAM: Last week, the murderer Damien Hanson was given three life sentences – a minimum of 36 years in prison. When the government extended the provision for early release three years ago, it also introduced new indefinite sentences to keep some offenders in custody as long as needed for public protection. The Home Office Minister, Fiona MacTaggart, won't discuss the details of particular cases, but does defend the government's approach.

Do you understand the frustration, even the rage that may be felt by the relatives of a victim of someone who's been released from prison early, who say that if he'd been kept in for his full sentence, he could not have committed this crime?

MACTAGGART: Yes I do, and one of the reason why the Home Secretary, following the horrific murder of John Monckton, commissioned a report to make sure that we learnt the lessons of the mistakes that were made in that case ...

NORTHAM: If the lesson that comes out of it was that he should simply not have been released early ....

MACTAGGART: But under the new sentences, well I can't talk about the individual case, but with indefinite sentences for public protection and extended public protection sentences, it is quite possible to keep someone in prison as long as they present a risk to the public.

NORTHAM: The inquiry into John Monckton's murder, which is expected to report this month, will have to answer a number of questions about the supervision of his killer after early release, the level of risk he was thought to present, and the decision to release him at all. This was made by a Parole Board, and reportedly without meeting the prisoner face-to-face. While the inquiry is underway, nobody from the Parole Board nationally will comment on the case. But one of its members, the solicitor Anne Molyneux, did agree to discuss the principles of the Board's operation with File On 4. She acknowledges that they decide the majority of cases – more than four out of five – on paper, without seeing the prisoner concerned.

MOLYNEUX: If they are prisoners who are serving sentences of four years or more, that's not life sentence prisoners, then their cases will be considered on paper and the prisoner will not be interviewed, except in unusual circumstances.

NORTHAM: And, apart from the cost consideration, what's the reason for that, because looking a prisoner in the eye must be at least part of forming a judgement about them.

MOLYNEUX: That's a fair point. But because of the enormous amount of material which the Parole Board have in front of them, which has been prepared by a body of professionals, the view is that that material allows the Parole Board to reach the right decision.

NORTHAM: You don't think you'd be better informed if you were able to see the prisoner and ask them questions?

MOLYNEUX: In cases where the board considering the case feels that it doesn't have enough information, then it is able to defer the case and ask for more information.

NORTHAM: It's not information really, is it? It's instinct, it's human judgement.

MOLYNEUX: But the instincts and human judgement will have been carried out by the report writers in those cases.

NORTHAM: But you're making the decision.

MOLYNEUX: We make the final decision based on the evidence which we have.

NORTHAM: What criteria does a prisoner have to meet before the Parole Board will agree to release them?

MOLYNEUX: I think the one word that everybody in the Parole Board says repeatedly throughout any Parole Board hearing is risk, risk, risk. Is that risk something which can be managed?

NORTHAM: And it's risk which is unavoidably at the heart of the system the government introduced five years ago to tighten arrangements for public protection. There's now a complex computer programme for assessing the risk that an offender might cause further harm once released. It takes account of a wide range of factors – including age, gender, employment or lack of it, housing, any addictions, past criminal record. These combine to give a score and a category of high, medium or low risk. The programme is known by the acronym OASys – offender assessment system. And we know that in practice, people using it often cut corners. This is clear from research published by the Home Office late last year, which reports that only a minority of OASys assessments are completed properly by Probation Officers. The study's author, Professor Hazel Kemshall of De Montfort University, sees this as a fundamental weakness.

KEMSHALL: About two-thirds of the OASys that we saw in the cases that we sampled were not completed or not completed properly.

NORTHAM: Two-thirds of them?

KEMSHALL: Yes, and we've reported that in the document, so areas know that and that's been very strongly fed back. And I think it is an area of concern that the main tool for the Probation Service, where there is a dedicated section on the risk of harm, is not actually being well used.

NORTHAM: Isn't this the very centre of the system for protecting the public?

KEMSHALL: Yes it is and it's got to be put right. Because it's the most reliable tool that's available at the moment, it's reasonably fit for purpose and I think it should be used with more rigour and with more integrity.

NORTHAM: This is also of concern to the Probation Officers' national union, NAPO. In the experience of its chair, Mike McLelland, the reason so many OASys risk assessments are left incomplete is that the computer programme itself is far from user-friendly.

MCLELLAND: My criticism of it would be that it's too long, it's too unwieldy, it's difficult to use. At the moment it's an electronic document, if you print it off, depending on how much you've written in it, you're going to get the document that's somewhere between 35 and 42 pages long. It's only when you finish the first thirteen sections that you get into the risk of harm screening and then the full risk of assessment and I think to be perfectly fair, by the time people have got through thirteen sections they're just getting a little jaded with this tool that they're having to fill in. I think there's still a considerable degree of resistance to using it.

NORTHAM: Is this just people who are set in their ways, people who are obstructive, getting in the way of a system which is supposed to be at the very centre of the assessment of risk of managing people who could be dangerous to the community?

MCLELLAND: Yes. We had some research commissioned a little while ago, looking at how people used OASys. And it probably is fair to say that people who have been in the service longer and are more experienced were perhaps more reluctant to use OASys than new staff coming into the service who've never known anything different.

NORTHAM: Another way of putting that would be that the old guard are dragging their feet.

MCLELLAND: One could say that, but I would suggest that a more creative way of looking at it would be to say that if you want people to use this tool you've got to make it more accessible.

NORTHAM: Failure to use the OASys programme properly is also reflected in a report from Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation published just before Christmas. It finds that a majority of risk assessments on sex offenders aren't

NORTHAM cont: completed satisfactorily at the start of their supervision in the community - the failure rate is 70%. When it comes to re-assessing risk after some significant incident, the failure rate is 82%. At the Probation Boards Association, which represents management of the service, the Chief Executive, Martin Wargent, warns that these figures could give a misleading impression of a record which is generally positive.

WARGENT: Work with offenders, these very serious offenders, is well done. Public protection is well managed by both the police and the Probation Service. There are areas, not critical areas, but important areas that need to be improved. That's what you would expect, you would ask for from inspections, but overall the reports are good and the results are extremely good. The outcomes and the work that these officers do is first class.

NORTHAM: Her Majesty's Inspector of Probation found something around 70% of these OASys risk assessments are not being completed properly for sex offenders at the beginning of their supervision, and that's not instilling public confidence that the system is working properly, is it?

WARGENT: I think you'd have to be a little bit careful about what the inspectorate say. They have quite rightly to operate on a counsel of perfection, everything has to be 100% right and we don't achieve all national standards, but we get pretty close to them.

NORTHAM: Given the importance of these assessments in terms of public protection, should you not be getting it right better than 30% of the time?

WARGENT: The answer to that is obviously yes, there's room for improvement, that's what the inspectorate say, but if you look at the various reports, you would see that it gives the Probation Service a pretty good bill of health on this.

NORTHAM: You don't think that, given the enormous public interest in protection from potentially dangerous offenders, you don't think there's a danger that you might be putting a somewhat complacent gloss on the findings of these reports?

WARGENT: No. No I think the facts stand for themselves.

NORTHAM: We wanted to see for ourselves how the OASys risk assessments and the management of real cases work in practice. We were able to arrange with a local Probation Service, South Yorkshire, to see them in operation and talk to practitioners about them. A junior minister at the Home Office agreed. Then suddenly we were told by the Home Office that the visit was off, and that that decision was unretractable. So we are unable to show the systems working as they're supposed to. But the Home Office accepts that there are problems. For the minister, Fiona MacTaggart, the report from the inspectors reveals a weakness in the primary responsibility of probation.

MACTAGGART: I really appreciate the emphasis that they put on risk of harm, because I think there was a lack of attention to the importance of this in the probation tradition.

NORTHAM: It seems extraordinary that anyone should have thought differently.

MACTAGGART: I don't think they thought differently, but they thought we have all these things to do and this is just one of them. And actually, what he is doing, quite rightly, and I think it's absolutely the job of a Chief Inspector to say, 'Stop and think what is your most important task, and your most important task is managing the risk to the general public of these offenders.' You're also helping to rehabilitate them, to reduce their future risk and so on, but you've actually got to manage their current risk, and the only way you can manage their current risk is by assessing it properly.

NORTHAM: And you're not concealing the fact that they're not doing it properly at the moment?

MACTAGGART: Well what I'm saying is that things have improved, and I think it's important to see this as a journey.

NORTHAM: But they haven't improved far enough, have they?

MACTAGGART: No they haven't, they haven't, and there's more to do.

NORTHAM: As part of the programme, we asked if we could visit a probation area to see how these systems work out in practice. If you're interested in public confidence being instilled in these systems, why wouldn't you let us?

MACTAGGART: I think there were operational reasons which meant that you couldn't go there at the time. I'm not worried about the media looking carefully at probation. But what I think we do need to do is to improve how it works.

NORTHAM: Well, the probation area concerned, the National Probation Service and your fellow junior minister all agreed that we could do this, and then all of a sudden someone decided we couldn't. Who was that?

MACTAGGART: I'm sorry, I don't know the answer to that question.

NORTHAM: The Home Office also made clear to us that the ban on our proposed visit for 'operational' reasons would cover all probation areas and that no staff anywhere would be allowed to talk to File on 4. Any failure or corner-cutting in risk of harm assessments could be significant. If they aren't done thoroughly, then the supervision plans that flow from them may be faulty and the network of public protection could begin to unravel. That system is called MAPPA, Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements, and it brings together police, probation and prison staff and other services where relevant. The point is to provide joined-up management of cases. But we've found that, even so, supervision plans can go awry in practice, threatening other innocent victims.

JEREMY: She was a kind, generous, a very good mother. She stood up for the underdog, she didn't like bullies. She could be, you could call it blunt, but she would say what she thought, wouldn't hold back.

NORTHAM: Jeremy is still visibly in shock over the murder of his former partner Naomi Bryant last August. He can't take in the sudden death of the woman he loved.

JEREMY: It didn't really hit me until after the funeral. I've been devastated. I'm really trying to get my life back together again at the moment, and I have fond memories of Naomi and I'm always going to miss her.

NORTHAM: Naomi Bryant met her death at home in Winchester. It was a Wednesday afternoon and she'd been in a local pub, where she met a man called Anthony Rice and walked with him back to her house. Once inside, he took a kitchen knife and went upstairs to check there was nobody there. She went up to see what he was doing and he strangled her with a pair of her tights, stabbed her in the back and chest fifteen times, and also stabbed her in the neck. Then he shoved her body under a bed, made his getaway, changed clothes and took a train to London.

#### ACTUALITY ON COUNTRY ROAD

NORTHAM: The murderer was living here, in a former coaching inn on the main road through the village of Otterbourne. This is Hampshire life at its most quaint - the village green, the pub, the cricket matches. For almost fifty years, the coaching inn has become a hostel for ex-offenders run by a Christian group. In all that time, relations with local residents have been generally harmonious. But the case of Anthony Rice has provoked anger. He has a long history of violent and sexual offences, and villagers here can't understand why the local MAPPA scheme allowed him to be placed in the hostel, and why his curfew seemed ineffective. The Chairman of the Parish Council is a retired MOD official, Michael Warne. He was horrified to learn from the court case that the murder wasn't the first act of violence Anthony Rice had committed while living in the hostel. He'd previously slipped out one night, in breach of his curfew, and attacked a woman on her way to work in a street in Southampton.

WARNE: He absconded from Elderfield on a date in April without anyone knowing, went into Southampton and committed the wounding offence by hitting a lady with a brick. And no one knows very much detail about this because the lady was unconscious. And he came back to Elderfield and told no one and it was an unsolved crime.

NORTHAM: How was it that he was able to leave Elderfield and be out at five o'clock in the morning?

WARNE: A good question, a good question, this is something we would like an answer to, because it does give us serious concern that a man who was subject to the MAPPAs system was able to leave the place without anyone knowing and come back. As a MAPPAs subject he was subject to a curfew but he just broke it and no one noticed.

NORTHAM: When he crept back into the hostel, Anthony Rice expected the police to come and get him. They had no way of linking him to the attack with a brick and so they never came. He said he began to feel untouchable. Villagers were troubled to learn just how dangerous a state he had reached – apparently without attracting official attention – by the time he murdered Naomi Bryant. He told the police he had:

READER IN STUDIO: An urge inside me to kill someone. If it wasn't her it would have been another person later.

NORTHAM: Why did the local MAPPAs scheme place a man with such dangerous feelings and a record of sexual and violent crimes in Elderfield hostel? Local residents had been led to understand that it would never take in anyone who might pose such a grave risk to public safety. Michael Warne, the Chairman of the Parish Council, has correspondence over the past twenty years, apparently giving repeated assurances of this, from the group that runs the hostel, Langley House Trust.

WARNE: We had a letter from Langley House Trust in 1985, telling us that they were unable to offer a home to any man who had a history of violence or sexual offences, and that was accepted as an assurance by the residents of the village.

NORTHAM: Over the twenty years since then, other letters from the Trust seek to reassure the parish that the situation has not changed and there is no increase in risk from hostel residents. The most recent letter about Elderfield came to Mrs Pam Cole, whose house is just along the road from the hostel. Her concern was set off by a leaflet distributed in church about the Langley House Trust at a day of support last year.

COLE: I picked up this one which said, 'Elderfield: specialising in working with a full range of ex offenders'. I just assumed that meant that anybody, whatever they'd done, could go and stay at Langley House.

NORTHAM: What was your reaction when you read that?

COLE: I wrote again, saying about this.

NORTHAM: And what reply did you get?

COLE: 'I am able to reassure you that the client group at Elderfield continues to reflect the general prison population and has not altered over the last few years.'

NORTHAM: So when you discovered that Anthony Rice had been a resident at Elderfield ...

COLE: I now feel that they have gone back on everything they told us, on all their words. I have spoken to several people since, and they are rather afraid of going out in the dark, sadly, which they've never done before. So now you don't know where you are and who's about, that's all.

NORTHAM: For the murder of Naomi Bryant, Anthony Rice has now been sent back to prison – it's his second life sentence. While they await the findings of the official inquiry into what went wrong, neither the local MAPPAscheme nor the hostel management, Langley House Trust, is available for interview. But the Parish Council Chairman, Michael Warne, wonders how much faith residents can continue to place in those responsible for the supervision of this case.

WARNE: We would like assurances that anyone who is released to Elderfield and is subject to MAPPAscheme is properly supervised and there is a proper curfew enforced, they don't go wandering out at night without anyone knowing. There is no absolute guarantee that that this couldn't happen again, but really someone ought to be being as sure as they possibly can, taking every possible step to make sure it



NORTHAM: How much time does that mean can be given to each?

KEMSHALL: Not much.

NORTHAM: Minutes?

KEMSHALL: Yes.

NORTHAM: And does that seem to you adequate?

KEMSHALL: No, and I think the areas themselves know that, so you've got a problem here really about how do you drive up quality when you're also looking at increases in the workload of panels.

NORTHAM: Coupled with a catalogue of problems Professor Kemshall found in the operation of MAPPAS, this can do little to raise public confidence in the system. The Home Office minister, Fiona MacTaggart, recognises that this is a time to take stock of the changes the government introduced.

MACTAGGART: We've only had MAPPA in place for five years, and I think that at the end of the five years we need to look back and see what has been achieved and where we haven't made the progress that we need to, and the reason why that's so important is because public safety is the most important thing.

NORTHAM: Let me put to you something that comes out of Professor Hazel Kemshall's report, which the Home Office published two or three months ago. She points to a system in which administration is only working properly in half the probation areas in respect of MAPPA, training is working properly in one in ten areas, and she talks to us of management review meetings which are so overloaded that they're looking at twenty cases in a single morning. That sounds like a system under strain.

MACTAGGART: Well that is not acceptable that there should be that kind of overload of cases, and it's one of the reasons why I've said that we need to make sure that resources follow risk. We've put in place a risk of harm action plan to ensure

