National Offender
Management Service

Service Level Agreement for Prison Services Commissioned by the National Offender Management Service from the Public Sector Provider

2014-17

Between

The National Offender Management Service as Commissioner and

Her Majesty's Prison Service

and the

High Security Estate

Template Version P1.0

Version Control Table		
Version No.	**Reason for Issue / Changes**	**Date Issued / Amended**
P 1.0	Published for Commissioning Round from 2014	1 April 2014

Table of Contents

Page

SECTION 1: DEFINED TERMS.....4

SECTION 2: FORM OF AGREEMENT 6
2.1 Purpose and Scope of this Document..... 6
2.2 Agreement 7

SECTION 3: CUSTODIAL PROFILE IN THE HIGH SECURITY ESTATE.....8
3.1 The High Security Estate (word limit 750)..... 8
3.2 Prison Population held in the High Security Estate..... 9
3.3 Segmentation Profile of the High Security Estate..... 10
3.4 Custodial Provision in the High Security Estate: 15
3.5 Resettlement Prisons 15
3.6 Offender Journeys and Provision within the High Security Estate, including inter–regional relationships 16

SECTION 4: COMMISSIONING INTENTIONS 18
4.1 The High Security Estate's response to Commissioning Intentions 18
4.2 The High Security Estate's Development Objectives 31

SECTION 5: ACCREDITED PROGRAMME PROVISION.....39

SECTION 6: NOTICE OF CHANGE PROCESS 41
6.1 Discretionary Changes..... 41
6.2 Mandatory Changes 41

SECTION 7: RESPONSIBILITIES, TERMS & CONDITIONS 42
7.1 Responsibilities 42
7.2 Delivery partners 42
7.3 Service Definition 43
7.4 Audit, Assurance and Risk Management..... 43

SECTION 8: MANAGING THE SLA.....44
8.1 SLA Review Process 44
8.2 SLA Delivery Issues and Failures 45

SECTION 9: FINANCIAL PROTOCOL 45
9.1 Financial Framework..... 45
9.2 Principles of the Annual Operating Price and Funding Arrangements 45

SECTION 10: ISSUES RESOLUTION 46
10.1 Issues Resolution Process..... 46

ANNEX A: NOTICE OF CHANGE AND BUSINESS CASE TEMPLATES ...47

SECTION 1: DEFINED TERMS

Defined Terms

Throughout this **SLA**, the use of the singular includes the plural. The following defined terms are identified in the document in bold text and have the following meanings, except where the context requires otherwise:

Annual Operating Price	Price to be paid for the **Services** under the terms of this **SLA**. In effect, the NOMS-funded annual budget for the **Establishment**.
Commissioner	The representative of the NOMS Directorate of Commissioning and Commercial acting on behalf of the NOMS Agency to commission services from **HMPS** under this **SLA**.
Establishment	The business unit of operational delivery, with a single point of accountability, for which **HMPS** has agreed to provide services under the terms of this **SLA**.
Her Majesty's Prison Service (HMPS)	Public sector provider of prison and high-security prison services commissioned by **NOMS** under the terms of this **SLA**. (Sometimes referred to in this **SLA** as "the **Provider**".)
In-Year Change	A material change to the **Service Requirements** or **Annual Operating Price** of the **SLA**.
Legislation	Any Act of Parliament or subordinate legislation.
Management Information	Information available to support the management and monitoring of service delivery.
NOMS	National Offender Management Service Agency, or its designated representative, acting in a corporate capacity.
NOMS Directory of Services	The list of **NOMS**-funded services delivered to offenders, defendants, victims and courts.
Notice of Change (NoC)	Mechanism by which an **In-Year Change** is affected.
Operational Capacity	The total number of prisoners that an **Establishment** can hold taking into account control, security and the proper operation of the planned regime.
Party	A party to this **SLA**.
Provider	See **HMPS**.
Service Level Agreement (SLA)	This **Service Level Agreement** between the **Commissioner** and **HMPS**.
Service Requirement(s)	The requirement(s) for service delivery under this **SLA,** as set out in the Establishment Local Annexes.
Service	A service to be provided by **HMPS,** as detailed in the **Service Specification** and/or other documents referenced under the **Service Requirement**.
Service Options	An option above the national minimum, available to commission, in some **Service Specifications**.

Service Specification	A document specifying, for each service in the **NOMS Directory of Services**, the outcomes and outputs to be delivered.
SLA Delivery Requirement	A specific, commissioned output delivered by the **Establishment** or on behalf of the **Establishment**.
SLA Delivery Requirement Level	The agreed level at which the output is expected to be delivered. The **Establishment's** performance will be monitored and assessed against this level.

SECTION 2: FORM OF AGREEMENT

2.1 Purpose and Scope of this Document

2.1.1 This **Service Level Agreement (SLA)** sets out an agreement between the **Commissioner** and **HMPS** for the provision of prison services commissioned and funded by **NOMS** within the control of the Deputy Director of Custody for the **High Security Estate**.

2.1.2 This **SLA** provides a description of a range of services that have been commissioned by funders other than NOMS for example health, education and other co-commissioned services to offenders. **HMPS** has specific responsibilities in respect of partnership working and enabling delivery. Responsibility for performance management arrangements of such services usually rests outside of **NOMS**, contained in separate SLAs, contracts or memoranda of understanding (MoU).

2.1.3 This **SLA** is designed to reflect the full range of **NOMS** custodial services and recognise the importance of providing a joined up system of custodial provision which supports offender management, rehabilitation and resettlement.

2.1.4 The delivery of custodial services by the **High Security Estate** and **Privately Managed Prisons** are managed separately and their performance is not managed as part of this **SLA**. All prisons, including **High Security Estate** and **Privately Managed Prisons**, are included within the **regional profile** of the **SLA** to demonstrate their presence in the region and the provision they offer.

2.1.5 This **SLA** has been agreed as part of the NOMS commissioning round. The commissioning round is the cycle of setting out the high level commissioning priorities for NOMS (taking into account service need and demand, resources, government policy and the priorities of other commissioners and funders of offender services) and securing services under SLAs and contracts to meet these priorities.

2.1.6 Separate internal agreements and protocols for the delivery of specific ancillary and operational support services remain in force until cancelled in writing. These include, but are not limited to:

- SLAs for estate maintenance
- MOUs for prisoner retail
- SLAs covering prison industries and prison laundries

2.1.7 For the avoidance of doubt, the **Parties** do not intend this **SLA** to be legally binding.

2.1.8 To support transparency, this **SLA** will be published on the Ministry of Justice website.

2.1.9 Further information on responsibilities, terms and conditions are outlined in section 7.

2.2 Agreement

2.2.1 The commencement date for this Regional **Service Level Agreement** will be **1 April 2014** and it shall remain in place until **31 March 2017**, inclusive, unless otherwise agreed by the **Parties**. This Regional SLA and the individual establishment annexes for Public Sector Prisons, which form a part of this agreement, will be reviewed on an annual basis and subject to change under the **Notice of Change** process.

Signed by the Commissioner (acting on behalf of the **NOMS** Agency to commission services from **HMPS** under the terms of this **SLA**):

Name (Print): Simon Boddis

Position: Head of Commissioning Group

Date: 28 March 2014

Signed by the Provider (as the representative of **HMPS** in respect of the services commissioned by the **NOMS** Agency under the terms of this SLA):

Name (Print): Richard Vince

Position: Deputy Director of Custody High Security Estate

Date: 26 March 2014

SECTION 3: CUSTODIAL PROFILE IN THE HIGH SECURITY ESTATE

3.1 The High Security Estate (word limit 750)

The High Security Estate comprises 5 Dispersal prisons (Frankland, Full Sutton, Long Lartin, Whitemoor & Wakefield) and 3 Core Local Prisons (Belmarsh, Manchester & Woodhill) providing an overall operational capacity of 6,285 places (source PMU 9.12.13). Policy and specialist support is provided by High Security Prisons Group who has offices in Wakefield and Clive House London. There is an overall Strategic Plan and Risk Register for the HSE to reflect business priorities and ensure connectivity between the operational aspects of the business, establishment SLA's and the overall delivery of NOMS priorities.

During 2013-14 performance has been generally solid across the group with all 8 establishments achieving Level 3 performance, underpinned by a strong focus on supportive attendance management. Given the significant business change implemented through Fair & Sustainable performance delivery levels have been quite impressive considering the changes in personnel and knowledge transfer that have taken place during the period. For 2014-15 there will be further significant change through the implementation of New Ways of Working and the underpinning Benchmarking of processes. Each prison has an MTT lead in place to oversee this transition and the overarching approach to implementation will be a phased one to ensure that the prisons remain safe, secure and decent through the change.

Managing change will remain at the core of the challenge for 2014-15 with the Core Local prisons transitioning into their new role of Resettlement prisons for short sentenced prisoners and those approaching the end of their sentences. The changes will see a re-balancing of their populations whilst at the same time maintaining business as usual and continuing to deliver the array of specialist unit provision to a high standard. It will also afford new opportunities to forge productive relationships with new providers and potentially see the introduction of new innovative practices.

The specialist unit provision within the HSE particularly CSC, MCBS and SIU's are anticipated to continue to experience high demand for their services and expertise through increased numbers of referrals of challenging and disruptive prisoners as well as referrals from Operation Venn. Plans are in place to strengthen the links between the CSC / MCBS system and the national PD strategy and a number of development objectives are included in this SLA to take this work forward in 2014-15 and beyond.

The implementation of Estate Re-Configuration during 2014 will support the key principles of the existing HSE Population Management protocol and its objective of ensuring that High Security places are maintained for the highest risk prisoners in terms of safety, security and order & control. It is also hoped that as interventions continue to be better targeted, supported by PSI 30/2013 [IEP] and our commitment to develop a Rehabilitative Culture that an increasing number of progressive moves out of Dispersal prisons may be enabled.

The development of a *Rehabilitative Culture* in the HSE over the next 3 years is a key strategic commitment and has a number of related developments under this theme, the common factor that being that each establishment is being required to develop a 3 year (reviewable annually) strategy. This will be informed by the current research being undertaken by Alison Liebling and her team from the Cambridge Prisons Research Group, the recent report on Regimes for Long Term prisoners and their needs, and feedback from the usual array of independent partners such as the IMB and HMIP. Focus will also be given to improving the effectiveness of the prisoner engagement interface through *Every Contact Matters*, and considering the way that Prisoner Consultative Committee's operate, as well as the day to day benefits of better applications and complaints processes in building better engagement and prisoner confidence in staff.

3.2 Prison Population held in the High Security Estate

The High Security Prison Estate holds the most dangerous and challenging prisoners in England and Wales and whilst only operating two key types of prison, the Dispersal and the Core Local (soon to transition to Resettlement prison) can end up holding the full range of adult male categorisations, remand, convicted but unsentenced and young adult prisoners. Security conditions are unsurprisingly determined by the highest level of security required that of Category A and the estate at the end of November 2013 held an average of 1025 Category A prisoners constituting 16% of the overall population.

Four of the HSE prisons (Full Sutton, Wakefield, Whitemoor and Woodhill) hold Close Supervision Centres (CSC's) for the most challenging prisoners in the estate. Full Sutton was added as additional capacity in December 2013 taking the overall number of available spaces to 48, with a further 16 spaces designated for use under Rule 46 provided around the HSE. Belmarsh hosts a High Security Unit (HSU) and Special Secure Unit (SSU) for those prisoners considered to be of very high and exceptional escape risk. The CSC provision is linked to a wider strategy for Managing Challenging Behaviour and is in the process of building closer links with the PD provision within the HSE.

Personality Disorder (PD) provision is integrated within the national PD Strategy with dedicated units at Frankland (Westgate) and Whitemoor (Fens) offering a combined total of 135 beds supported by a 21 bed PIPE Unit at Frankland (Psychologically Informed Planned Environment), the only one within the HSE and for Category A prisoners only. During 2013 a 44 bed Enhanced Progression Unit opened at Belmarsh. The Frankland PIPE Unit has secured Enabling Environment status and Frankland's A Wing (Therapeutic) is in the process of applying for it having recently submitted the required portfolio and is awaiting feedback. There is also the intention to secure Enabling Environment status for the new CSC at Full Sutton and to the other CSC's if success

Three HSE prisons host Sex Offender Treatment Programmes (Frankland, Full Sutton and Wakefield) and therefore the majority of sentenced sex offenders are held at those locations to enable their access to appropriate intervention programmes.

Young Offenders are held at Woodhill and have recently been added to Belmarsh's admissions criteria with both sites holding 111 young adults between them on 10.12.13.

Operational capacity for the HSE prisons up until 31.10.13 was 94.73% with Wakefield and Whitemoor operating at 99% of capacity.

3.3 Segmentation Profile of the High Security Estate

The Segmentation data was taken as a snapshot on 31st March 2013. Segmentation data is compiled from P-NOMIS extract as used for prison population statistics and Police National Computer Research Database. This does not represent the whole population as it excludes non-criminal prisoners, young people (< 18), unsentenced and those without a valid PNC record.

Nationally there were 69,866 offenders within the segmentation data cohort. 4,775 offenders (6.8% of the national total) were identified within the segmentation data as being within the High Security Estate (HSE), 3,059 held (64% of the HSE total) within Dispersal Prisons and the remaining 1,716 in Core Local Prisons (36% of the HSE total).

- 31% were low risk (OGRS0-24) of re-offending,
  Dispersals – 24% Core Locals – 7%
- 26% were medium risk of re-offending (OGRS 25-49)
  Dispersals – 19% Core Locals – 7%
- 30% were high risk of re-offending (OGRS 50-74)
  Dispersals – 17% Core Locals – 13%
- 11% were very high risk of re-offending (OGRS 75-89)
  Dispersals – 4% Core Locals – 7%
- 1.4% whose risk of re-offending was prolific (OGRS 90-100)
  Dispersals – 0.06% Core Locals – 1.3%

Based solely on the risk of re-offending the most prevalent segment within the HSE is the low risk of re-offending with 31% of the population falling within this group. And who generally would not require services beyond those described as Core. However as covered later in this document this does not cover the risk of serious harm or security and order and control related considerations. Also within this group are 1042 sexual offenders of which 160 are identified as high / or very high risk of sexual reoffending on the OSP with 127 of these held within Frankland (35), Full Sutton (33), and Wakefield (59), sites with SOTP expertise and provision. In broad terms the HSE population profile is higher that the national one in terms of Low, Medium and High risk of re-offending and lower against the Very High and Prolific segments. This reflects the earlier point in terms of the other considerations that determine allocation to the HSE.

When the data was analysed to identify the main offence types within the cohort:

- 53% of offenders in the HSE were violent offenders compared to 36% nationally. 73% of the HSE total was held in Dispersal prisons.

- 22% of offenders in the HSE were sexual offenders compared to 14% nationally. 85.5% of the HSE total was held in Dispersal prisons.

- 9% of offenders in the HSE had an acquisitive offence compared to 21% nationally. 93% of the HSE total were located in Core Local prisons and within Core Locals accounted for 24% of their collective segmented population.

- 6% of offenders in the HSE had a Drugs offence with 68% of this cohort held in Core Local prisons and 32% held in Dispersal prisons. Within the

Core Local's Drug offences accounted for 11% of their collective segmented population slightly less that the national total of 14%.

- 5% were convicted of Robbery lower than the national figure of 11% with these distributed equally at 50% between Dispersals and Core Locals. Within Core Locals they constitute a higher proportion of the population accounting for 7.3% of their collective segmented population.

- 3% of offenders in the HSE had an offence classified as 'Other'

- 2% of offenders in the HSE had motoring as their main offence with the vast majority held in Core Local prisons.

Overall Violent, Sexual and Acquisitive Offenders are the most prevalent groups within the overall High Security Estate, noting that the majority of Violent and Sexual Offending prisoners were held in Dispersal conditions. The percentage of prisoners for these two categories was higher than the overall levels for the rest of the prison estate. For the segments of Acquisitive crime, Drugs offences and Robbery the HSE overall held lower proportions of these types of prisoner. However there is a caveat to this in that prisoners with Acquisitive crime offences held by Core Locals (24%) were in fact of higher proportion than the national segment for this offence (21%).

The data was analysed to identify the sentence lengths of those held within High Security prisons and for clarity is sub divided between Core Local and Dispersal establishments.

Core Local prisons (excluding remand and unsentenced prisoners)

- 22% had a sentence length of 4 years or more (determinate sentence) with the largest number of these held at Manchester (183)
- 30% serving between 1-4 years with the largest number of these held at Manchester (234).
- 14% had an indeterminate sentence with the largest number of these held at Manchester (87)?
- 21% of the offenders had 12 months or less to serve with the largest number of these held at Manchester (191).
- 12% of offenders were identified as recalls with the largest number of these held at Manchester (95).

Dispersal prisons (excluding remand and unsentenced prisoners)

- 72% had an indeterminate sentence with the largest number of these held at Frankland (593).
- 26% had a sentence length of 4 years or more (determinate sentence) with the largest number of these held at Wakefield (238)
- 0.2% serving between 1-4 years with the largest number of these held at Full Sutton (3). Across the Dispersal estate all sites only hold low single figure numbers for this category of prisoner.
- Only 1 prisoner located in a Dispersal prison had a sentence of 12 months or less.

- 1 of offenders were identified as recalls with a total of 32 quite evenly distributed amongst Dispersal prisons.

Time left to serve data shows (excluding ISPs, Recalls, and unsentenced, non-criminal and young people (<18)):

- 2028 offenders within this cohort with an identified sentence end date
- 1207 of these were in Core Local Prisons (59%) and 821 in Dispersals (41%)

Within the Core Local cohort

- 54% of these offenders had <6 months left to serve
- 15% had between 6 months and 1 year remaining on their sentence
- 14% had between 1 and 2 years left to serve
- 12% had between 2 and 5 years left of their sentence
- 5% had 5 or more years of time remaining to serve

Within the Dispersal cohort

- 5.4% of these offenders had <6 months left to serve
- 5.5% had between 6 months and 1 year remaining on their sentence
- 10% had between 1 and 2 years left to serve
- 41% had between 2 and 5 years left of their sentence
- 38% had 5 or more years of time remaining to serve

Violent Offenders held in High Security Prisons

The risk of violent reoffending assessment (OVP) data was analysed for the 2518 offenders identified as having violence as their main offence, including criminal damage and public order offences only (excluding ISPs, Recalls, unsentenced, non-criminal and young people (<18)).

Within the Core Local cohort

- 18% were identified with a low risk of violent re-offending (OVP 0-29) and
- 37% scored a medium risk of violent reoffending (OVP 30-59);
- 17% were high risk of violent re-offending (OVP 60-79)
- 2.5% at very high risk of violent re-offending (OVP 80-99).
- 26% of the offenders with a violent offence had no valid OASys assessment.

Within the Dispersal cohort

- 36% were identified with a low risk of violent re-offending (OVP 0-29) and
- 37% scored a medium risk of violent reoffending (OVP 30-59);
- 5% were high risk of violent re-offending (OVP 60-79)
- 0.4% at very high risk of violent re-offending (OVP 80-99).
- 21% of the offenders with a violent offence had no valid OASys assessment.

Domestic Violence

There is also some national data analysis on the level of Domestic Violence offending within the violent offenders group. In Prisons, nationally, 16% of violent offenders are a current Domestic Violent perpetrator. 27% are perpetrators at some other time for Domestic violence, leaving 57% whom are not Domestic Violent perpetrators. On the basis of this estimate potentially up to 1083 offenders in the High Security Estate could potentially be a Domestic Violence perpetrator currently or at some other time. It is important to note that there may be additional offenders whom are or have been a domestic violence offender but is not part of their current index offence.

When reviewing how much time these Violent offenders had left to serve, 3% had a medium or higher risk of violent reoffending with 2 or more years left to serve on their sentence.

Sexual Offenders held in High Security Prisons

Based on the outputs of the OASys sexual offence risk tool and OGRS segmentation an overview is provided of those offenders identified with having a sexual index offence, this amounting to a total of 1016 offenders in the High Security Estate. (with a current sexual offence including those with a sexual motivation /element which are not statutory sexual offences only and excludes unsentenced, non-criminal and young people (<18)):

Core Locals

- 26% of offenders with a sexual offence had low risk of sexual reoffending (OSP score 0-11)
- 33% of these offenders were identified as medium risk of sexual re-offending (OSP score 12-14),
- 25% were high risk of sexual reoffending (OSP score 15-17).
- 12% had a very high risk of sexual reoffending (OSP score of 18-32).

27% of the sexual offenders within Dispersal prisons had an OSP of medium or higher and had 2 or more years left to serve.

Dispersals

- 25% of offenders with a sexual offence had low risk of sexual reoffending (OSP score 0-11)
- 31% of these offenders were identified as medium risk of sexual re-offending (OSP score 12-14),
- 29% were high risk of sexual reoffending (OSP score 15-17).
- 15% had a very high risk of sexual reoffending (OSP score of 18-32).

19% of the sexual offenders within Dispersal prisons had an OSP of medium or higher and had 2 or more years left to serve.

This Regional profile provides an overview of the population segments within the High Security Estate. The response to 4.1 Commissioning Intentions, 4.2 Development Objectives and Section 5 Accredited Programme Provision details how the High Security Estate will address the needs of the offender groups in more detail. Specifically the region will use segmentation data to inform strategies for each segment of offenders which will be developed in 14-15. The strategies will be developed and driven by High Security Prisons Group (HSPG) and will involve the DDC and Governors from the region, Commissioners, HSE Heads of Psychology and the Population Reconfiguration lead.

3.4 Custodial Provision in the High Security Estate:

Name	Security Cat	Population: Male/YO	Size (Op cap)	Specialist/ National Function	PSP Annex to SLA (yes/no)
Belmarsh	Cat A	Category A or lower/ young adults suitable for closed conditions	927	HSU SSU EPU	Yes
Frankland	Cat A	All Cat As, Cat B Prisoners sentenced to 4 years or more	808	DSPD PIPE SOTP	Yes
Full Sutton	Cat A	All Cat As and Cat B prisoners sentenced to 4 years or more including ISPs	626	CSC SOTP SSU	Yes
Long Lartin	Cat A	All Cat A, Cat B prisoners sentenced to 4 years or more, including Indeterminate Sentenced Prisoners (ISP's)	622	SIU Detainee Unit.	Yes
Manchester	Cat A	Category A or lower/Young Offenders suitable for closed conditions including Restricted Status.	1286	SIU	Yes
Wakefield	Cat A	All Cat As, Cat B Prisoners sentenced to 4 years or more, including ISPs	750	CSC SOTP	Yes
Whitemoor	Cat A	All Cat As, Cat B Prisoners sentenced to 4 years or more, including ISPs	458	CSC DSPD	Yes
Woodhill	Cat A	Category A or lower/Young adults suitable for closed conditions or lower including restricted status	819	CSC PWU	Yes

3.5 Resettlement Prisons

Name	Contract Package Area (CPA) - Lot
Belmarsh	Metropolitan & City of London – Lot 20
Manchester	Cheshire & Greater Manchester – Lot 6
Woodhill	Thames Valley – Lot 16

3.6 Offender Journeys and Provision within the High Security Estate, including inter–regional relationships

The nature of High Security conditions particularly in the case of Dispersal prisons does not support a direct geographical offender journey in a regional context. The Core Local prisons do operate within a regional context serving the courts in their locality and will continue to combine High Security conditions with their new role as Resettlement prisons. The High Security Estate in conjunction with PMU continue to operate a Population Strategy and will maintain a published document detailing its operation and which seeks to ensure that High Security places are maintained for the most dangerous and high risk prisoners in the prison estate. This strategy supports a progressive approach to the management of risk enabling where appropriate progression outside of the HSE when prisoners are able to adequately demonstrate their successful engagement in reducing their risk. For indicative purposes the following is noted on page 18 in terms of prisoner flows in and out of the HSE based on data extracted from P-NOMIS for the period February 2012 – February 2013.It is also a feature of the High Security Estate that specialist functions have their own distinct offender journey which forms part of wider national strategies – Personality Disorder (PD) and Close Supervision Centres (CSC) / Managing Challenging Behaviour Strategy (MCBS).

The HSE hosts two Personality Disorder units, the Westgate Unit at Frankland and the Fens Unit at Whitemoor for PD prisoners that require High Security conditions. Frankland also has the only progression PIPE (Psychologically Informed Planned Environment) within the HSE exclusively for Category A prisoners and provides the opportunity for prisoners to consolidate learning through relationships and interactions. The PD strategy also includes an Enhanced Progression Unit (London Pathway Programme Unit) at Belmarsh delivered in partnership between Belmarsh, London Pathways Partnership and London Probation Trust. This unit is available to all categories of prisoner with significant personality difficulties and operates to support a safe and successful release from custody

CSC places are determined by a referral process as mandated by PSI 42/2012 and consequently can involve movements of prisoners between sites (Full Sutton, Wakefield, Whitemoor and Woodhill) and also interface with both PD and MCBS provision.

Prison	Top 3 sending establishments		Top 3 onward destinations	
	Establishment	**No. & % of total**	**Establishment**	**No. & % of total**
Belmarsh	Core Local prison receiving from Central Criminal Court and its feeder magistrates Courts in SE London. In addition the establishment serves Crown and Magistrates Courts in SW Essex.		Highpoint	304 (18.7%)
			Wayland	223 (13.7%)
			Brixton	209 (12.9%)
Frankland	Belmarsh	34 (9.8%)	Lowdham Grange	33 (9.7%)
	Durham	27 (7.8%)	Belmarsh	30 (8.8%)
	Long Lartin	26 (7.5%)	Long Lartin	30 (8.8%)
Full Sutton	Belmarsh	32 (13.3%)	Lowdham Grange	41 (18.1%)
	Manchester	25 (10.4%)	Woodhill	17 (7.5%)
	Leeds	21 (8.7%)	Frankland	17 (7.5%)
Long Lartin	Belmarsh	31 (12%)	Cardiff	38 (11.7%)
	Frankland	31 (12%)	Frankland	24 (7.4%)
	Whitemoor	25 (9.7%)	Belmarsh	22 (6.7%)
Manchester	Principally Manchester, Salford and Trafford Crown Courts and other courts in the North West		Risley	297 (19.2%)
			Buckley Hall	286 (18.5%)
			Wymott	12.4% (191)
Wakefield	Frankland	18 (11.3%)	Frankland	21 (16.8%)
	Woodhill	16 (10%)	Full Sutton	14 (11.2%)
	Manchester	13 (8.1%)	Woodhill	10 (8%)
Whitemoor	Belmarsh	69 (31.5%)	Lowdham Grange	39 (16.5%)
	Frankland	20 (9.1%)	Long Lartin	27 (11.4%)
	Long Lartin	17 (7.8%)	Swaleside	27 (11.4%)
Woodhill	Northampton, Aylesbury, Milton Keynes and Wellingborough Crown Courts among others		Stocken	142 (10.7%)
			Ranby	122 (9.2%)
			Springhill	61 (4.6%)

SECTION 4: COMMISSIONING INTENTIONS

4.1 The High Security Estate's response to Commissioning Intentions

CI Title & No.	Response to Commissioning Intention	Where appropriate, name which establishment/s annex will provide further detail
1. Enhance public protection and ensure a safe, decent environment and rehabilitative culture	**1(a) There is a sense of purpose in relation to rehabilitation, desistance, and progression through a sentence which is shared and understood by all who work with offenders.** The DDC and HSE Senior Management Board recognise the importance of developing a rehabilitative Culture within the HSE and the benefits of ensuring that staff working with offenders are clear about why *Every Contact Matters* is important. A development objective has been set for all HSE prisons to develop a local Strategy for developing a Rehabilitative Culture supported by a local action plan. The intention is to identify and promote behaviours known to support desistance from crime by prisoners whilst also considering communications strategy, coaching and training support, fairness and consistency, inclusivity, and the effectiveness of Prisoner Consultative Committee's. Further details are set out below at 1(b). **1(b) All who work with offenders consistently demonstrate behaviours and attitudes that support rehabilitation and desistance.** This area has been identified for priority focus within the HSE and is reflected in a common Development Objective for all our prisons who are required to develop a local strategy that promotes a Rehabilitative Culture. During Year 1 of this SLA the primary focus will be the establishment of the Strategy and respective action plan which will be used to guide the establishments' priority areas for development during Years 1, 2 & 3. This will include a focus on the principles of *'Every Contact Matters'* . Progress will be monitored through Quarterly SLA Review meetings and visits by the DDC and Regimes Manager. Also in recognition of the poor MQPL survey results obtained by a number of Dispersal prisons, particularly in respect of BME Perceptions further work has been commissioned through Alison Liebling and the Cambridge Prisons Research Centre. There is also a recognition that the needs of prisoners serving longer sentences are quite different to those serving shorter sentences and in the Dispersal prisons the segmentation data confirms that 72% of prisoners are serving indeterminate sentences and 26% serving determinate sentences of 4 years or more. It therefore follows that the regime required to develop and maintain prisoner hope and engagement is quite different to that needed by shorter sentenced prisoners. The recommendations of the Liebling Report presented to	

	NEMC in September 2013 will be taken forward in conjunction with the above pieces of work. **1(c) Efforts are made to ensure offenders experience the environment as safe.** Preservation of life and safety are the key priorities in the High Security Estate and are reflected as such in our Strategic Plan and Risk Register. The very nature of High Security conditions has the effect of concentrating the most dangerous prisoners in the prison estate in a relatively small numbers of prisons. Whilst recognising that the HSE has higher levels of staffing and camera coverage than the rest of the estate the unpredictability of some of the most dangerous prisoners held, particularly those with mental health conditions makes this a significant challenge. There are also additional challenges presented by increasing numbers of prisoners that for gang related or other issues are requesting Rule 45 Own Protection status and therefore seeking location amongst vulnerable prisoners. The three murders of prisoners in High Security custody by prisoners who were claiming Rule 45 Own Protection status provides a clear demonstration of the risks involved. During 2013 the High Security Estate published new operating procedures to improve the management of this risk and contained in the document *HSE Population Management Strategy & Operating Procedures Section Two: Strategic Management and Transfer of Prisoners.* During 2014-15 further work will be undertaken to assure and strengthen delivery against this process. The focus upon safety also considers the research carried out by the Cambridge Prisons Research Centre that indicates the crucial need for prisoners to feel safe in enabling them to focus on opportunities for rehabilitation and change. It also follows that for staff to feel confident in their engagement with prisoners that they also need to share a sense of safety. Therefore a continued commitment to achieving a demonstrable zero tolerance to violence will be a core expectation across the HSE with focus upon how this is delivered and communicated in practical terms. Analysis of Violence Management data will continue to form part of the standard preparations for DDC visits irrespective of whether or not the prison is on target against the Violence Management Metric and opportunities to share best practice will be sought. This analysis also considers Use of Force levels and the governance of Use of Force, the latter considering minutes of meetings, attendance, and terms of reference as per PSO 1600. For the latter it is envisaged that an HSE Safer Custody forum will be established for HSE prisons, chaired by the Regimes Manager and meeting at 6 monthly intervals. It is also intended to develop a 'virtual Safer Custody Community' who would normally be invited to attend the meetings but encouraged to share information dynamically in between scheduled meetings. This forum will help promote shared learning across the HSE and also provide a platform for national Safer Custody leads to attend as guest speakers. Recommendations	

	arising from HMIP/MQPL/ Ombudsman Reports will also be considered at this event. Development objectives have been put in place to progress the above and also include measures to ratchet up security and prevent the entry of unauthorised items into HSE prisons and the introduction to Segregation Units of Body Worn Video, the latter not only valuable for evidential purposes but also a clear commitment to transparency that its deployment represents. **1(d) Good quality risk assessments, risk management systems and information-sharing between partner agencies (where relevant) result in the application of appropriate public protection and security measures, and these ensure the needs of victims are appropriately addressed.** Security and Public Protection are the corner stone outputs of the High Security Estate and close management attention is focussed on compliance with the Public Protection Manual and managing effectively those prisoners covered by the MAPPA process. Performance against the requirement for MAPPA F submission has been historically strong and the ViSOR partnering measure has consistently achieved very good performance as has OASys QA. As a result of the national systems audit of ViSOR conducted by Audit & Corporate Assurance Unit each High Security prison has an action plan in place to address identified weaknesses. The HSPG Regimes Manager visits each establishment a minimum of once each quarter and will follow up on action plan progress / compliance with PSI 06/2013 – Mandatory Use of ViSOR. Each site has a protocol in place that covers the local use of the system and how it complies with the PSI and this document will also form the basis of local establishment assurance. However the national segmentation data extract suggests that there may be a number of prisoners without OASys assessments in place and this will be an area for additional scrutiny. Risk assessments for escorts and bedwatches receive close local management attention and also are audited annually by A&CA in addition to the local self audit programme. Any baselines that score 2 or less are automatically discussed at Quarterly SLA Review. **1(e) Intelligence is gathered, developed and shared in a safe and timely manner.** **1(f) The availability of drugs and mobile phones in prisons is tackled** **1(g) Prisoners are prevented from continuing criminality from within prisons.**	

	In respect of the above Commissioning Intentions; The High Security Estate is committed to ensuring that its establishments comply with the instructions set out in the National Security Framework and the Public Protection Manual and provide assurance that individual establishments' Local Security and Public Protection Strategies will be kept up to date in line with current policy'.	
2. Strengthen integration of service delivery between directly funded, co-commissioned providers and wider partners	**2(a). There is evidence of effective coordination of delivery of services and integration of providers locally, regionally and nationally to maximise outcomes for offenders.** The absence of geographical proximity makes this difficult for HSE prisons to achieve collectively. The development of Through the Gate Services in Resettlement prisons such as Belmarsh, Manchester and Woodhill will necessitate greater integration within Region, with other establishments as part of the overall offender journey and for access to services as they transfer to new providers and evolve. Healthcare and Education are existing areas where a degree of regional integration already takes place and High Security Prisons will be working to strengthen, develop and optimise those relationships in pursuit of better outcomes for their prisoners. The DDC ensures oversight of Co-Commissioned services through Quarterly SLA Monitoring meetings at which Healthcare, Substance Misuse Services, and Education are standing agenda items. This will be expanded further to include 'Through the Gate Services' for the prisons undertaking a resettlement role and Social Care. To ensure focus is maintained during a period of considerable transition a development objective has been added to Table 6. **2(b). Facilitate the ongoing operation of mandating day one entry of prison leavers onto the DWP Work Programme and any future changes through the introduction of Universal Credit.** All HSE establishments are committed as per the original programme to ensuring that DWP staff based in prisons have access to the required facilities and accommodation whilst being mindful of the roll out of Transforming Rehabilitation and Universal credit. The monitoring of attendance and local partnership dynamics will form part of the Regimes Managers assurance criteria for establishment visits. **2(c). In England - work together with NHS England and Public Health England in line with the National Partnership and Co-commissioning Agreement to ensure that NHS commissioned health services (including clinical and non-clinical substance misuse services) in custody support both health and justice outcomes and:** **Are informed by an up to date Health Needs Assessment[24] taking account of the reconfiguration of the custodial estate including the creation of**	

	Resettlement Prisons **Support sustainable recovery from addiction to drugs and alcohol and improved mental health including dual diagnosis;** **Promote continuity of care from community to custody, between establishments and through the prison gate in partnership with new providers of probation services;** **Are implemented alongside efforts to reduce the supply of drugs and alcohol in to prisons and the diversion of prescribed medication.** All HSE prisons attend local partnership Boards with their local Health Authority and providers in respect of local Health and Substance Misuse Service provision and as discussed previously in this document this is also an SLA Quarterly Review standing item. In terms of Regional Governance Boards it would be unrealistic to expect that the DDC attends all of these given the geographical spread of the estate. However in the DDC's absence a suitable alternative representative would attend in his place. The influence of diverted medications will also be tracked referencing the national MDT report and local Security Intelligence and will interface through establishment Drug Strategy Meetings. **2(d). In England - Work together with local authorities to ensure that adult offenders and defendants with care and support needs are appropriately identified, their needs are assessed and they are supported to live with decency and as independently as possible; and that arrangements are made for continuity of care when an individual moves.** All HSE establishments were tasked in 2013-14 with contacting their Local Authority to begin the development of working relationships and inform transitional planning in the run up to Local Authorities taking up statutory responsibility for Social Care once the Care Bill is enacted in April 2015. This expectation will continue through 2014-15 see the develop of local action plans and progress against the specified milestone objectives identified in the 'What Good Looks Like' document will be monitored via DDC and Regime Manager Assurance visits and Quarterly SLA Review Meetings. This is an important area of development need for the High Security Estate who particularly in the case of the Dispersals who have an increasingly aged population with long sentenced and indeterminate sentenced prisoners. This will see an increase in demands for support services and palliative care. Effective partnership working will therefore be essential to ensure that prison, NHS England, Education provider and relevant third sector support is co-ordinated and the optimal outcomes obtained.	

	In terms of current practice, Healthcare providers ensure that physical and mental health needs are identified on reception and provide a range of support in conjunction with Prison Service staff (e.g. Disability Liaison Officer) and where appropriate risk assessed prisoner 'Buddies' are recruited to assist with non-personal care. The Education Contractor also delivers screening during the early phase of custody to identify issues of learning disability and options for support (noting that between 5% - 10% of the prisoner population has a Learning Disability and that 7% of adult prisoners have an IQ below 70 (a further 25% in the range 70-90) *Mottram 2007).* The High Security Estate is also taking part in a pilot NOMS Survey designed to assist in quantifying the provision we have and the needs of our population as we prepare for the involvement of the Local Authority. HMP Wakefield has been selected for this in recognition of the age demographic of its population. **2(e). In England - Work with local authorities to promote inclusion of, and maximise benefits to, offenders' families.** 2013-14 HSE establishments SLA's carried a requirement for establishments to as a minimum make contact with the Local Authority lead to establish support options. However the nature of the High Security Estate and the split between Core Local Prisons and Dispersal's means that the latter have limited numbers of prisoners who's families are domiciled within the Local Authorities area of control. It is recognised that prisoners' family links play a key role in desistance but also in maintaining a sense of hope during their imprisonment, particularly important for those serving long sentences. All HSE prisons offer support and other provisions to help maintain family contacts and staying in touch, examples including the Family Man course and Story Book Dad's. However all three core local prisons have been required through development objectives to continue to develop contacts with Local Authorities in development of this Commissioning Intention. **2(f). In England - Continue to improve access to a pathway of new and existing services for offenders with severe personality disorders. Services are primarily targeted at men who present a high risk of serious harm to others and women who present a high risk of committing further violent, sexual or serious criminal damage offences. Services are co-commissioned with NHS England Specialised Commissioning to support health and justice outcomes.** There are two High Secure Personality Disorder Units at HMP Whitemoor - The Fens, and HMP Frankland - Westgate Unit. These units offer 135 Assessment and/or Treatment beds. (The Fens = 70 beds and Westgate 65 beds). There is a comprehensive and consistent	

	referral procedure whereby prisoners can be referred via most disciplines including: OMU, Psychology, Operational staff and/or by making a self -referral. Each unit holds monthly referral panels where MDT referral information is reviewed against a consistent set of referral criteria. If the referral provides sufficient information to indicating the prisoner is likely to meet DSPD criteria, then that prisoner will be offered a place for assessment. The DSPD assessment comprises of a Common Data Set of assessment and psychometric tools to identify both the level of risk and the presence or absence of Personality Disorder, including Psychopathy. This assessment will also seek to identify a functional link between the Personality Disorder and Offending. The assessment is consistent across both sites - thereby providing a common assessment practice and heightening inter-rater reliability between sites. Both sites have an Individualised Treatment Needs Analysis which seeks to analyse and provide a comprehensive understanding of the Treatment Needs of the prisoner. This TNA will follow the prisoner throughout his stay within the units. Treatment will be continually evaluated and measured against this. Pre and Post Intervention measures will be implemented at regular and agreed intervals throughout treatment. Both sites offer a comprehensive Clinical Framework which seeks to address a) the presence of Personality Disorder, b) Criminogenic Need, and c) the Functional Link between a + b. Treatment does not seek to eradicate Personality Disorder and/or Psychopathy, but provides prisoners with opportunities to engage in treatment to teach them skills to manage the behaviours associated with PD in a more functional and pro social way. Each Clinical Framework has been designed specifically for this challenging and complex population. Each uses an Integrated Model of Treatment - which seeks to utilise the most appropriate therapeutic models for Axis I & II difficulties associated with this population, as well as robust treatment for criminogenic need. Treatment is reviewed at a 3 and 5 year period. Within the review progress (or lack of it) will be measured using a triangulation approach (self report, collateral information, and psychometric tools) to ensure that all available information is utilised to provide an informed and objective account of progress. Each site has robust progression strategies which seek to identify the most appropriate progression routes for individual prisoners. **PIPE - Psychologically Informed Planned Environment at HMP Frankland** This is currently the only progression PIPE within the High Security estate and is for Category A prisoners only. It is a 21 bed unit.	

The purpose of a PIPE is to provide individuals who meet PIPE criteria with a minimum six month, and a maximum two year timeframe, to live and engage within a safe, supportive environment where staff are trained to promote the personal development of the residents. PIPEs are designed to have a specific focus on the environment, promoting the importance of quality relationships and interactions. The aim is to maximise ordinary situations, to provide individuals with the opportunity to test out new learning, and become confident in building and maintaining relationships, and a sense of community.

A PIPE is not a treatment, rather it is an environment designed to support offenders' development and use of self management skills acquired during programmes and interventions. The environment provides them with the opportunity to consolidate new learning, and try out a new way of interacting, at a significant stage in their pathway through the criminal justice system.

The PIPE unit at HMP Frankland is a self contained unit, integrated within the establishment. Core components for PIPE prisoners structured into the PIPE unit regime are:

1. Structured sessions (one session per week per prisoner – small groups)
2. Creative sessions (self selected by the prisoner – multiple choices of activities including: cookery club, creative writing, arts and crafts, team challenges, substance misuse/ stress management sessions, acupuncture, music club, reader project)
3. Key Worker sessions (one session per prisoner per week if have been on the unit less than six months; per fortnight if been on the unit for longer than six months)
4. Wing/community forum (one session per week – full group)
5. Skills development/ building relationships/ achieving goals (Good Lives action plans ongoing throughout engagement on PIPE)
6. Enabling Environment (contribution to the 'enabling environment' ongoing throughout engagement on PIPE)

Enhanced Progression Unit at HMP Belmarsh

The London Pathway Progression Unit (LPPU) at HMP Belmarsh provides a 44 bedded unit for men of all categories who have significant personality difficulties. The service aims to assist them in progressing towards safe and successful release. The LPPU works primarily with men who have a realistic pathway into the community within two years but also with those who need support to progress through their sentence. We work within a psychologically-informed model of desistance, helping men plan for their future by enhancing their self-awareness, skills and sense of social value, and by developing

	relationships in custody that will be sustained after release. The LPPU is delivered by a partnership between HMP Belmarsh, the London Pathways Partnership of four NHS mental health Trusts, and London Probation Trust. **2(g). In England - Align services with Offender Learning and Skills Service (OLASS 4) providers in prisons. Put in place local partnership working arrangements and determine what learning opportunities will be offered in each prison. Support initiatives to make prisons places of work and strengthen the focus on employability. Enhance access to mainstream learning and employment services for offenders on return to the community.** Each of the High Security prisons is responsible for their engagement within their OLASS 4 Cluster and with the support of the Cluster Head of Learning & Skills who is part funded by the establishment, ensure that the curriculum developed and delivered is agreed as appropriate to the needs of the prisoner whilst also recognising that in Dispersal prisons prisoners distance from discharge and potential employment impacts on what is appropriate for delivery. The DDC maintains oversight of dynamics through the Quarterly SLA Review Meetings **2(h). In England - Strengthen partnership working to ensure that offenders have access to support and services to both prepare for and enable access to employment.** The three Resettlement prisons have development objectives that require them to work constructively with providers in the run up, transition and post implementation phases of the Rehabilitation Programme's transfer of 'Through the Gate' services and transition to the role of Resettlement prison whilst maintaining the delivery expectations of a High Security Prison.	
3. Deliver an efficient, quality service	**3(a). Target resources on evidence-informed interventions and services which are likely to deliver the best outcomes for the investment. This includes targeting factors shown to be related to NOMS intended outcomes and using a service design which will be effective with the groups which receive it.** All HSE prisons have a development objective in place that requires their Senior Management Teams to develop their understanding and use of Segmentation data and use it to review	

	against their prisons current population profile, and ensure that interventions provided to this population remain relevant and appropriate. Also for all HSE Offender Management Units to review the population segment that scores Low on both OGRS score and OVP (Offender Violence Predictor) score and complete a brief review considering the justification for this cohort of prisoners being appropriately placed within the HSE. This objective is scheduled for review each quarter to ensure that HSE places and interventions are maintained for target groups. **3(b). Have robust quality assurance systems in place to ensure offender services are (1) delivered as they are intended (i.e. with integrity and as planned and designed) and (2) that they are effective** All High Security Prisons have systems in place to ensure that offender services are delivered as intended and these are described in the individual establishment Service Level Agreements. However to ensure a more corporate approach and sufficient rigor High Security Prison Group leads will liaise with Commissioning Strategies Group to identify and agree a robust strategy to achieve this requirement. This is reflected as a development objective. **3(c). Review delivery where it exceeds the minimum requirements set in the NOMS Service Specifications.** All HSE establishments maintain a local programme of assurance to avoid over or under delivery and this will be monitored through the Regimes Managers assurance visits and discussed at Quarterly SLA Review Meetings.	
4. Ensure delivery is matched to population, purpose and NOMS outcomes	**4(a). Use segmentation and local data sources to target resources for rehabilitation services, case management and risk management where they deliver the greatest outcomes for investment.** The pan HSE overall segmentation data will be cross referenced with individual establishment data to ensure that the above is achieved and that resources are targeted in line with sentence planning, risk reduction, and reducing offending need. HSPG will look to undertake assurance snapshots of selection to programmes to ensure that these core principles are maintained and that applicable overrides are properly justified. There is a related development objective in Table 6 (3a) requiring establishments to review their local use of segmentation data in regard of local population need. In reflection of the key role played by OASys in allocation to interventions there will be an increased focus on the monitoring of backlogs and this will be tracked through DDC bilats with Governors. OASys quality is	

	already tracked via Hub data and discussed during assurance visits as necessary. **4(b). Ensure the use of custodial capacity delivers the most cost-effective configuration of places and meets the MOJ's strategic requirements and the needs of co-commissioning and delivery partners whilst reducing cost.** The HSE will ensure that operational capacity is managed and utilised effectively in line with its designated role and that establishments liaise with PMU to ensure that prisoners that do not need to be located or remain located in the HSE secure appropriate moves. This undertaking is supported by HSE Population Strategy which has been agreed in conjunction with PMU.	
5. Ensure that delivery of services is responsive to individual needs and characteristics to maximise outcomes	**5(a). Relevant individual needs and characteristics are effectively identified, assessed, and monitored. This information is shared appropriately, proactively and sensitively across the organisation, and with delivery partners.** All HSE prisons gather this information on reception but it is also recognised that this is an area requiring further progress and a development objective has been set accordingly to develop a local strategy document that details how provision is made for each protected characteristic and other characteristics requiring specialist provision. The intention is that the process will identify gaps in delivery and inform strategic thinking and the development of partnerships with other agencies to address these gaps, a particular factor in the case of Social Care and transitional planning. To ensure transparency this document would be published for the information of prisoners, staff, IMB, and visitors to the establishment and progress against this area of work would be tracked through regimes Managers assurance visits and Quarterly SLA Review Meetings. **5(b). Information regarding individual needs and characteristics is used to adapt and sequence services to meet individual needs and maximise their benefit, and offenders are supported and encouraged to access appropriate services.** The work detailed at 5(a) will enable individual requirements to be better met and gaps in provision to be targeted for action.	

6. Deliver priority national or specialist services	**6(a). Continue to identify, assess and manage extremist offenders by engaging with existing local structures and ensuring that training and awareness is embedded among key staff groups. Ensure referral, where appropriate, to interventions, structured assessment and structured interventions and faith-based programmes according to offender risk and need.** In relation to NOMS' approach to the identification, assessment and management of extremist offenders, all HSE prisons will ensure delivery in the key thematic areas of Intelligence Gathering & Management; Offender Management and Public Protection; and Interventions & Resettlement. **6(b). Deliver victim-offender conferences (Restorative Justice) where capacity exists and develop partnerships and a supportive environment to enable delivery where it does not.** HMP Woodhill is the only HSE prison that forms part of the original capacity building programme in conjunction with Thames Valley Partnership and they have requested additional training for facilitators. All HSE prisons have a manager in place with lead responsibility for Restorative Justice and are encouraged to engage with appropriate RJ requests. **6(c). Ensure the efficient use of prison places through development and implementation of local bail strategies and use of HDC for appropriate offenders, including making full use of Bail Accommodation and Support Service.** There is a strong commitment to make best use of custodial accommodation within our prisons and an aspect of that approach is to maximise the successful use of Bail and HDC referrals through the contractor (Stonham). Quarterly data is available to track this and is used to support performance challenge at Quarterly SLA Review Meetings. The Regimes Manager will provide additional assurance to delivery by obtaining feedback from the Contractor and national Commissioning lead on engagement by the establishments and also looking to see how it is marketed to prisons particularly on Induction and on House Units. The nature of this Commissioning Intention means that it volume terms it is mainly applicable to the HSE Resettlement prisons. **6(d). Increase the amount of commercial and economically beneficial work in prisons undertaken by prisoners.** All HSE prisons are working to optimise attendance in workshops and delivery against the Working Prisons metric and across the HSE there are a number of ONE3ONE Contracts and	

	locally sourced work contracts in place. All HSE prisons will engage closely with ONE3ONE Solutions when opportunities to expand or undertake additional commercial activity present themselves. Most of the prisons are members also of their local Chambers of Commerce to raise local profile and networking opportunities and with the intent of sourcing commercially beneficial work. It is also noted particularly in the Dispersal Estate that constructively occupying prisoners regularly and predictably has greater benefits to the stability of establishment beyond the simple commercial value of the work that they do and also benefits the sense of hope necessary to steer longer sentenced prisoners through the earlier phases of their sentence. **6(e). Support the delivery of efficiencies across the criminal justice system by increasing the use of prison video links.** Having previous been a common development objective across the HSE in the 2012-13 SLA this Commissioning Intention is re-instated as a development objective for 2013-14 in reflection that apart from saving money in terms of escort costs the risk to security is minimised when video links are used. It is recognised that there are a number of factors beyond the direct control of establishments but engagement with local criminal justice partners, court user groups and consideration to flexible operating hours can make a real difference in terms of utilisation. The are other innovative practices that can be employed as HMP Frankland were able to do with the trial of a category A prisoner where the Judge was persuaded to bring the court to the prison and avoid the risks and costs associated with an external escort. Data for video court utilisation for the period shows scope for improvement particularly for the Core Local prisons who by the nature of their business would expect greater opportunities to use the technology. Progress will be monitored against the national data available and evidence viewed on assurance visits by the Regimes Manager that illustrates the efforts made by the establishment to optimise usage.	

4.2 The High Security Estate's Development Objectives

CI Title & No.	Development Objectives What do you want to achieve? What will be the measurable outcome, how will you achieve this and by when?	Where appropriate, name which establishment/s annex will provide further detail
1(b). All who work with offenders consistently demonstrate behaviours and attitudes that support rehabilitation and desistance.	• **For all HSE prisons to develop a local strategy that details how they intend to develop a *Rehabilitative Culture* over the next 3 business years and identifies areas of priority / weakness for action. This strategy should be reviewed annually and include as a minimum approaches to;** *Every Contact Matters,* communications strategy, coaching and training support, fairness and consistency, inclusivity, and Prisoner Consultative Committee's. (Further reference should be made to the NOMS Evidence and Segmentation 2014 document pages 10 & 11 and the slides from the Rehabilitative Culture event in October 2013) **Target date 30/9/2014** • **An Action Plan** to address identified needs in progressing towards a ***Rehabilitative Culture***, for instance – introducing innovations such as: "Drop In Centres" providing awareness and advice to Prisoners with regards possibilities for progression, or "Celsius Meetings" gauging the "temperature" of the prisons.	ALL HSE Prisons
1(c). Efforts are made to ensure offenders experience the environment as safe.	**I.** **Maintaining a safe environment** - To implement the recommendations of the Review of Front End Searching carried out in November 2013 in line with published time frames **[when confirmed].** **II.** **Improving staff and prisoner confidence in safety** - To introduce Body Worn Video to staff working in Segregation Units. **[roll out timescales to be confirmed]** **III.** **Promoting a zero tolerance to violence** - Establishments to take local action to **increase local awareness** amongst staff, prisoners and visitors of the NOMS policy of zero tolerance to violence. This approach must include publication of Violence Management data and this data must have adequate local assurance arrangements in place to ensure its accuracy. **Target date – Quarterly review.** **IV.** **Preservation of life** - Establishments are to ensure their Local Assurance frameworks reflect the accepted recommendations arising from the three murders in High Security custody. Quarterly assurance fieldwork should be undertaken also covering compliance with the HSE Population Strategy – Strategic Management and Transfer of Prisoners document and an evidence file maintained for potential	ALL HSE Prisons

	inspection by the DDC or Commissioners. **Target date – Quarterly review.** **V. Extremist Prisoners -** To ensure that individuals that seek to impose extreme views or ideologies on others are robustly managed in order to minimise their ability to be able to impact on the safe operating of establishments, individual offenders or groups of offenders. **How.** A range of management options will be explored in order to both minimise the effect this offender type may have and to offer developed interventions in order to address their views. **Measure.** Through competitive analysis of related intelligence from NOMS and partner agencies in order to assess any changes in dynamics following management strategies having been agreed and put in place. **Progress reviewed quarterly**	
1(d). Good quality risk assessments, risk management systems and information-sharing between partner agencies (where relevant) result in the application of appropriate public protection and security measures, and these ensure the needs of victims are appropriately addressed	**Promoting Public Protection** - In 2013 Audit & Corporate Assurance Unit identified inconsistent information sharing between Security and Public Protection departments, specifically the transfer of information from IR's onto ViSOR. Local arrangements and monitoring to ensure that information is transacted on a timely basis between these two systems. **Target date – Quarterly review.**	ALL HSE Prisons
2(a) There is evidence of effective coordination of delivery of services and integration of providers locally, regionally and nationally to maximise outcomes for offenders	Partners and other providers have a positive impact on prisons beyond delivery of a service - integration of delivery by all providers is therefore vital in ensuring that we maximise investment and maximise outcomes for offenders. Recognising that the range and volume of partners with which we work is expanding, the DDC will ensure that by September 2014 (subject to national progress) prisons in this region review how they work with existing and new partners and providers (including by anticipating any changes as a result of Through the Gate) and create plans which describe how they will deliver: • A clear strategic vision for how services align to maximise outcomes and create an integrated, seamless offender management service (including a shared understanding of outcomes and priorities) • A clear agreed plan of how services sequence and compliment each other, providing	High Security Prisons Group HMP Belmarsh HMP Manchester HMP Woodhill

	continuity of services to offenders both within and across prisons (facilitating the needs of all providers and contractual partners to allow them to effectively deliver) • Leadership which actively enables and integrates services, where partnership working arrangements improve performance and aid resolution of issues • An understanding of resource allocation, and how delivery and choices impact on the investment and activity of others • An agreement on how to safely use and share data and information Progress towards implementation of plans will be monitored at a local level during establishment visits and at a regional level at regional meetings to ensure strategic oversight and effectiveness is maintained	
2(f). In England - Continue to improve access to a pathway of new and existing services for offenders with severe personality disorders. Services are primarily targeted at men who present a high risk of serious harm to others and women who present a high risk of committing further violent, sexual or serious criminal damage offences. Services are co-commissioned with NHS England Specialised Commissioning to support health and justice outcomes.	(**PD Site Specific**): 1. In conjunction with the HSPG lead to develop a High Secure Personality Disorder Brochure detailing a basic overview of all of the HS PD services currently offered for men within the HSE suffering from a PD. **Target date 30/9/2014** 2. In conjunction with the HSPG lead to develop a combined Referral Information Document which provides information which allows the referring establishment to make an informed and meaningful decision as to which is the most appropriate site to refer to. **Target date 30/9/2014** **(HSE & PD Sites)** 3. For all HSE sites to maximise opportunity to identify appropriate referrals for all HS OPD sites. **<u>Offender Personality Disorder (OPD) Pathway for Close Supervision Centre prisoners</u>** 4. For CSC & HS OPD Leads to develop an agreed pathway procedure model and/or criteria for moving prisoners across the specialist OPD Pathway services 5. For CSC & HS OPD Leads to review current Referral Guidelines for each service and incorporate information pertaining to the variety of OPD Pathway options available to	HMP Frankland HMP Whitemoor HMP Belmarsh ALL HSE Prisons HMP Woodhill HMP Whitemoor HMP Wakefield HMP Full Sutton

	the CSC populations. 6. CSC and HS OPD Unit staff to attend relevant meetings regarding current and future referrals across services to ensure closer links. 7. For HSE staff to be aware of the HS OPD Pathway model, and feel able to make informed and meaningful decisions regarding appropriate referrals to, and across the PD Pathway. **Progress will be reviewed by the HSPG lead by 30/9/2013** 8. For HSE staff to continue to make meaningful and informed referrals identifying the most appropriate Pathway service, including CSC and/or HS PD Units for HS prisoners **Offender Personality Disorder (OPD) Pathway for Subversive Disruptive Prisoners** 9. Diversion of a small number of STG nominal's who 1) are involved in prison violence, disorder or subversion, and 2) who present in a way that is likely to reflect psychopathic traits, towards the HS Offender Personality Disorder Pathway . 10. For Pathfinder and HS OPD leads to establish closer working links. 11. For consideration to be given on completion of PCL-R and/or IPDE assessments (or at least screening, in the first instance) of STG nominal's involved in prison violence and persistent subversive activity. Upon completion of such assessments an HS OPD referral considered. 12. STG/Pathfinder Nominal's who potentially meet HS OPD criteria to be considered for suitability for such services. 13. Where cases are considered suitable and consent to moving to a HS OPD unit, CT advice and consultancy to HS OPD offered to ensure that both general criminogenic and specific extremism risks are addressed as effectively as possible by HS OPD interventions and that all the relevant risks are continually assessed.	ALL HSE Prisons
2h). In England - Strengthen partnership working to ensure that offenders have access to support and services to both prepare for and	To work constructively with providers in the run up, transition and post implementation phases of the Rehabilitation Programme's transfer of 'Through the Gate' services and transition to the role of Resettlement prison whilst maintaining the delivery expectations of a High Security Prison. **Target date – Quarterly review.**	HMP Belmarsh HMP Manchester HMP Woodhill

enable access to employment.		
3(a). Target resources on evidence-informed interventions and services which are likely to deliver the best outcomes for the investment. This includes targeting factors shown to be related to NOMS intended outcomes and using a service design which will be effective with the groups which receive it.	• For HSE Senior Management Teams to develop their understanding and use of Segmentation data and use it to review against their prisons current population profile, and ensure that interventions provided to this population remain relevant and appropriate. **Target date – Quarterly review.** • For all HSE Offender Management Units to review the population segment that scores Low on both OGRS score and OVP (Offender Violence Predictor) score. Complete a brief review considering the justification for this cohort of prisoners being appropriately placed within the HSE. **Target date – Quarterly review.**	ALL HSE Prisons
3(b). Have robust quality assurance systems in place to ensure offender services are (1) delivered as they are intended (i.e. with integrity and as planned and designed) and (2) that they are effective	High Security Prisons Group will work closely with HSE prisons and Commissioning Strategies Group to **enable by November 2014** HSE prisons to have developed effective quality assurance processes for implementation which indicate whether the services, activity and interventions it provides are of an acceptable standard of quality and are having the impact they are intended to deliver. Information from these processes will be regularly reviewed by the senior management team and specific members of staff will be given responsibility for the QA processes and following through on actions identified in the reviews. **Lead HSPG [Regimes Manager & Lead Psychologist]**	HSPG led activity
4(b). Ensure the use of custodial capacity delivers the most cost-effective configuration of places and meets the MOJ's strategic	**To work constructively with PMU to ensure that our population profile is managed to achieve the outcomes required by the Reconfiguration Project which is currently in the detailed planning stages.** From the perspective of the HSE the main areas of high level evaluation are that the Category C prisoners currently held in Core Locals could be relocated to Category C prisons to be replaced by appropriately allocated Category B prisoners from elsewhere around the Prison	ALL HSE Prisons

requirements and the needs of co-commissioning and delivery partners whilst reducing cost.	Estate. This approach will also see a focus on ensuring appropriately risk assessed progressive moves from the HSE to non-HSE estate to ensure that HSE spaces are preserved for those prisoners presenting the highest risks of escape or to order and control.	
5(b). Information regarding individual needs and characteristics is used to adapt and sequence services to meet individual needs and maximise their benefit, and offenders are supported and encouraged to access appropriate services.	NOMS expects providers to take account of the specific needs and characteristics of individuals and that providers are able to evidence and articulate how they will ensure offenders are supported and encouraged to access appropriate services, with reference to: Learning Disability and Difficulty Physical health and disability Mental health Maturity, including capacity for taking responsibility for and understanding consequences of one's actions, and attitudes to risk taking Family circumstances (e.g. relationship breakdown, caring responsibilities, financial difficulties etc) Protected characteristics including: Gender, Sexual orientation, Race, Age, Faith, Gender re-assignment, Pregnancy and maternity Examples of how offender services should be tailored include adapting materials and interventions, adjusting communication style and adding resources such as targeted one to one support. As well as considering an individual's specific characteristics, providers will need to demonstrate that they are able to make any reasonable adjustments required by the law. Where reasonable adjustments require partnership working, co-commissioned approaches should be looked at. **With regard to the above establishments should develop a local Strategy document that details specifically how provision is made for each of the above criteria and identifies gaps in provision / areas for improvement that can then be included in the Local Equalities Action Plan and also potentially inform transition planning for the transfer of lead responsibility of Social Care to local authorities from April 2015. This must also**	

	include how local monitoring and management oversight is maintained. This should be published and available to staff and prisoners. **Target date – Quarterly review**	
6(a). Continue to identify, assess and manage extremist offenders by engaging with existing local structures and ensuring that training and -awareness is embedded among key staff groups. Ensure referral, where appropriate, to interventions, structured assessment and structured interventions and faith-based programmes according to offender risk and need.	• In relation to NOMS' approach to the identification, assessment and management of extremist offenders, all High Security Prisons will ensure delivery in the key thematic areas of Intelligence Gathering & Management; Offender Management and Public Protection; and Interventions & Resettlement. • All High Security Prisons will ensure that any recommendations related to the identification, assessment and management of extremist offenders which are identified in year are implemented within reasonable timescale. **Monitored Quarterly**	ALL HSE Prisons
6(c). Ensure the efficient use of prison places through development and implementation of local bail strategies and use of HDC for appropriate offenders,	To maximise the successful utilisation of BASS accommodation places for HDC and BAIL with progress monitored quarterly against the national BASS data set at QSLAM (Quarterly SLA review Meeting) **Target date – Quarterly review.** .	HMP Belmarsh HMP Manchester HMP Woodhill

including making full use of Bail Accommodation and Support Service.		
6(e). Support the delivery of efficiencies across the criminal justice system by increasing the use of prison video links.	To monitor prison video link utilisation and work to achieve an increase in its use compared with 2013-14. This approach may see increased engagement with Court User Group Meetings / Magistrates visits / variation in operating hours and stakeholder groups but may also consider other innovation that reduces cost and risks to security such as showcased by HMP Frankland when they were previously able to innovatively bring 'the court to the prison'. **Target date – Quarterly review.** In addition all HSE prisoners have been set the related objective to develop (or continue) a strategy for extending use of video conference facilities by (date) consistent with the NOMS Video Action Plan, ensuring that use is consistent with type of establishment and makes maximum usage of existing/planned facilities. (Named person) will be the establishment lead for the NOMS video action plan and will establish and maintain relationships with the relevant stakeholders.	ALL HSE Prisons

SECTION 5: ACCREDITED PROGRAMME PROVISION

A summary of the Accredited Programmes provided in the High Security Estate

Accredited Programmes Provided within the Region							
	PSP		**PMP**		**REGIONAL TOTAL**		
Name of accredited programme	**Number of agreed starts** (expected for 2014-15)	**Number of agreed completions** (planned total for 2014-15)	**Number of agreed starts** (expected for 2014-15)	**Number of agreed completions** (planned total for 2014-15)	**Number of agreed starts** (expected for 2014-15)	**Number of agreed completions** (planned total for 2014-15)	**Total National Volume (Completions)**
Programme Type: General							
Thinking Skills Programme **(TSP)**	380	342	0	0	380	342	3534
Total	380	342	0	0	380	342	**4366**
Programme Type: Violent							
Healthy Relationships Programme -High Intensity **(HRP-HI)**	16	14	0	0	16	14	137
Healthy Relationships Programme - Moderate Intensity **(HRP-MI)**	16	14	0	0	16	14	92
Chromis	34	32	0	0	34	32	32
RESOLVE	230	207	0	0	230	207	1472
Self Change Programme	35	32	0	0	35	32	174

Total	**331**	**299**	**0**	**0**	**331**	**299**	**2144**
Programme Type: Sex Offender Treatment Programme (nationally commissioned)							
Core Sex Offender Treatment Programme **(C-SOTP)**	36	34	0	0	36	34	613
Adapted Sex Offender Treatment Programme **(A-SOTP)** (Becoming New Me) **(BNM)**	16	14	0	0	16	14	92
Extended Sex Offender Treatment Programme **(E-SOTP)**	36	32	0	0	36	32	124
Healthy Sexual Functioning **(HSP)** Programme	12	12	0	0	12	12	43
Total	**100**	**92**	**0**	**0**	**100**	**92**	**963**
Grand Total	**431**	**391**	**0**	**0**	**431**	**391**	**7553**

SECTION 6: NOTICE OF CHANGE PROCESS

This section describes the process by which material changes to this SLA are agreed by HMPS and the Commissioner.

6.1 Discretionary Changes

6.1.1 Either Party may propose a discretionary change.

6.1.2 In the first instance, the Party proposing the discretionary change will discuss the proposal with the other Party.

6.1.3 If they wish to proceed, the Party proposing the discretionary change will then prepare a Notice of Change (NoC) accompanied, where appropriate, by a business case (a NoC template and business case template/checklist are provided at Annex A) for the consideration by the Parties and any relevant internal and external stakeholders .

6.1.4 In considering the proposed NoC, the Commissioner and/or HMPS and any relevant internal and external stakeholders may request further details or clarification to enable them to consider the proposed change.

6.1.5 The Party receiving the proposed NoC will respond to the Party proposing the change in an appropriate and timely way.

6.1.6 Having considered the responses the Commissioner will decide to:

- Amend the SLA to include the proposed change, or;
- Modify the proposed NoC, or;
- Let the proposal lapse and take no further action.

6.1.7 The Commissioner will inform HMPS and any relevant internal and external stakeholders of the decision taken.

6.1.8 Where, after consultation, HMPS believes that a change will have a detrimental effect upon its delivery of the SLA and/or will result in additional costs above and beyond those provided for by NOMS; it may use the issue resolution process set out in Section 10. In this case, HMPS must start the issue resolution process within 10 working days of being notified of the Commissioner's decision to approve a change.

6.2 Mandatory Changes

6.2.1 Where the Commissioner considers a change to be mandatory it will notify HMPS, clearly stating that the change is a mandatory change.

6.2.2 Any changes which the Commissioner states are mandatory changes must be implemented by HMPS. Mandatory changes do not require agreement by HMPS and must be implemented by HMPS immediately on notification or by the date specified.

6.2.3 Where the mandatory change is considered by the Commissioner to have

a material impact on the Service Requirements or the Annual Operating Price, the Notice of Change process will be used.

6.2.4 Where HMPS believes that a mandatory change will have a detrimental effect upon itself, its delivery of the SLA and/or will result in additional costs above and beyond the Annual Operating Price, it may use the issues resolution process as set out in Section 10. In this case, HMPS must start the issue resolution process within 10 days of being notified of a mandatory change.

6.2.5 Whilst the issues resolution process is taking place, HMPS will still be required to comply with the requirements of the Mandatory Change.

6.3 Documenting changes

6.3.1 Both Parties will maintain a register of all NoCs issued, together with their outcomes and a summary of all changes agreed to the Service Requirements and/or the Annual Operating Price for audit trail purposes.

6.3.2 Where required, the Commissioner will be responsible for issuing updated and/or amended SLA documentation (in some cases it may suffice to append a signed copy of an agreed NoC to this SLA).

SECTION 7: RESPONSIBILITIES, TERMS & CONDITIONS

7.1 Responsibilities

7.1.1 HMPS agrees to provide the Services in accordance with the terms of this SLA.

7.1.2 In delivering the requirements of this SLA, HMPS shall comply with all relevant legislation, statutory and regulatory requirements (and any subsequent amendments, additions or deletions to such), and all mandatory content in applicable Prison Service Instructions

7.1.3 In delivering the requirements of this SLA, HMPS agrees to co-operate fully with NOMS to exchange experiences and good practices.

7.1.4 If, at any time after the commencement of this SLA, HMPS believes that it will not be able to meet the Service Requirements for whatever reason, it shall notify the Commissioner as soon as possible, providing details of the issue. Any material changes required as a result of the issue will be managed in accordance with the Notice of Change process set out at Section 6.

7.2 Delivery partners

7.2.1 HMPS shall work with the local community and with the voluntary and community sector, social enterprises, faith groups, private and statutory organisations and agencies and, in Wales, the Welsh Assembly Government, as well as national statutory partners to achieve the requirements of this SLA and to further both NOMS objectives and the

objectives of partners.

7.2.2 HMPS may sub-contract another organisation to deliver the Services as specified in the Establishment Local Annex. Restricted probation services and restricted services to the courts cannot, under legislation, be sub-contracted to non-public sector organisations. HMPS will remain accountable for the delivery of any sub-contracted Services and must notify the Commissioner of any delivery partners, under sub-contracting or other arrangements.

7.2.3 HMPS shall work to meet any requirements and obligations agreed and supported by the Commissioner under joint working arrangements with NOMS partners and providers of probation services (other than the Secretary of State.) This includes the sharing of information.

7.2.4 The Establishment will support the delivery of projects funded by the European Social Fund.

7.3 Service Definition

7.3.1 HMPS will deliver the outcomes and outputs in the applicable Service Specifications listed in the Establishment Local Annex. HMPS will deliver these services in accordance with the NOMS Statement of Vision and Values and subject to the Annual Operating Price.

7.3.2 As Service Specifications are introduced or updated, they will be introduced into the SLA though the Notice of Change process, except where the change introduced by the Service Specification(s) is not material.

7.3.3 HMPS will meet the SLA Delivery Requirement Levels set following negotiations with the Commissioner and documented on the NOMS Performance Hub.

7.3.4 Where there is a need to make material changes to the Service Requirements, HMPS and Commissioner will follow the Notice of Change process set out in Section Six. Such changes will reflect NOMS requirements and priorities, as well as any agreed recommendations arising from audit and inspection reports.

7.4 Audit, Assurance and Risk Management

7.4.1 The Establishment shall fully co-operate with any audits or reviews initiated by the Commissioner and provide evidence that any review findings are being addressed.

7.4.2 The Commissioner will, where possible, provide HMPS and the Establishment with reasonable notice of any audit or inspection it intends to initiate, but reserves the right to arrange for an audit or inspection to be conducted on any area at any time without prior notice.

7.4.3 Where any investigation is undertaken by a person or body empowered to

conduct such investigation and/or proceedings, HMPS shall:

- Provide any information requested in the timescale allotted;
- Attend and permit members of the Establishment's staff to attend any meetings as required;
- Allow itself and any member of the Establishment's staff to appear as witnesses in any ensuing proceedings;
- Co-operate fully and promptly in every way required by the person or body conducting such investigation during the course of that investigation and/or proceedings; and
- Ensure that its sub-contractors (including sub-contractors of any tier) fulfil the above responsibilities.

SECTION 8: MANAGING THE SLA

8.1 SLA Review Process

8.1.1 The SLA Review Process will be a proportionate review of delivery against this SLA and will be conducted in a manner and at a frequency determined by the Commissioner, largely relying on HMPS's internal assurance information and processes. Findings from the SLA Review Process will be made available to HMPS and may be shared with any relevant internal or external stakeholders.

8.1.2 Any formal meeting between the Commissioner and HMPS convened as part of the SLA Review Process shall be scheduled in advance wherever possible and both Parties will have the opportunity to involve others if necessary to ensure that issues can be addressed.

8.1.3 In addition to the aforementioned SLA Review Process, the Commissioner and HMPS shall agree, as necessary, meetings and visits to any site where Services are provided. This schedule may be reviewed and revised to reflect changes in HMPS's delivery against the SLA.

8.1.4 The Commissioner shall have access at all reasonable times to information pertaining to SLA delivery. In addition, HMPS shall support reasonable requests from the Commissioner for information about the Services as required from time to time, and shall despatch promptly to the Commissioner all other relevant information, including, but not limited to, first drafts of the following reports:

- Performance reports, including audit reports
- Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons reports
- Prison and Probation Ombudsman reports
- Reports by the Office of the Surveillance Commissioner
- Reports by the Interception of Communications Commissioner's Office
- Any other reports into serious operational failures

8.1.5 HMPS will provide service cost information through the INview costing system (supported by MyDetail and Phoenix).

8.2 SLA Delivery Issues and Failures

8.2.1 In the first instance, the Commissioner and HMPS will seek to resolve any issues that may arise through bipartite discussion at the lowest appropriate level.

8.2.2 If an issue cannot be resolved at the lowest appropriate level between Commissioner and HMPS it shall be escalated to line managers. If the issue is not resolved by escalation then it shall be managed in accordance with the Issues Resolution process detailed in Section Ten of this SLA.

8.2.3 Where the Commissioner is not satisfied with the actions taken by HMPS in response to identified delivery issues and/or failures, or it considers the issues and/or failures to be of a serious nature, it may use the Issues Resolution Process detailed in Section 10.

8.2.4 Without prejudice to any improvement action that may be under way under this agreement, NOMS reserves the right to take more immediate performance improvement action where serious deficiencies are identified or there is a repetition of the same issues.

8.2.5 Sustained failure to deliver could ultimately result in the Commissioner ceasing to commission the services at the Establishment from HMPS.

8.2.6 NOMS may take into consideration the performance of the Establishment from periods prior to the term of this SLA.

SECTION 9: FINANCIAL PROTOCOL

9.1 Financial Framework

9.1.1 HMPS shall meet the requirements of the delegated financial authority issued to the Governor on behalf of the NOMS CEO and comply with the requirements of HM Treasury's "Managing Public Money" document and NOMS financial controls and frameworks.

9.2 Principles of the Annual Operating Price and Funding Arrangements

9.2.1 The Annual Operating Price for this agreement will be the sum of the annual operating prices outlined in each local establishment annex for this region. Where the Annual Operating Price is subject to change which does not affect the delivery of the Service Requirements in this SLA, no Notice of Change is necessary.

9.2.2 The Establishment will receive funding for the financial year from NOMS, subject to the delegated financial authority issued to the Governing Governor on behalf of the NOMS Chief Executive.

SECTION 10: ISSUES RESOLUTION

10.1 Issues Resolution Process

10.1.1 The Parties shall seek to work together to resolve any issues (including any failure to agree a matter) that may arise under this SLA at the lowest appropriate level in a timely way, having regard for the objectives of NOMS. If an issue cannot be resolved at this level it shall be escalated to line managers.

10.1.2 If the Parties are unable to resolve an issue through line managers, either Party may invoke this process by notifying the other in writing and notifying the Secretary to the NOMS Commissioning and Commercial Sub-Committee

10.1.3 The Issue Resolution Process must be carried out in a timely manner, starting with an Issue Report, prepared by the Party which invoked the process, setting out:

- Name of the originator;
- Date the issue was first raised;
- Description of the issue (including any relevant evidence and history of similar problems);
- The implications of the issue, its severity and the degree of urgency;
- An estimate of the current and potential cost of the issue; and
- Work being undertaken to resolve the issue.

10.1.4 Within 10 working days of invoking the process, the Party which invoked the process will share the Issue Report with the other Party, who may add any additional comments to it before it is submitted to the NOMS Commissioning and Commercial Sub-Committee.

10.1.5 If a resolution is not achieved at the NOMS Commissioning and Commercial Sub-Committee, the matter will be referred to the NOMS Executive Management Committee for a final and binding decision.

10.1.6 For the avoidance of doubt, the rights and responsibilities of the Parties shall not cease due to any issue.

Annex A: Notice of Change and Business Case templates

NOTICE OF CHANGE (NoC)

Issued by: [Insert: Commissioner or Provider details]

In respect of: [name of Establishment]

Date of Issue:

Ref No: [Insert: Unique reference number in a format agreed by Commissioner and the Provider]

Title & Issue [Provide a relevant title for the **NoC** (including details of the subject and applicable date/period), a brief headline/outline description of the change proposed and state whether or not this NoC is mandatory. Where the **NoC** relates to a change of **SLA Delivery Requirement Level** this should be made clear and this document copied to Performance and Analysis Group]	
Change Required [Please provide full details of the proposed change(s) or refer to an attached document including the date from which it will be implemented.]	
Financial Implications: VALUE: £ In-year figure (£): n/a (assuming implemented on date specified above) Full year costs (£): n/a	[Please provide full details of the financial implications or refer to an attached document.]
Outcomes	[Please provide full details of the outcomes expected or refer to an attached document.]
Quality Implications:	[Please provide full details of quality implications]
Regional Implications:	[Please provide full details of any impact this proposed change would have at a regional level]

Issued		**Approved**	
Date:		Date:	
Signed:		Signed:	
Name:		Name:	
Position:		Position:	

Business Case template / checklist

Issue [Background to and purpose, including NOMS or sponsor for the change.]
Timing [Including any lead in time, details if implementation is to be phased.]
Cost [Any estimated cost implication.]
Scope of Work [The issue being considered including the provision of defined deliverables and timescales (what is to be delivered by when) - include the provision of any breakdown of goods and services to be provided including how its delivery is to be managed (contingency plan).]
Benefits [The benefits to be obtained (financial, intangible, skills transfer) and an assessment of the benefits against the cost of the project.]
Considerations [How implementation will be handled; the risks of not proceeding; other options that have been considered; availability of funding and approval.]
Special Issues [Any special issues for consideration.]