

Annual Report of the Interagency Group for a Fairer and Safer Ireland,

2020

November 2021

Dear Minister McEntee,

I have pleasure in presenting you with the annual report for 2020 of the Interagency Group for a Fairer and Safer Ireland.

The main purpose of the Group is to implement two key recommendations of the Penal Policy Review Group Report (*July 2014 Report of the Strategic Review of Penal Policy* (www.justice.ie/penalpolicy), which call for much greater cross-government cooperation in the management and rehabilitation of offenders and crime prevention in general.

This report outlines the work the Interagency Group undertook during 2020.

Progress continued during 2020 to improve access by offenders to the public services they need on release to increase their likelihood of social conformity. The Covid-19 pandemic presented particular challenges for the Irish Prison Service (IPS), both in protecting prisoners from infection and in safely releasing offenders to the community. The success of the IPS in preventing infection within the prison estate is a remarkable achievement and a credit to all concerned. The cooperation between the Prison Service, the Department of Housing and the local authorities in finding accommodation for homeless offenders released from prison during the pandemic was exemplary and provides a model for tackling the problems facing homeless offenders. The cooperation of the IPS and the HSE in protecting the health of offenders before and after release throughout the year was also excellent.

In its report, the Group draws attention to the need to build an evidence base of the social, economic and educational profile of offenders and their outcomes to provide a basis for more effective interagency cooperation to reintegrate offenders and reduce crime. The CSO has published pioneering work in this respect which needs to be built on. There is much we could learn from other countries about how to capture and share information for this purpose. Interagency coordination remains hampered by the absence of a unique identifier of offenders across criminal justice agencies and the absence of data sharing arrangements across all agencies with responsibilities for offenders on release.

As I step down from the Chair of the Interagency Group, I would like to thank the members of the Interagency Group for their commitment to improving cross government cooperation in relation to offenders and penal policy. I would like to thank the officials of the Department of Justice who support the work of the Interagency Group and the secretaries of the Group over the past five years in particular – Keith Lynn, Chrystele Brunet-Lee, Aaron Murphy and Timothy Hurley. May I wish my successor as Chair, John O’Callaghan, Deputy Secretary of the Department of Justice, every success in continuing the work of interagency cooperation to increase social conformity among offenders and to reduce crime.



Ruth Barrington PhD
Chair
March 2021

Contents

1. Context	
1.1. Background	5
1.2. Rationale for Group	6
2. Working Methods	
2.1. Representation on the Group	12
2.2. Meetings	12
2.3. Terms of Reference	12
3. Work Programme 2020	14
4. Report for 2020	
4.1 Issues dealt with by the Group	16
4.2 Research Proposals	19
4.3 Improving Interagency Co-ordination	26

Appendices

Appendix A - Membership of Interagency Group for a Fairer & Safer Ireland.	29
Appendix B - Attendance at meetings of Interagency Group for a Fairer & Safer Ireland.	30

1 Context

1.1 Background to the Establishment of the Interagency Group

The Penal Policy Review Group (PPRG) conducted a wide ranging strategic review of penal policy, taking into account relevant work already carried out in this jurisdiction and elsewhere, the rights of those convicted of crimes, the perspective of those who are victims of crime, and the interests of society in general.

The PPRG advocated an approach to crime and the penal system which emphasised rehabilitation and advocated for an improved penal system, the reduction of reliance on imprisonment as a sanction, and an increased focus on alternatives to prison. A strong thread running through all of its recommendations is the need to see the wider social context of offending, and to ensure that the work of the criminal justice agencies is integrated with social services, broadly conceived.

The Government endorsed the Penal Policy Review Group recommendations in 2014.

An Implementation Oversight Group (IOG) was established to oversee implementation of the Penal Policy Review Group's recommendations. The Group is chaired by Dr. Mary Rogan, Associate Professor, School of Law, Trinity College who was a member of the Review Group. The Group submits Implementation Reports to the Minister every six months for publication.

The two key recommendations of the Review Group Report relevant to the work of the Interagency Group are recommendations 3 and 41 below. These recommendations promote inter agency and inter departmental cooperation, on the basis that crime is a matter of social as well as penal policy.

Recommendation 3

The Review Group recommends that there must be greater emphasis, if necessary through legislation, on promoting inter-agency cooperation in the management and rehabilitation of offenders. In addition to the criminal justice agencies, there is a need to recognise that a whole-of Government approach is required in collaboration with relevant agencies and local authorities in addressing offending behaviour and assisting offenders in maintaining crime free lives.

Recommendation 41

The Review Group recognises that crime is a question of social as well as penal policy and recommends that all Government departments and agencies consider the question of crime prevention when formulating policy. In this regard, the Review Group recommends that the Department of Justice and Equality join with all Government Departments and agencies to facilitate and support research in order to assist in the formulation of penal policy.

1.2 Rationale for the establishment of the Interagency Group

The rationale for the Interagency Group is that crime is a challenge for all of society and requires a whole-of-society response. Crime is associated with many social problems such as economic deprivation, unemployment, low levels of educational achievement and substance

misuse. Society suffers as a result of crime and everyone has an interest in preventing crime; it is not just the responsibility of criminal justice agencies.

The socio-economic factors which may be involved when someone goes to jail are the same factors which need to be addressed when he or she comes out of prison. That is to say, many people convicted of criminal offences have similar characteristics and deficits, which have contributed to their offending, and issues that are likely to inhibit them leading lives free of crime and predispose them to re-offending.

For example, a significant percentage of those in prison or on probation are low income, unemployed, with low levels of educational achievement, and many are relatively young men, with histories of substance misuse. Homeless people, those with mental illness and also members of the Traveller community are also considerably over-represented in the prison and probation populations.

The number of committals to prison, of both prisoners on remand and those who have been sentenced, demonstrates the scale of the challenge to public bodies of facilitating successful reintegration of prisoners into society and reducing recidivism. The table below provided by the Irish Prison Service shows the size of the prison population and the through-put of the prison system in recent years. The provisional figures for 2020 show that there was a dramatic reduction of more than 2,500 in the number of offenders committed to prison last year compared with 2019. This reduction may be related to the Covid-19 pandemic and associated delays in prosecutions and in the courts. It remains to be seen if the figures for 2020 are an aberration or the acceleration of an earlier trend.

The trend demonstrated in the table below since 2010 is of a significant fall in the number of people committed to prison, it is notable that in recent years, the total number of prisoners released was less than those committed. If the number of committals to prison returns to a more normal pattern, the trend of more committals than releases raises concerns about a possible return to overcrowding in prisons and the possibility of prisoners being released at short notice without the agreed protocols being followed.

TOTAL COMMITTALS INTO AND RELEASES FROM PRISONS

Year	Total Committals	Total Releases
2020	6,340	6,682
2019	8,939	8,656
2018	8,071	7,811
2017	9,287	9,313
2016	15,099	15,205
2015	17,206	17,403
2014	16,155	16,662
2013	15,735	15,905
2012	17,026	17,052
2011	17,318	17,358
2010	17,179	16,922

Source: Irish Prison Service

DAILY AVERAGE NUMBER OF PRISONERS IN CUSTODY

The table below provides figures in relation to the daily average number of prisoners in custody over recent years. The overall daily average number of prisoners in custody in 2020 was 3,824, compared to 3,971 in 2019, a decrease of 3.7%. The average number of female offenders in custody was 148, a 12.9% decrease on the 2019 average of 170.

Year	Average Daily Population
2020	3,824
2019	3,971
2018	3,893
2017	3,680
2016	3,718
2015	3,722
2014	3,915
2013	4,158
2012	4,318

2011	4,390
2010	4,290

OFFENDERS SUPERVISED BY THE PROBATION SERVICE

The figures for offenders supervised by the Probation Service show a trend of increasing numbers in recent years, with a significant reduction in 2020 associated with the restrictions of the Covid-19 pandemic.

Year	Total offenders dealt with in year*	Total offenders referred from courts
2020	15,537	6,661
2019	16,607	9,009
2018	15,777	8,105
2017	15,269	7,799

* This includes offenders being dealt with at the beginning of the year in addition to new referrals made during the year.

REOFFENDING AMONG OFFENDERS

Valuable information about the population of offenders is provided by the CSO's studies of recidivism or reoffending. The latest data in relation to recidivism rates for offenders who were given a custodial sentence or community sanction is contained in the sixth set of recidivism studies published by the Central Statistics Office (CSO) in August 2020 and November 2020.

The studies report on:

- Prison Recidivism which provides information on offenders who were released from a custodial prison sentence from 2014 to 2017. A summary of the findings are set out below.
- Probation Recidivism which provides information on the level of recorded re-offending by individuals placed under the management of the Probation Service. The latest study primarily relates to individuals who entered the Probation Service in 2016. The findings of this are set out below.

Prisoner reoffending

Prison re-offending estimates are calculated using data provided by the Irish Prisons Service and An Garda Síochána's PULSE reporting system. This latest publication introduced greater clarity in analysis of prisoner re-offending in Ireland by providing separate data on re-offending rates for prisoners released from custody, and for those who receive what is known as a "Fine sentence" (persons who receive a fine following a court appearance, and who may serve a custodial sentence if the fine is not paid). This publication also introduced a shorter time period for measurement of re-offending (one-year rate) to provide a more timely understanding of re-offending in Ireland.

Of prisoners released from custody in 2014, 55% were linked to a re-offending incident within three years of their release. The data also indicate that younger age groups of released prisoners are much more likely to re-offend, with almost 80% of released prisoners aged less than 21 at the time of entering prison re-offending within three years of release. In contrast, just 29.5% of prisoners who were over 50 years old re-offended within three years of release.

Re-offending rates are falling over time whether one looks at three year or one year windows for re-offending following release from custody. A little more than 40% of prisoners released in 2017 re-offended within one year of release, compared to just over 46% of prisoners released in 2011 who re-offended within one year of release.

There is a small difference in re-offending rates between males and females. Although the vast majority of released prisoners in 2014 were male (93%), slightly more females re-offended within three years (58.3%) than males (55%).

Probation Reoffending

The Probation Recidivism study reported that almost a third (31.1%) of offenders managed by the Probation Service re-offended within a year. Probation re-offending rates are remaining relatively static over time, with 28% of 2013 probationers re-offending within one year, compared to 31.1% of 2016 probationers who re-offended in one year.

In the most recent cohort for which a three-year re-offending rate is available (2014), almost half (47.2%) of individuals committed at least one re-offence for which they received a conviction. Males (30.3%) remain marginally more likely to re-offend than females (30.0%) within one year of entering probation in 2016.

There is an inverse relationship between age and re-offending rates. Persons aged under 18 (45.6%) are more than twice as likely to reoffend than those aged over 65 (21.7%). Data for 2016 indicate that the level of re-offending is higher among individuals sentenced to a Probation Order (34.1%) than those sentenced to a Community Service Order (28.3%) or those under Post Release Supervision Order (15.9%).

The highest proportion of re-offending within one year is among individuals who were initially placed into probation as a result of Theft (39.1%) or Public Order related offences (37.5%). In contrast individuals who were placed under the supervision of the Probation Service for Sexual offences (10.2%) were least likely to re-offend within a year of receiving a probation order. Half (50.6%) of probation re-offenders within one year received a custodial sanction for their re-offending offence.

Limitations of Recidivism reports

In presentations to the Interagency Group, CSO representatives have drawn attention to the limitations of their reports on recidivism. The absence of a shared identification system in the criminal justice system makes it time consuming and resource intensive to track individuals from the Pulse system used by An Garda Síochána, through the Courts Service and on conviction, to the Irish Prison Service and the Probation Service. It is not possible to track an estimated 5 per cent of offenders.

Limited information is collected about the profile of those who reoffend or those who do not reoffend. As part of its data holdings, the CSO has access to and use of other administrative datasets such as those of the Department of Social Protection, Revenue, Education and other

agencies and departments. It also has access to mortality data from the General Registry Office, the Geo-directory and Census data. Other information which would be useful in predicting the risk of recidivism before or at the time of incarceration include; age at first offence, prior arrests, family status, health status and education level. The addition of these variables could be used to enrich the existing prison and probation datasets to provide a better understanding of the factors that predispose offenders to reoffend or conversely, to lead a crime free life. They would also draw attention to the cross government nature of the responses needed to reduce recidivism and crime.

In this respect, the Interagency Group welcomed the initiative by the CSO to publish a 'frontiers series' report in October 2020 on the employment, education and other outcomes for offenders who were recorded in the prison census of 2016 for whom the CSO could link data from other sources. Of those offenders, 60% were neither in employment nor education and less than 10% were in substantial employment by 2019. Of those in substantial employment, the median weekly earnings was €350 compared with €593 for all PAYE earners. The highest educational level of 57% of these offenders was junior certificate. Almost 80% of those offenders who were neither in employment nor education were in receipt of social welfare payments, principally working age income support, disability/carers support or supplementary payments.

The report highlights how marginalised a population offenders are and the importance of good data to the design of interagency interventions to divert offenders and people at risk of offending from crime. The CSO has published this 'frontier series' report with caveats but it points the way to value of establishing a comprehensive, reliable and regular analysis of the profile and outcomes of offenders.

ACCESS TO SERVICES

By definition, offenders can experience resistance, delays and even rejection in trying to access mainstream services. As a result, from a very practical point of view, their level of risk of reoffending can be unwittingly increased. Clearly, criminal justice services - prison and probation - have a responsibility to do what they can to facilitate reintegration, by virtue of their specific roles, responsibilities, experience, and expertise. However, they can only go so far: to address some of the issues that have a significant impact on the risk of reoffending - e.g. homelessness, unemployment, addiction, and mental illness - the cooperation of the relevant Government departments and agencies is required.

Therefore, there is a clear need to have joined-up services, including improved information sharing and operational co-operation to achieve optimal impact on reducing offending and victimisation in our communities.

A key role played by the Interagency Group is to raise awareness among its members from Government departments and agencies of the implications of policy and services on the reintegration and rehabilitation of offenders and the prevention of crime and of the need to adapt or coordinate those policies/services to facilitate reintegration and reduce recidivism.

2 Working Methods

2.1 Representation on the Interagency Group

The Interagency Group consists of representatives of the main Departments and agencies with responsibilities for the management and rehabilitation of offenders. The membership of the Interagency Group in 2020 is included at Appendix A.

2.2 Meetings

In 2020 the Group met four times on the following dates: 11 March, 10 June, 17 September and 9 December. All but the 11th March meeting were held via Zoom due to restrictions on in-person meetings necessitated by the outbreak of Covid-19. In total, to the end of 2020, the Group has held 18 meetings. A table of those Departments/agencies attendance at the 2020 meetings is attached at Appendix B.

The Pathways to Reintegration subgroup met twice in 2019 on the following dates: 4 March and 29 May (this meeting was held by Zoom due to Covid-19 restrictions). In total, to the end of 2020, this subgroup had held five meetings. The Group also set up a subgroup to discuss issues arising from the letter of 27 March 2020 from Gurchand Singh, Chief Information Officer, to the Group's Chair in response to the proposals from the Interagency Group for research projects to be supported by the Department of Justice's research and information fund. This Research Subgroup held a meeting on 2 September 2020.

2.3 Terms of Reference

The following are the terms of reference of the Group:

The mission of the Interagency Group on Cooperation for a Fairer and Safer Ireland is to improve interdepartmental and interagency coordination in the integration and rehabilitation of offenders and the prevention of crime as recommended by the Report of the Penal Policy Strategic Review Group.

To this end, the Interagency Group will:

1. Review existing pathways that involve interagency coordination and cooperation to improve the integration and rehabilitation of offenders;
2. Based on this review, propose improved interagency coordination arrangements for the integration and rehabilitation of offenders;
- 3 Promote pro-social behaviour by offenders, to those most at risk of offending and anti-social behaviour, which results in positive participation in society.
4. Recommend how the consideration of crime prevention could be incorporated in the formulation and implementation of public sector penal and social policies.
5. Consider how fairness and greater equality could be achieved in the areas of penal and social policy in relation to crime prevention issues.

6. Identify where research and data collation could assist in greater integration across the Public Service in terms of the rehabilitation of offenders and the formulation and impact of penal policy.

3. Work Programme 2020

The work programme for 2020 agreed by the Interagency Group is set out below, linked to the Group's terms of reference.

1. Review existing pathways that involve interagency coordination and cooperation to improve the integration and rehabilitation of offenders.

In 2020, the Group will continue to identify where interagency cooperation can improve the effectiveness of the pathways for the integration and rehabilitation of offenders. It will facilitate agreement among the agencies involved through reviews of successful interagency initiatives and proposed initiatives and, through discussion and analysis, encourage alignment of policy and service objectives.

The Group will continue to focus on encouraging solutions to blockages in existing pathways and agree new pathways among the relevant agencies which improve the integration and rehabilitation of offenders.

2. Based on this review, propose improved interagency coordination arrangements for the integration and rehabilitation of offenders.

The work of the Group to date suggests that interagency cooperation could be enhanced to ensure that offenders, on release from prison, have an identity for the purposes of accessing relevant and needed public services, have better access to accommodation, to medical care for on-going conditions, particularly continuity of care regarding mental health issues and to training/employment opportunities. The Group will recommend steps that could be taken to improve access to these services.

The Group aims to specifically focus on access to the public services card in order to ensure that all prisoners can access related public services on their release from prison. The Group also aims to focus on employment related issues such as job seekers protocol, disability benefit and employment opportunities.

The Group also aims to continue to focus on the issue of medical cards to eligible offenders on release from prison. This includes the monitoring of procedures currently in place in the IPS with a view to improving procedures for applying pre-release and maintaining access to medical cards post release for eligible prisoners.

3 Promote pro-social behaviour, which results in a positive participation in society.

The Interagency Group has noted the success of the Community Return Programme in promoting better social behaviour among prisoners before release from prison and their positive participation in society after release.

The Group will examine initiatives involving interagency cooperation in other jurisdictions, which could improve social behaviour and the positive participation of offenders in society and make recommendations where appropriate.

4. Recommend how the consideration of crime prevention could be incorporated in the formulation and implementation of public sector penal and social policies.

The Group will examine ways in which cross-sectoral issues are handled nationally and in other jurisdictions to identify an effective model for incorporating crime prevention in the

formulation and implementation of penal and social policies and make recommendations accordingly.

Based on the evidence of the importance of family life to the reintegration and rehabilitation of offenders, the Group will continue to focus on strengthening & maintaining family links for prisoners. The Group will pay particular attention to how interagency cooperation could strengthen offenders' engagement in family life, both in prison and on release.

5. Consider how fairness and greater equality could be achieved in the areas of penal and social policy in relation to crime prevention issues.

The Group will review existing policies and practices in crime prevention from the perspective of fairness and equality and identify where interagency cooperation could achieve greater fairness and equality in crime prevention.

The Group will focus on accommodation related issues and their importance to fairness, equality and crime prevention. This includes focussing on implementation of a housing protocol between relevant services including the IPS, monitoring and contributing to Housing First Policy which is being developed and which aims to provide housing and provision of wrap around services support services for prisoners with special needs on release.

The Group will continue to monitor and engage with relevant services regarding continuity of medical care pre and post release, particularly in relation to those suffering from mental illness.

6. Identify where research and data collation could assist in greater integration across the Public Service in terms of the rehabilitation of offenders and the formulation and impact of penal policy.

The Group will continue to review existing research and data on the rehabilitation of offenders and the formulation and impact of penal policy and recommend where, from an interagency perspective, further research and data are required to underpin policy and to monitor implementation of service initiatives in the rehabilitation of offenders and the impact of penal policy.

The Group specifically aims to examine the following areas in detail, recidivism studies, crime prevention & reduction programmes and longitudinal studies of offenders post release with a view to collaborate with the Department of Justice in respect of their Data and Research Strategy and including proposals from the Group in the Departments call for research proposals.

4. Report for 2020

4.1 Issues dealt with by the Group

All agencies were particularly concerned in 2020 to assist the Irish Prison Service ensure that offenders released from prison were not put at risk of contracting Covid-19 and that offenders who were homeless were offered accommodation, medical cards (if eligible) and income support on release

Healthcare

The Irish Prison Service's approach to the Covid-19 outbreak was celebrated by the Group, and has been recognised internationally as best practice in terms of infection control. Hugely aware of the risk, the IPS implemented infectious control measures which would have been in place for a TB or SARS outbreak. A good stock of PPE was also available due to being infection control ready. IPS worked with the Department of Justice and the Department of Health on implementing screening controls (including temperatures) in and out of Prisons and Courts. As of 31st December there were 24 positive cases in the prison population.

Fourteen day quarantine measures were put in place for new committals, however IPS put in place systems within each prison to carry out in-house swabbing. 28 nurses completed the train the trainer swabbing course and disseminated this information back to the other nurses in the prisons, enabling a large cohort of nurses to be competent in swabbing. Elderly/vulnerable prisoners were cocooned and managed separately from the general population. Red Cross volunteers, teachers, counsellors and staff worked together to produce a weekly newsletter for those isolating which received a warm response from the prison population. This led to compliance with restrictions and no unrest, unlike in other countries' prison environments. Misinformation in the media about claims that prisoners were infected with the virus was clarified with the HSE as referring to staff who contracted the virus in the community. This clarification helped maintain the trust and confidence of prisoners.

National training and standard/guidance for contact tracing were mobilised between HSE, IPS and RCSI which led to contact tracing commencing within 20/30 minutes. This was achieved by tracing an officer or prisoner who was symptomatic of Covid-19 symptoms through their full shift using the cameras and identifying the transmission risks among the population.

A publication with Journal of Public Health documenting the IPS approach to COVID-19 was published and well received. The WHO also reviewed the practices of IPS and recommended it as best practice.

The Prison Service introduced temporary release measures to provide for social distancing within the prison estate. The IPS adopted a staged approach to reducing the prison capacity by granting temporary release for those with sentences shorter than 6-12 months who were assessed as low risk. Some releases were via the Community Return scheme which involved the support of a keyworker and adherence to strict conditions. The IPS achieved an 11% reduction of the prison population from March to May 2020 through a structured and carefully considered temporary release programme.

Medical Cards

Acquiring a medical card prior to release from prison is important for many offenders with medical conditions who do not have the means to pay medical and pharmacy bills. It is a vital mechanism for continuity of care, providing support to maintain medical regimes commenced in prison on return to the community, supporting stability and reducing the risk of re-offending. The application process to the HSE for all applicants is complex and can be particularly challenging for prisoners. A pilot Medical Card scheme to encourage prisoners to apply for a card in preparation for their release, which began in 2018 in Cork prison in cooperation with the HSE, was extended to all prisons in 2019. This initiative continued in the first quarter of 2020, and the Irish Prison Service encouraged offenders to re-engage with the national medical card unit in order to retain their medical card beyond 3 months post release, particularly in the context of the Covid-19 outbreak. A total of 729 medical card applications were granted in 2020.

Income support/ Training and Employment

Income support is vital for offenders on release from prison as they begin the process of reintegration. The Group was informed during 2019 of the decision of the Department of Employment Affairs and Social Protection to withdraw its community welfare officers from the larger prisons. Community welfare officers played an important role in providing offenders with temporary income on release and linking them with the job seeker support services of the DEASP. Procedures were put in place by the DEASP to allow persons on release with a temporary public services card to withdraw their first payment at any office and then have it registered to the office nearest their home. These arrangements should allow prisoners to access the income support they need in their first day in the community, and to cope with the difficult few days post-release that have been identified as a weak point in the reintegration process.

No discernible issues were encountered with the new arrangements around the temporary public services card during 2020. However, the Group was informed that payments worked better when there were Community Welfare Officers in prisons. Now prisoners leave prison and often do not always call to the nearest INTREO centre to collect their social welfare payment. However, the arrangements between INTREO offices that allow offenders to collect their payment at the office nearest their release location and the one in their home area are working. A disadvantage of this approach is that there is no way of recording who leaves prison and who collects the payment, as these persons do not have to disclose that they are coming from prison.

Of all prisoners released up to March 2020, 687 prisoners engaged with employment and training services, including IASIO, and 143 went into a community employment scheme, of which 34 transitioned into paid employment.

Social Enterprise and Employment

The Group welcomed the publication of *Working to Change*, the Department of Justice's Social Enterprise and Employment Strategy, in November 2020. While the overarching theme of *Working to Change* is increasing access to employment opportunities for people with criminal convictions, it sets out a total of 46 inter-connected actions under three strategic areas of focus: (1) social enterprise employment options; (2) general employment options and (3) entrepreneurship. While the strategy is led by the Department of Justice, the actions are aligned with a number of other national and international policies, signifying that in order to

address crime and create safer communities, the importance of multiple agencies needing to work collaboratively and learning from each other.

Accommodation

The impact of Covid-19 temporary releases on accommodation for the offenders involved was discussed between colleagues in the Medical Card Unit of the HSE, the Department of Social Protection, the IPS and the Department of Housing with efforts made to predict which offenders might need housing services and to allow local authorities to be notified.

The IPS predicted that 37 people would require homeless services between March and April 2020. As part of the efforts to manage the release of homeless offenders carefully, IPS commenced daily reports to the Department of Housing of prisoners who had declared their risk of homelessness. The IPS increased the number of resettlement coordinators by 8 via redeployment of other IASIO staff and these resettlement coordinators worked with prisoners and single points of contact in the local authority to smooth the transition from custody to the community.

By the end of April 2020, the IPS had released 50 people seeking housing supports of which 30 had Dublin addresses. The Department of Housing and local authorities worked with resettlement coordinators to identify housing solutions for individual offenders. However, even with this level of support some prisoners choose not to take the support offered. In one case of a vulnerable female, the local authority offered several possible options but the person refused to engage and did not show up to take arranged accommodation. She had completed her sentence in full and there was no further assistance that the IPS could offer. Individuals cannot be forced to accept their release plan when their sentence is complete.

A report in early May 2020 by the IPS identified 262 offenders due for release between May and the end of June, of which 41 (6%) declared a risk of homelessness, 18 of which were Dublin based. This information was communicated to the Department of Housing for onward transmission to the local authorities. Resettlement Coordinators liaised between the relevant local authority and each prisoner affected to make the best effort to find a housing solution. The IPS continued to build on their excellent relationship with Dublin City Council, who found accommodation for 25 offenders between March and June 2020.

An issue that was brought to the attention of the Group was the issue of accommodation for prisoners on remand when they are released by the court. The IPS do not currently have this data and therefore are unable to alert the relevant local authority of a risk of homelessness.

Mental Health

Mental health and healthcare remains an area of concern for the Group. The new Central Mental Hospital (CMH) facility, which is scheduled to open in 2021, will provide limited additional beds and is unlikely to impact much on the need for specialised mental healthcare for prisoners. The Group was informed that there are a significant number of prisoners with acute mental health needs whom the IPS considers should be treated in dedicated mental healthcare facilities. In supporting this new facility the IPs, in collaboration with IASIO, have created a new dedicated role for a Training & Employment Officer to work full-time in the new CMH. Set against the background of the pandemic and strained resources, this is an area that needs specific action.

The Group welcomed the new Government's commitment to establish a high-level and cross-departmental/cross-agency taskforce, which will consider how best to provide for the mental health and addiction challenges of those imprisoned, and primary care support on release. Collaboration between the Department of Health and Department of Justice on the development of Terms of Reference and structure for the establishment for this Mental Health taskforce was at an advanced stage at the end of 2020.

4.2 Research on offenders and penal policy

The Review Group on Penal Policy highlighted the need for evidence based on research to inform penal policy and recommended that the Department of Justice and Equality join with other Government Departments and agencies to support research in order to assist in the formulation of penal policy.

The Group welcomed the publication by Prof. Ian O'Donnell (UCD) of 'An Evidence Review of Recidivism and Policy Responses', commissioned by the Department of Justice. The Group invited Professor O'Donnell to present his report at its meeting of 10 June 2020.

Important points raised by Professor O'Donnell in his Report are as follows:

- Most sentences are six months or less. Remission is applied at 25% in most cases. Most people are only in custody for a very brief time. It can push them in to homelessness, put children in to care, it is disruptive and those imprisoned do not get time to engage with services. This can also have an impact on employment, as those who are convicted with short custodial sentences are also likely to lose their job.
- Could district courts cease using custody as a punishment? Magistrates in England are lay people with similar powers to district court judges. Custody is used very carefully and as a last resort, but this is not the case in Ireland. Judges in Ireland seem to use custodial sanctions because they see the advantages of it rather than seeing the disadvantages. A custodial sentence is used to send a message, such as a way of protecting a vulnerable offender
- What could we use instead? An Oireachtas committee report from 2000 looked at the possibility of using fines (targeted fines on a person's disposable income). We are better now at collecting fines, and the scope for using community service on completion of a program can be very useful. However, Professor O'Donnell suggested that it is important to be aware of the dangers of attaching lots of conditions on a community sanction such that it fails. Finding simple alternatives to a custodial sentence that assist the offender to avoid reoffending is the start of the solution.
- Sentencing options in the District Court need to be reviewed if we are to tackle the problem of damaging short sentences. A review of these options and the alternatives available would help shed light on why certain options are availed of more often than others. There are alternatives: Fines, community service, CBT etc.
- Static and Dynamic Risk Factors – dynamic risk factors are the ones we are looking at working with. We can often see the effects of static risk factors on people's lives (age of first conviction for example) but we cannot change them. Softening of the laws around spent convictions could really help with one dynamic risk factor –removing the badge of criminality that follows you post-incarceration. There is scope for reviewing that legislation. Spent convictions legislation was based on what was

considered a long sentence in the 1970s and 1980s. Forty years ago, 10 year sentences were unheard of. A life sentence then was 7/8 years. We have become used to a serious escalation in what we consider to be a long sentence. It is useful to bear this in mind when considering historical sentencing guidelines.

- Procedural Fairness – How the Gardaí deal with known offenders is the key. They are treated differently. The evidence is that treating people fairly will have a long term beneficial effect on the lives of offenders. For this reason, we need to look at Gardaí treatment of offenders; first timers and repeat offenders. the Garda opinion on whether or not someone is released from prison also needs to be reviewed. The arresting officer is contacted for their opinion on whether or not a prisoner should be released even if it has been 7 years since they arrested that person. They do not know what the person has done while they were in prison (education, psychology, workshops etc.) so their opinion has remained static. This needs to be reviewed

- Sean Aylward, a previous Director General of the IPS was involved with a data research team in UCD. The research undertaken by the team received new interest when Prof O'Donnell's report was launched. In that earlier research, Prof O'Donnell followed up on the address of all prisoners, cleaned up the data and geo-mapped the addresses. It showed where prisoners were returning to and it has implications for resource management and allocation to target the areas where prisoners are living post release and where they need education, employment and social care funding. This approach would still be cheaper than funding prisons. This sort of forward looking approach is extremely useful in supporting and reintegrating ex-prisoners in the community and perhaps should become standardised when planning the post-release plan for prisoners. It was a good piece of interagency work.
- When discussing data there is a language issue which reinforces a damaging status quo. Saying "Prison and its alternatives" puts prison at the centre of the criminal justice system. Better to say "Community sanctions and imprisonment".
- The Nordic countries do data very well. They have a unique identifier for each person in the criminal justice system that all services use. It makes research very straight forward. It's more difficult to do here but it is still worth doing and Prof O'Donnell believes we have the expertise in the country to do it.
- Another very positive step for grappling with this problem would be to look at other jurisdictions' approach to funding probation, crime prevention and rehabilitation. There is a need to boost funding for multi-annual research projects. A research project on sentencing decisions would be really useful for understanding not just why some sentences are given but the long term consequences.
- You must see a link in your issues. If there are lots of people in prison then there are problems in the community causing this, whether it is poverty, over policing, lack of education , addiction or social services. Making those links in your research and policymaking is important. If the research can highlight problems that can be responded to, then that will help with responsive, evidence-based policy.

The Group thanked Professor O'Donnell for a most insightful and informative response to questions from the Group.

Research Proposals

The terms of reference of the Inter Agency Group mandate the Group to identify where research and data collation could assist in greater integration across the public service in terms of the rehabilitation of offenders and the formulation and impact of penal policy. The Interagency Group's Work Programme included a commitment to review research and data on the rehabilitation of offenders and the formulation and impact of penal policy and to recommend where, from an interagency perspective, further research and data are required to underpin policy and to monitor the implementation of service initiatives in the rehabilitation of offenders and the impact of penal policy.

The Group was aware that little research was being conducted on penal policy, particularly as it relates to prisoners, former prisoners, and interagency working. It welcomed the commitment by the Department of Justice to invest in data and research.

In July 2018, the Department of Justice published a Data and Research Strategy to improve the quality of data and evidence to achieve the strategic goals of the Department. At the same time, a data and research Implementation and Oversight Group was established and a Chief Information Officer appointed, supported by a small team. A Research Advisory Group, comprising academics and members of criminal justice agencies and the Department was also established.

In October, the Department of Justice issued a call to the research community for proposals to undertake studies in specified areas relevant to the strategic agenda of the Department. The call was the first in a series, with a subsequent call in early 2019. A maximum of €30,000 (ex-vat) was available per successful proposal. The Interagency Group agreed to propose priority areas for research, in the expectation that they might be included in future calls.

Based on advice from the CSO and taking into account other issues considered by the Interagency Group, the Interagency Group proposed the following three research proposals, for inclusion in futures calls for research proposals or for funding separately.

Recidivism and Reintegration

The first proposal was to enhance the existing study of recidivism by deeper analysis of the data available to the CSO, including age, gender, type of offence, geographical location, other available demographic information, and type of sanction and the length of time to reoffending. There is also the possibility of linking the existing data with information in the Department of Social Protection, Revenue, Department of Education and the Health Service Executive to give a fuller picture of the factors associated with recidivism and reintegration. This would require further discussion and consultation with those bodies, but the potential value of such aggregated data is immense. There is a need to reduce the time lag in the reporting of the data and to calculate the likelihood of reoffending for different time periods. While the Group was aware of the CSO's commitment to making resources available to maintain the current recidivism study, additional resources were needed to delve deeper into the data and the issues affecting recidivism/reintegration. The Group suggested that funding be made available by the Department of Justice and Equality through one of the calls to the research community to support an academic researcher to undertake this work, in close association with the CSO.

Crime Prevention and Reduction Programmes

A number of crime prevention and reduction programmes have demonstrated that interagency cooperation can work well and achieve agreed objectives. An evaluation of the effectiveness of these crime prevention and reduction programmes, both pre and post release would be valuable in embedding interagency cooperation in the implementation of penal policy. The Community Returns Programme, SORAM, JARC, the pilot initiative to develop more family friendly prisons and the Youth Diversion programme are candidates for external evaluation to assess their impact on the rehabilitation of offenders and their families. The Group suggested that an academic research team be funded through a targeted call to undertake this evaluation.

Longitudinal study of offenders

Longitudinal studies have proven very effective in studying cohorts of people over time and identifying the factors that shape their lives. The Growing up in Ireland (GUI) study and TILDA, a study of cohort of older people, are two examples of publicly funded studies, which are following the life experience of two groups of people at the two ends of the age spectrum. A similar study of a cohort of offenders, focused on their quality of life and experience of integration rather than on recidivism, would shed light on the problems they face, their experience of public services and the factors that helped or hindered their re-integration. It would provide a continuing rationale for interagency cooperation for successful rehabilitation of offenders and crime reduction policies. Offenders could be invited to join the cohort while still in prison, undertaking community service or on probation and agree to be contacted again at scheduled intervals, such as six months, two years, five years etc. The findings from the study would be reported on at regular intervals and the data collected would be made available to researchers for 'nested studies' of particular issues, subject to the standard safeguards. Additional cohorts of offenders could be added at 5 or 10 year intervals to measure what progress, if any, has been made to the reintegration of offenders and the extent of interagency cooperation in achieving that objective.

Such a study requires an institutional commitment over an extended period if the full value of its findings are to be realised. The funding of such a study would require a long term commitment (of at least 5 years) and the amount required to fund the study would be outside the parameters of the Department of Justice's calls to the research community to address priorities of penal policy. The Group was aware that the CSO has a strong commitment to providing information and evidence for whole of government approaches to addressing social and economic problems and has a unique statutory authority to combine data from different public organisations. It has already demonstrated its contribution to penal policy through the reports on recidivism and would be an institution of choice to undertake a longitudinal, cohort study of offenders.

Embedding the learning

The Group considered that it would be important that what is learnt from the studies proposed above is shared with those agencies with responsibilities for the integration of offenders and for crime reduction. One way to achieve this learning is to involve representatives of those agencies with responsibilities in a research group/s to oversee the research undertaken and to engage with the researchers as their findings emerge. The group/s could be under the aegis of the existing Interagency Group.

The Group's proposals were submitted to the Chief Information Officer (CIO) of the Department of Justice in June 2019. A response to these proposals was received on 27 March 2020. As per the recommendations in the Group's research proposals, the CIO stated that the Department was availing of the National Data Infrastructure (NDI) to utilise administrative data sources such as social welfare payments data from the Department of Social Protection and post primary data from the Department of Education. Professor Ian O'Donnell's study on recidivism was also mentioned as a good example of an evidence review providing a springboard for further research and analysis. In respect of crime prevention and reduction programmes, the CIO stated that the Department's Research and Data Analytics team were in the process of commissioning an evaluation of the Garda Youth Diversionary Programmes. This was due to be undertaken by an independent organisation or individual and commissioned via the Office of Government Procurement. As outlined in the Action Plan for the Joint Management of Offenders a formal evaluation of SORAM was also proposed. The CIO also acknowledged the benefits of a longitudinal study as identified by the Group. However, it was also stated that the use of administrative data sets could also help to track individuals over time with the use of data linking and unique identifiers enabling the CSO to do this. Following a review of the findings of the current collaborative project with the CSO future waves of research using the same cohort of offenders and also looking at offenders in the 2021 Census could be conducted. As highlighted above this analysis is focused on the individuals' interaction with the state and its services rather than recidivism. It was hoped that this analysis would provide an insight into their quality of life and integration in the community.

On foot of this response, it was agreed by the Group that a subgroup dealing with more detailed discussions around research issues should be set up, reporting to the main Group on any issues arising.

The subgroup agreed that the proposed evaluation of SORAM and JARC described by the CIO in his response was good news. It was also agreed that it would be useful if the Interagency Group could have a role in this project, perhaps reviewing the Terms of Reference of the Review and that representatives of the key agencies/Departments could be involved in an oversight group for the evaluations. The Interagency Group could be updated regularly on the status of the project/s.

It was agreed that it would be useful to have the CSO's views on whether there is work that could be valuably done on recidivism in the absence of the collated administrative data that the CIO's response letter mentioned. How relevant is the proposal for the expanded recidivism study in light of the work that has been done or is there a more effective study that can be done instead?

The importance of having Department of Justice support for research proposals to help implement them and push them through was stressed. Representatives from the Department of Justice on the Interagency Group continued to liaise with that Department's Research Unit about the research proposals again to explain the point of view of the Group and how it aligns with the Department's policy work.

The subgroup also discussed the longitudinal study of offenders which had been proposed by the Group. The possibility was raised of looking at the existing GUI and TILDA data again to examine the experience of participants in those studies of incarceration or exposure to law enforcement. If the numbers of people with such experience in the original cohorts of participants were too small, it might be possible to extend the sample to include people with experience of offending, as the TILDA study had done in relation to older people with learning difficulties.

The subgroup also decided to explore with the CSO what progress could be made before the Department of Justice's administrative data matching project is finished. The CSO considers that progress could be made, building on the CSO unique access to match data from different government sources.

The main value of the CSO is that the Statistics Act permits the Office to match data, for example, from the Prison Service to PULSE data and the data held by other government departments. There is scope to understand more about offending and the background of offenders by combining the PULSE data and administrative data holdings from other government agencies.

The CSO's priority is to publish statistics in line with the mandate they have from their data providers and stakeholders. There may also be potential to develop anonymous research data files as long as they have permission from data providers to do so.

For example, the 2016 Prison Census data is valuable in enabling the CSO to track prisoners' interactions with other State services such as housing, health (use of a medical card etc), educational attainment and employment status. The value of this approach was demonstrated in the 'Frontier Series' report published by the CSO in October 2020 on Offenders 2016 - Employment, Education and other Outcomes 2016-19 referred to earlier in this Annual Report.

The CSO is looking to include the ownership of a vehicle as an indicator of economic participation after or before individuals enter custody as part of the Offenders 2016 project.

In relation to a longitudinal study of offenders post release,, the CSO considers that such studies provide learning about what questions to ask and how to evolve questioning to achieve useful insights. For example the computerisation of a lot of the GUI metadata will give insights in future as to how to carry out a similar longitudinal study of offenders. Enhanced data accessibility by applying correct standards in metadata is key to realising data's value.

From a CSO perspective, when policy interventions are being developed or rolled out, the data or characteristics of the policy need to be designed/captured and documented in order that key statistical indicators can be generated efficiently that can measure the policy's outcomes. They need guidance from policy makers on what to look for, such as what do policy makers need to know in order to make effective decisions. Key indicators and evidential thresholds have to be clear in the minds of policy makers when trying to learn from the raw data which the CSO can provide.

The best way to assist the CSO is to provide them with good data. The IPS has a high standard of data collection now and it is very useful. The Probation Service also makes quality data available to the CSO. One of the important contributions to CSO's work from the Interagency Group is their advocacy for access and supply of information and data from the Justice agencies.

The Group went on to discuss their interests in the data. The point was made that the true value to policy makers of this data is to be able to say how effective policy interventions are and what makes them more or less effective. For example, being able to see whether or not an offender was engaged with supports, whether or not they had housing, whether or not they engaged with the Probation Service and if and to what extent these different wrap-around

support factors improved their chances of reintegration or affected their re-offending behaviour.

The data is useful when you can weigh the value of a policy intervention by comparing the behaviours of those who reoffended and those who did not and identify what might have been the differences in their situation that could be more effective from an interagency point of view. The timing of the interventions can be a factor. What are the biggest factors and what can we do about it? For instance, should housing come first before any other issues are addressed? What effect does having access to a medical card have on the likelihood of reoffending? There is already evidence that being in employment is a significant factor in non-offending behaviour. It's accepted that the data can't tell the full narrative but it is what we have and provides some evidence of the effectiveness of policy interventions.

The CSO also pointed out that they mostly generate national or regional statistics which provide a structural framework in which to evaluate policy interventions that might be taking place with a smaller subgroup of individuals involved in policy initiatives. Longitudinal data analysis allows for more granular statistics but can be limited by relevancy as it tends to be outdated. In the case of prison re-offending / recidivism, the CSO reports are limited by a two year delay because the re-offending incident needs to be proven in court before it is considered valid. It would be very difficult to get data on this generally due to such a small sample size, a bigger sample will always be more accurate, and as mentioned above, this kind of research will never be quite up to date. It can take up to two years before the data is available.

CSO Recidivism Study

Felix Coleman, CSO presented to the Interagency group on the CSO's work on recidivism among prisoners and those on probation at the September and December meetings of the Group. The results of this work and the challenges faced by the CSO in compiling it have been discussed earlier in this report. The Interagency Group was most impressed by the commitment of the CSO to the publication of this important data series and to making it more relevant to policy requirements.

4.3 Improving Interagency Coordination

The terms of reference of the Interagency Group require it to propose improved interagency coordination arrangements for the integration and rehabilitation of offenders. During 2020, the Group examined interagency arrangements in Northern Ireland for public protection to discover what aspects, if any, might be relevant to this jurisdiction. The Chair and Secretary of the Group met with Steven Allison Head of Public Protection Branch, Community Safety Division, Department of Justice and Julie Smyth, PPANI Co-ordinator/PSNI Public Protection Branch in Belfast on 10th March to gain an understanding of their legislative provisions and how interagency coordination operated in the North in relation to the reintegration of offenders. On 16th September Steven Allison and Julie Smyth made a presentation to the Interagency Group on the Northern Ireland arrangements and their operation.

Public Protection Arrangements in Northern Ireland

The Criminal Justice Order, 2008 provides the legislative base for coordination by agencies in Northern Ireland in relation to rehabilitation of offenders and protection of the public. Section 50 of the Order provides as follows

50.—(1) The Secretary of State may issue guidance to agencies on the discharge of any of their functions which contribute to the more effective assessment and management of the risks posed by persons of a specified description

(2) Guidance under this Article may contain provisions for the purpose of facilitating co-operation between agencies, including—

(a) provisions requiring agencies to maintain arrangements for that purpose and to draw up a memorandum of co-operation; and

(b) provisions regarding the exchange of information among them.

The Order was introduced against a background of public outrage about a murder committed by an offender shortly after his release from prison. Under Article 50 of the Order, the Minister for Justice issued guidance setting out the framework for how the organisations must work collaboratively together through what is known as ‘Public Protection Arrangements Northern Ireland’ (PPANI) to assess and manage the risk of serious harm posed by sexual and violent offenders. The Order put coordination on a statutory footing with PPANI replacing the previous, informal arrangements. Under the Order, the Minister for Justice issued guidance about the coordinating arrangements to be put in place and a Manual of Practice to be followed.

A PPANI Strategic Management Board (SMB), on which the key agencies with responsibility for protection of the public and integration of offenders are represented, is responsible for strategy and policy. The Minister for Justice also appoints two lay members of the Strategic Management Board to represent the public interest. The SMB must meet at least four times a year and publish an annual report. At operational level, there are Local Area Public Protection Panels (LAPPPs) which have at their core representatives from the police, probation and social services. LAPPP meetings take place throughout Northern Ireland to assess the risk posed by individual offenders and to draw up risk management plans for those offenders who pose the greatest risk.

The agencies involved in the PPANI arrangements in Northern Ireland are the Prison Service, the Probation Service, the Police Service, the Department of Justice, the Department of Health and Social Services, the local Health and Social Care Trusts, the Housing Executive, the Department of Education, the Department of Social Development and the NSPCC, who all have a statutory duty to cooperate and share information to ensure the effective assessment and management of the risks posed by sexual and certain categories of violent offenders. The Chair of the SMB (currently Steven Allison) rotates between the Police Service, the Prison Service and the Probation Service on a two yearly basis. Critical to the successful operation of PPANI is the employment by the Department of Justice of the PPANI coordinator (Julie Smyth) who works full time with the LAPPPS and SMB to support risk assessment and coordination. The PPANI Coordinator was previously employed by the Probation Service of Northern Ireland.

PPANI is not a separate organisation, but a set of arrangements which requires all statutory agencies with responsibility for child protection and criminal justice to work together to protect the public by reducing the offender's opportunity and/or inclination to re-offend. In August 2020, 1,667 offenders convicted of sexual or violent offences were being managed under PPANI arrangements.

The PPANI arrangements in Northern Ireland are closely linked to a sentencing regime that is based on the assessed risk to the public of those found guilty of sexual or violent offences by the Probation Service prior to sentencing. Offenders posing the greatest risk to the public may be subject to life time supervision on release from prison and those sentenced to more than six months in custody, are subject to supervision post release. PPANI arrangements do not apply to offenders convicted of offences other than sexual or violent crimes or whose sentence is less than six months. It is understood that PPANI arrangements are working well and that there is a reasonable level of public confidence in its operation.

A question and answer session followed the presentation about the PPANI arrangements. Questions included the extent to which rehabilitation played a part in sentencing or probation; the decentralised role of the public protection arrangements in Northern Ireland; the use of electronic monitoring as an alternative to prison; mobile phone monitoring of persons on bail and on parole and the speed with which the order for the return of an offender to prison can be carried out. The Group expressed its gratitude to Steven Allison and Julie Smyth for their most informative presentation on interagency cooperation for public protection in Northern Ireland.

The Group discussed the presentation and noted the proportion of sexual or violent offenders returned to prison (about 80% depending of the circumstances of their parole) and the very different approach to sentencing of sexual and violent offenders in Northern Ireland. The robustness of PPANI was acknowledged but the Group was not sure if such arrangements were appropriate for this jurisdiction. The appointment of a full time coordinator was noted as valuable and a model for what was needed here. The Chair undertook to draft a paper on the relevance of the PPANI arrangements for interagency coordination in this jurisdiction for discussion by the Group. This will be brought to the Group in 2021, and will form part of a more formalised structure for interagency working on the part of the Department of Justice.

The Group welcomed the commitment by the Department of Justice to provide a statutory basis for interagency coordination for SORAM.

Appendix A

2020 Membership of Interagency Group for a Fairer and Safer Ireland.

Dr Ruth Barrington, Chairperson
Mr Ben Ryan, Department of Justice
Ms Deborah White, Department of Justice
Ms Therese Molyneux, Department of Justice
Mr Graham Hopkins, Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage
Mr Jim Walsh, Department of Health
(alternate) Ms Dairéarca Ní Néill, Department of Health
Mr Finbarr Lane, Department of Education and Skills
(alternate) Ms Stacy Cannon, Department of Education and Skills
Mr Dan Harty, Department of Social Protection (to December 2020)
(alternate) Ms Lisa Arnold, Department of Social Protection (to December 2020)
Ms Annette Kilcullen, Department of Social Protection (from December 2020)
(alternate) Ms Geraldine Hurley, Department of Social Protection (from December 2020)
Mr Felix Coleman, Central Statistics Office
(alternate) Ms Olive Loughnane Central Statistics Office
Mr Joe Doyle, Health Service Executive
(alternate) Mr Eamon Keenan (Health Service Executive (from December 2020)
Ms Kate Mulkerrins, An Garda Síochána
Mr Tom Ward, Courts Service
Mr Fergal Black, Irish Prison Service
(alternate) Ms Melanie Rhatigan, Irish Prison Service
(alternate) Mr Kieron Moylan, Irish Prison Service
Ms Una Doyle, Probation Service
(alternate) Mr Darragh Bailey, Probation Service)

Secretary to the Interagency Group

Mr Aaron Murphy, Department of Justice (to September 2020)
Mr Timothy Hurley, Department of Justice (from September 2020)

Appendix B**Attendance at 2020 meetings of the Interagency Group for a Fairer and Safer Ireland.**

Bodies represented	Meetings	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	Total meetings attended
Chairperson		✓	✓	✓	✓	4
Dept. Housing, Local Government & Heritage		✗	✓	✗	✓	2
Central Statistics Office		✓	✓	✓	✓	4
Department of Justice		✓	✓	✓	✓	4
Health Service Executive		✓	✓	✓	✓	4
Dept. Education & Skills		✓	✓	✓	✓	4
Dept. Social Protection		✓	✗	✓	✓	3
An Garda Síochána		✓	✗	✗	✓	2
Courts Service		✗	✓	✗	✗	1
Irish Prison Service		✗	✓	✗	✓	2
Dept. Health		✓	✓	✓	✓	4
Probation Service		✓	✓	✓	✓	4

Attendance at 2020 Meetings of the Pathways to Reintegration Subgroup

Bodies represented	Meetings	4 th March 2020	29 th May 2020	Total meetings attended
Chairperson		✓	✓	2
Irish Prison Service		✓	✓	2
Dept. Social Protection		✓	✗	1
Department of Justice		✓	✓	2
Probation Service		✓	✓	2
Dept. Health		✓	✓	2
HSE		✓	✓	2
Dept. Housing, Local Government & Heritage		✗	✓	1

Attendance at 2020 Meeting of the Research Subgroup

Bodies represented	Meetings	2 nd September 2020	Total meetings attended
Chairperson		✓	1
Dept. Social Protection		✓	1
Department of Justice		✓	1
Dept. Health		✓	1