

SCORING GUIDE FOR RISK MATRIX 2000 S & V Scales

International Version¹

David Thornton, Ph.D.

Yolanda Fernandez, Ph.D. & Maaïke Helmus, Ph.D.

November 2024

¹ The International Version is intended primarily for professionals working outside England and Wales.

CONTENTS

Introduction

- What is it; What is it for; Who is it for; Who should use it

Item Definitions for RM2000

- Definitions for individual items

Instructions for Scoring RM2000S

- Combining items to score the S-Scale

Instructions for Scoring RM2000V

- Combining items to score the V-Scale

Instructions for Scoring RM2000 Treatment Need Indicators

- Combining items to score Sexual Criminality and General Criminality Need Indicators

Introduction

Risk Matrix 2000 (RM2000) is a statistically-derived risk classification process intended for males aged at least 18 who have been convicted of a sexual offense. At least one of these sexual offenses should have been committed when the perpetrator was aged 17 or older. It uses simple factual information about individuals' past history to divide them into categories that differ substantially in their rates of reconviction for sexual or other violent offenses. Risk Matrix was originally developed for use in England and Wales. While it is applicable in other jurisdictions, its scoring rules were originally tailored to specific features of criminal justice systems prevailing in England and Wales. In this International Version some details of the Scoring Guide are different from the version intended for use in England and Wales; namely guidance relating to jurisdiction-specific laws has been removed.

This scoring guide describes how to score the RM2000/S and the RM2000/V scales. RM2000/S is a prediction scale for sexual reoffending. RM2000/V is a prediction scale for non-sexual violence (NSV) engaged in by individuals convicted of sexual offenses. The purpose of Risk Matrix 2000 is to allow individuals to be divided into risk categories that reliably differ in their relative rate of known sexual (S-scale) or non-sexual violent (V-scale) recidivism. The risk category labels produced by RM2000 are described in Table 1. These category labels have been revised to correspond to those now used for Static-99R and based on the Justice Center's standardized risk levels. Reasonable implications for the management of individuals falling in the different categories are described in the Priority Implications column.

Table 1: Risk Category Labels for the S & V Scales

Risk Category Label	Priority Level	Priority Implications
Below Average	Low	Lower intensity management and supervision except take particular care regarding the possibility of further offending against past victims
Average	Medium	Typical management and supervision for individuals convicted of sexual offenses in your jurisdiction
Above Average	High	More intensive management and supervision than provided for individuals at Average risk
Well Above Average	Very High	Much more intensive management and supervision than provided for individuals at Average risk

It is important to recognize that applying labels of this kind represents a value judgment that is relative to the practical purpose of managing individuals with a history of sexual offending.

RM2000 is not intended for use in making decisions about family re-integration where the task is to distinguish at very low levels of risk, and to consider risk that may be very situation specific. It is instead used to distinguish a group of individuals who collectively present a relatively higher risk to the community from among the broad range of individuals serving community or prison sentences.

It is important to recognize that RM2000 does not capture all influences on sexual and violent re-offending and consequently the risk presented by individuals within a category will vary depending on how these other influences apply to the specific individual. Some of these other influences are known and a more comprehensive assessment could combine RM2000 with assessments of other known risk factors such as measures of dynamic risk to better approximate the risk presented by the individual.

The utility of tools like RM2000 depends on the degree to which users score it consistently and in a way that follows the intention of the test developers. Inter-rater reliability has sometimes been lower in field studies of actuarial instruments.

Wakeling, Mann and Milner (2009)² reported a study of the inter-rater reliability of the RM2000S scale under field conditions. Their results indicated that the tool had good general inter-rater reliability. An overall kappa of 0.81 for one set of cases was found, and an overall kappa of 0.91 was found for the second set of cases. These kappa statistics were calculated to assess agreement between two raters on all items and total risk categories across a number of cases.

The authors provide recommendations including the following:

1. All risk assessment tools should be tested for inter-rater reliability.
2. Risk assessment manuals should continually be updated.
3. Reliability findings should be fed back to clinicians using the tool.
4. Risk assessment tools should only be conducted by those trained in the tool.
5. Ideally all risk assessments should be double scored.
6. Where discrepant information is found, further clarification should be sought before a final judgment is made.

To sustain reliable scoring of the instrument, Risk Matrix 2000 should only be used by evaluators who have been specifically trained in its use, preferably by a certified trainer.

The accuracy of the risk assessment produced by RM2000 depends on the reliability, completeness, accuracy, and truthfulness of the information with which the evaluator has been provided. Information given by the individual being assessed may be used in

² Wakeling, H. C., Mann, R. E., & Milner, R. J. (2011). Interrater Reliability of Risk Matrix 2000/s. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 55(8), 1324-1337. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X11386933>

scoring RM2000, but where there is any doubt about its accuracy further information should be sought to corroborate it. Where possible information from official sources should be obtained.

A summary of the research background to RM2000, including information on predictive accuracy, and related guidance on how to interpret and report RM2000 classifications is contained in the Evaluator Guide which should be used in parallel with this Scoring Guide.

Item Definitions for RM2000

This section provides guidance on how to score each of the items used in the Risk Matrix 2000 scales. Instructions on how to combine them are given in the next section. For ease of use each item is given its own section.

Items are described in the following order.

- Age at Commencement of Risk
- Sexual Appearances
- Criminal Appearances
- Sexual Offenses against a Male
- Sexual Offenses against a Stranger
- Absence of 2-year co-habitation
- Non-contact Sex Offense
- Violent Appearances
- Burglary

Note that Age at Commencement of Risk is scored in different ways depending on whether it is being used for the S-scale or the V-scale.

Initial Screening

Risk Matrix 2000 can only be used if the individual meets the following criteria:

1. The individual must be aged 18 or over
2. The individual must have at least one conviction for a sexual offense committed when the individual was aged 17 or over
3. The individual must be assigned male at birth. RM2000 can be used for persons assigned male at birth, regardless of their gender identity or presentation at the time of assessment or at any other period of their life (e.g., trans women, non-binary, or two-spirited individuals). Persons being evaluated do not have to identify as cisgender males.

This distinction (based on sex assigned at birth) is based on the appropriate population for the tool and is a separate consideration from the person's gender identity, what their pronouns are, or how they are housed/classified in correctional environments. For example, consistent with bias-free guidelines, this may mean the tool is used in a report that uses female pronouns for the person being assessed. For individuals who meet the inclusion criteria for RM2000 based on sex assigned at birth, but do not identify as male at the time of assessment, their gender identity and any social or medical gender affirmation processes would be considered external to their scores on the RM2000. This information is relevant from a treatment-responsivity perspective, but may or may not be relevant in terms of their risk to reoffend.

Risk Matrix 2000 cannot be used with individuals assigned female at birth.

Provided the individual meets these criteria then all appearances for sexual offenses are counted when scoring RM2000, including ones where the individual was under the age of 17 (i.e., juvenile offences).

In order to determine whether rule 2 applies, assessors should use the same definition of a sexual offense as in 'Sexual Appearances' below.

Age at Commencement of Risk

“Age at Commencement of Risk” refers to the individual’s age now if he is in the community, or to the age the individual will be when he is discharged from prison (or from some other secure setting that prevents offending in the community). For prisoners it may be convenient to score it on the basis of two ages – a) his age now, b) the age he will be when he could first be released. If this changes the overall risk classification you should report the results using some variation of: “If Mr. Smith were released tomorrow he would fall into risk category XXX, however, he is not eligible for release until [date] and at that time he will fall into risk category XXX”. Researchers using the scale should of course simply use the date of discharge from prison to determine age.

If scoring the scale after his release, you use the current age (at time of assessment), even if considerable time has passed since release from the latest offense.

Points are scored differently for age depending on which scale is involved. Table 2 indicates how the points are allocated.

Table 2: Points Scored for Each Age Band

Age	18-24	25-34	35-44	45+
S-Scale Points	2	1	0	0
V-Scale Points	3	2	1	0

Sexual Appearances

A sexual appearance is a court appearance at which the individual was sentenced, and where at least one of the offenses for which the individual was sentenced had a sexual element, even if the name of the charge is not sexual.

The number of offenses or charges that were dealt with on a sentencing occasion is immaterial. What is counted in RM2000 is the number of occasions the individual was sentenced for at least one, or more, sexual offenses, not the number of offenses that were dealt with.

The exception to this is when RM2000 is being completed to inform a presentence report. At this stage the individual will not in fact have been sentenced for the sexual offense to which the report relates. In these circumstances the assessor should proceed on the basis that the individual has been convicted of the offense and so *will* be sentenced for it. The offense in question therefore *would* count for the purposes of RM2000 even though the individual has not yet been sentenced for it. This means that if the offense is the individual's first one, then RM2000 *can* be used, even though technically the individual has not yet been sentenced for any sexual offense.

Similarly, if RM2000 is being used to inform an assessment that is being carried out after someone has been charged for an offense but before the court has determined whether they are guilty, then the scale may be used in a hypothetical way e.g., Mr. Jones has been charged of XXX. If it is determined by the court that he is guilty of this sex offense, then he would fall into the YYYY Risk Matrix risk category.

Offenses should be counted as having a sexual element if any of the following criteria are met:

- *Sexual Abuse of Children*: The legal charge for which the individual was sentenced implies illegal sexual behavior between the individual and a person under the legal age of consent when the individual was either over the age of consent or (if under the age of consent) at least 5 years older than the victim.
- *Sexual Assault*: The legal charge for which the individual was sentenced implies illegal sexual behavior in which the individual used force, threats, alcohol or drugs to obtain sexual interaction with the victim without consent. Note that the age of the victim is irrelevant for this criterion.
- *Non-Contact Sexual Offenses*: This covers illegal sexual behavior involving; a) indecent exposure; b) voyeurism; c) possessing or manufacturing indecent photographs of children; d) obscene telephone calls; e) unwanted obscene suggestions made in person or through other media (telephone; internet).
- *Offenses with a concealed sexual element*: This refers to offenses where the official legal charge does not imply one of the above but the assessor judges that it is more likely than not that the underlying behavior included sexual abuse of children, sexual assault, or a non-contact sexual offense. Examples would include a rape/murder where the conviction was for murder, or a sexual assault that was

reduced through plea bargaining to some other charge. Illegal non-sexual behavior motivated by specific and unusual sexual interests would also count as concealed sexual offenses. Examples would be a man stealing women's underwear in order to gratify a sexual fetish and being charged with burglary, a man strangling a woman because doing so gave him sexual pleasure and being charged with assault, or a man engaged in illegal sexual acts with animals and being charged with mischief.

Prostitution-related offenses should not be counted as sexual offenses. Similarly, failure to comply with special restrictions imposed because the person has a history of sexual offending should not count as sexual offenses (examples of such offenses include convictions for breaches of orders such as Sexual Offenses Prevention Orders, Foreign Travel Orders, and convictions for failure to register as a sexual offender). Offenses of this kind should not be scored under Sexual Appearance but may be scored under Criminal Appearances.

Persistence after last punishment

Count sexual appearances as distinct if the later sexual offense occurred after he had been sentenced for the earlier offense. Thus, the underlying concept here is persistence in sexual offending after last punishment.

Example 1: The individual is sentenced for sexual assault in 1985 and then commits another sexual offense in 1986 for which he is sentenced in 1987.

This counts as 2 sexual appearances.

Example 2: The individual is sentenced for sexual assault in 1985 and then he is sentenced in 1987 for a sexual assault that was committed in 1984.

This counts as one sexual appearance.

Example 3: The individual is sentenced in 1985 for 3 sexual assaults and then commits 4 further sexual assaults in 1986 for which he is sentenced in 1987.

This counts as two sexual appearances.

Example 4: The individual is arrested in 1985 for a sexual assault and while on bail commits a second sexual assault. He is sentenced for the first sexual assault in May of 1986 and sentenced for the second sexual assault in December of 1986.

This counts as one sexual appearance.

Where information about the dates of offenses is not available, a reasonable approximation for this item is to simply count the number of court appearances for sentencing at which at least one offense had a sexual element.

It may help when working out ‘persistence after last punishment’ to apply the following rules:

- Always count the first sentencing occasion involving a sex offense.
- In subsequent sentencing occasions, look at the previous sentencing occasion.
- If the sex offense that was dealt with in the new sentencing occasion was committed *after* the date of the previous sentencing occasion, the new sentencing occasion counts as a new Sexual Appearance
- If the offense that was dealt with at the new sentencing occasion was committed *before* the date of the previous sentencing occasion, the new sentencing occasion does not count as a new Sexual Appearance.

Other issues

A complication in scoring this item occurs when an individual is arrested for a sexual offense, released on bail, and then commits and is arrested for another sexual offense while on bail from the first offense. This does not count as two appearances for sexual offenses (see example 4 above.)

Appearances are defined based on a conviction (or a reasonable presumption of impending conviction). Charges are insufficient to form an appearance. An individual may be arrested for a sex offence, then released on bail and sexually reoffends. He is subsequently convicted of the two offences on a single sentencing date (or two separate dates). In this case, count only one appearance. In other words, to count as separate appearances, the person has to reoffend after being *punished* for the offense (i.e., after the conviction, not just after the arrest or charge).

Often, sentencing occurs at the same time as conviction. However, in some cases sentencing can occur a considerable period of time after conviction. If they have been convicted but not yet sentenced, this is sufficient for a new offense to count as a new appearance. In other words, when applying the persistence after punishment principle, treat the date of an Appearance as the date of conviction.

Example 5: The individual commits a sex offense in 1994 and is convicted for it in January 1995 but released to the community. He is sentenced for this offense in March 1995. Meanwhile, he committed another sex offense in February 1995. He was convicted for this in June 1995 and sentenced on the same day.

This would count as two Sexual Appearances.

For juveniles some processes that fall short of a trial and conviction may be counted as sentencing equivalents. These can include such things as formal police cautions, reprimands and final warnings. To be counted, these sanctions must involve an admission of guilt and be administered through some jurisdiction-specific recognized formal process by the police or by a court.

A further complication for juveniles is that in many jurisdictions there are two systems for responding to criminal acts committed by them. One is the criminal justice system and involves charges, convictions, probation, and custody. The other is more oriented to the goals of child welfare and involves such things as out of home placements and special schools. These will be referred to here as the juvenile justice system and the juvenile care system. Where an offense is responded to through the juvenile justice system the usual rules for identifying sentencing occasions apply.

Where an offense is responded to through the juvenile care system this can be counted as a sentencing occasion if the care system determines the individual committed a sex offense and sanctions him by placing him in a secure setting (like a special school) or transfers him from a less secure setting to a more secure setting. However, no more than one such placement can be counted as a sexual appearance for behavior that occurs prior to the age of 16.

Sometimes there will be events that are analogous to a Sexual Appearance but which would not have been specifically investigated in the original research. These include sanctions imposed by military courts; religious authorities that respond to priests who have engaged in sexual abuse by removing them from their positions, requiring them to go through sex offense specific treatment, and warning their religious superiors about their past offending; and sanctions imposed by professional bodies (for example on doctors). Where the individual's behavior was clearly a sexual offense that has been detected, investigated, and sanctioned by such authoritative bodies, then the evaluator may reasonably choose to interpret this as the equivalent of a Sexual (and Criminal) Appearance. Deciding whether such an analogy is appropriate in an individual case involves an element of professional judgment. In reporting the result, for example to a court, it is recommended that the evaluator explain the basis for their judgment that the events they are relying on involved "persistence after punishment" similar to that involved in an ordinary sentencing occasion.

Prison adjudications for sexual behavior that violates prison rules would normally not count as the equivalent of Sexual Appearance. They may, however, be counted where all of the following apply (a) the behavior involved would have been illegal if the person were in the community and not under legal supervision, (b) the behavior involved constituted an actual or attempted contact sexual offense, and (c) a sanction was imposed. Multiple adjudications of this kind during a given prison sentence do not count as more than one Sexual Appearance. If, however, the person is released to the community (on parole, for example) and then returned to prison, then further adjudications of this kind may count as a second Sexual Appearance.

Sometimes a person commits a sexual offense while under parole or probation supervision and this is dealt with as a violation of supervision conditions leading to a revocation rather than leading to a new charge and conviction. A parole revocation can count as a sexual appearance if the violations considered in the revocation decision included behavior that constituted a sex offense (i.e., something that someone not under

parole could be convicted for) AND the individual was required to stay in custody after the revocation decision. For a probation or community supervision violation to count, it should include behavior that constituted a sex offence AND an additional sentence is added (e.g., jail or extended period of community supervision).

Criminal Appearances

A Criminal Appearance is a court appearance for sentencing at which at least one of the offenses for which the individual was being sentenced was a significant criminal offense.

A significant criminal offense is defined here as one where the court could impose a custodial penalty or community supervision. Note that “could” means that this penalty is available to the courts, not that it was actually imposed in this case. Parking offenses, speeding, and other minor driving offenses are not treated as significant criminal offenses. Driving without insurance would not count as a significant criminal offense, unless it is attached to a more serious offense (e.g., dangerous driving) which would then attract a community or custodial sentence.

As with sexual appearances, to count as a new criminal appearance, at least one of the criminal offenses dealt with on the new sentencing occasion must have been committed after the last sentencing occasion; that is, the persistence after last punishment rule described above applies to criminal appearances also.

There are some offenses that have not resulted in convictions, but which have been scored as a Sexual Appearance. These are described in the Sexual Appearances section. Where you score an event as a Sexual Appearance you should always also count it as a Criminal Appearance.

Prison adjudications and disciplinary hearings should not count as Criminal Appearances unless they count as Sexual Appearances.

Community supervision violations (e.g., parole revocations or probation violations) can count if the underlying behavior is a criminal offense that someone not under supervision could be charged for AND there is a sanction.

Sexual Offenses against a Male

In scoring this item count any conviction for a contact sex offense that involves a male victim aged under 16 at the time of the offense.

Also count non-contact sex offenses involving male victims aged under 16 if the sexual behavior involved was clearly and deliberately directed at a male. For example, indecent exposure to a group containing males and females would not count, as the males may have only been incidentally present.

Offenses against animals are not used to score this item.

Child Sexual Exploitation Material (CSEM)/Child Pornography Offences

A conviction for possession or distribution of indecent images of children that included pictures of males and females would not normally be scored under this item unless there was evidence that the individual had deliberately sought images of males.

Evidence that the individual deliberately sought images of males can come from a variety of information sources. If the indecent images contained a greater proportion of males than females, then you can safely presume they sought images of males. Similarly, the individual may self-report that they sought images of males.

When such information is unavailable, the following may be indicators of having sought images of males:

- Is there evidence of the individual using male search terms (e.g., “boys”) while searching for indecent images?
- Was there evidence of the individual perusing websites that promote sexual contact with boys? (e.g., websites promoting boylove)
- Did the individual engage in online conversations with other adults about images or sexual activity with males?
- Fascination with boy stars (e.g., singers/performers)
- Focus on males in other child content that would not be considered illegal (e.g., saving catalogue photos of boys)

These factors may be evidence against deliberating having sought male content:

- The majority of the indecent images of males also included female children
- The individual has used the internet to contact boys so as to befriend them in order to gain trust or contact with females, who were targeted for sexual offenses.

Overall, interest in males among indecent images is less common than interest in females. When interest in males is present, it is often fairly obvious. These considerations can help you evaluate this item, but ultimately you should not use a single image (or a small number of images) to presume they sought content of males. There should be stronger evidence. If the evidence is very limited, it is best to give the benefit of the doubt and score this item as absent.

Sexual Offenses against a Stranger

Count any conviction for a sexual offense against a stranger.

A victim counts as a stranger if either the victim did not know the individual who offended 24 hours before the offense or the individual who offended did not know the victim 24 hours before the offense.

“Knowing” minimally involves having physically met, had a conversational exchange with, and being able to recognize the other person. All three of these conditions must be met to classify as “knowing”. The exception to this is when two people have been communicating via a webcam; in this situation, they may not have physically met, but could still be classed as “knowing” each other for the purpose of this item.

Offenses against animals are not used to score this item.

Do not score this item on the basis of accidental victims; the perpetrator must have intended to offend against the victim for the offense to be scorable under this item.

Child Sexual Exploitation Material (CSEM)/Child Pornography Offences

Do not score this item on the basis of the possession, viewing or downloading of indecent images of children.

Single (No history of 2 year co-habitation)

This factor is counted as present if the individual has never, as an adult, cohabited in the community with an adult with whom they had a marriage-like relationship for at least 2 years.

The 2 years must be continuous with the same partner. Common-law marriages and stable same-sex relationships count as marriage for this purpose. Polyamorous relationships where the individual has cohabitated with at least one of the partners for 2 years count as marriage for this purpose.

If an individual claims a marriage or marriage-like relationship and there is some reason to doubt this claim, then only treat him as having been married if there is some corroborating evidence to support this.

If the individual has lived in a “marital” type relationship continuously for at least two years, but sexually abused children within that family within the first two years of that relationship, then the marital type relationship is deemed to have ended at the point he started abusing the child.

Note that the risk factor can still be scored as present even if either of the following apply.

- The individual has had a number of short-term relationships that together add up to over two years.
- The individual is a priest.

The 2 continuous years living in a marital-type relationship need to be in the community. Brief interruptions when one party was away should be disregarded but if the individual is in custody for more than three months then this interrupts the count of time together and resets the clock to zero.

Extended work-related separations such as for individuals working on oil rigs, merchant seaman, or during military service do not necessarily interrupt the count of “time married” so long as the evaluator judges there to be a genuine attempt to live together when this is possible and regular contact is maintained (in so far as this is practical) while they are apart. Email, messaging, and phone calls are now commonly possible even during such absences.

Noncontact Sex Offense

This covers convictions for illegal sexual behavior involving:

- a) Indecent exposure;
- b) Voyeurism;
- c) Possession of or manufacturing illegal pornography or indecent images of children;
- d) Obscene telephone calls;
- e) Unwanted obscene suggestions made in person or through other media (telephone; Internet).

Where there is a sexual offense that does not involve physical contact, and is not on the list (a to e) above, you should only score it as Noncontact if the underlying behavior indicates the presence of a paraphilia and is of a kind known to occur at a relatively high rate. Consider also how similar the behavior is to one of the prototypical noncontact offenses (a to e above).

Also do not score as “Noncontact” if the underlying behavior was a contact offense and plea-bargaining or some similar process led to a conviction for a noncontact offense.

Do not score one of these offenses as “Noncontact” if they occurred incidentally in the course of committing or attempting a contact offense. By incidentally is meant two things, either that the person was trying to commit a contact offense and as a by-product of this committed a noncontact offense, or, that the noncontact offense was committed primarily as a steppingstone to carrying out a contact offense. Examples of these two kinds of incidental noncontact offense are as follows.

The first example is an instance of a noncontact offense occurring as an unintended by-product of committing a contact offense.

A man breaks into a woman’s apartment, makes his way to her bedroom where she is sleeping, and rapes her. During the rape, the woman’s child, disturbed by the noise, wanders through into his mother’s bedroom, calling out. The man, startled by the appearance of the child, pulls his penis out of the woman he was raping and stands up, thus exposing his erect penis to the child.

The second example is an instance of a noncontact offense was committed primarily as a steppingstone to carrying out a contact offense.

A man develops a strategy of exposing his penis to children before approaching them and touching them sexually. His idea is that if the child does not run off when they see his penis then they will be open to his touching them.

The Noncontact item should not be scored based on either of these kinds of incidental offense. In thinking about this it may be useful to contrast these kinds of events to a more prototypical intentional indecent exposure in which a man waits in a park until he sees a

woman walking by, then exposes his penis in a fashion designed to catch her attention but does not approach her.

It can sometimes be hard to determine whether something was intended as a steppingstone to a contact offense. In cases of uncertainty, follow the principle that if a man commits a noncontact offense but then makes a sexual approach, or attempts to sexually assault, the same victim within 24 hours of the noncontact offense, then the noncontact offense should be presumed to be incidental and not used as the basis for scoring the Noncontact item.

However, it is still possible for a scorable Noncontact offense and a Contact offense to occur in close proximity if it is clear that the noncontact offense was not a steppingstone to the contact offense. Here is an example.

A man would allow his teenage daughter to drink alcohol at home and sometimes drugged it so that she passed out. While she was unconscious, he would undress her and pose her in sexual positions. Then he would take photographs of her. He stored the photographs on his computer and used them to masturbate to.

Here, both a contact sexual offense and a noncontact sex offense occurred, but the noncontact offense was not a steppingstone to the contact offense. If anything, it seems to have been the other way round. So, the Noncontact item should be scored.

Some further examples illustrate how these distinctions apply.

A man unobtrusively follows a woman walking home from a bar, seeing where she lives. He departs but returns two hours later and looks in one of the windows trying to see her. He notices she is sitting watching television. After a while, he sees her turn the television off. She goes into a bedroom, undresses and, wearing only some panties and a t-shirt, walks back into the room he can observe. He watches her and as she goes round the apartment turning off lights. He watches until she appears to have gone to bed, waits another 30 minutes, and then quietly breaks into the house. He walks into the bedroom where she is sleeping and sexually assaults her.

This involves a noncontact offense followed within 24 hours by a contact offense against the same victim. Further the noncontact behavior is plausibly in preparation for the contact offense. The Noncontact item would not be scored.

A man goes out peeping, every night he follows the same route, looking in the same houses where he has learned he is likely to be able to see a woman partially unclothed or undressing. This behavior goes on over a month. Eventually he becomes obsessed with one woman who he repeatedly sees in her underwear. One night, having observed her, he breaks into the house and sexually assaults her.

In this case, although he did peep at her shortly before the contact offense, a lot of his peeping behavior occurred more than 24 hours before the contact offense and was directed at other victims. Accordingly, the Noncontact item should be scored.

Here is another example.

A man sent an unsolicited “dick pic” to a woman he knew along with a message suggesting they should get together. Later that day when saw her he spoke to her briefly and then grabbed her breast.

Again, this involves a noncontact offense followed withing 24 hours by a contact offense against the same victim. Further, although the unsolicited picture and sexual suggestion is not a realistic way of winning the woman’s interest, it is plausibly part of the behavioral sequence that led to the contact offense. The Noncontact item would not be scored.

Contrast this with the next example.

Travelling to work on a train, a man discovered that he could airdrop “dick pics” into iPhones being used by women who were nearby. He started doing this regularly, enjoying their startled expressions when they saw the pic. One evening travelling home he dropped an image into the phone of a woman standing next to him in the crowded train, waiting to get off at the station. In the crush he put his hand on her butt and fondled it while she was held in place by the crowd.

Here, although he committed a contact offense against a woman who he had just committed a noncontact offense against, many of the instances of his noncontact offending were against different women who he did not try to physically molest so there was a significant amount of noncontact offending that was independent of his contact offense. Consequently, the Noncontact item would be scored.

Summarizing for the situation where someone has committed both contact and noncontact sex offenses: we would score the Noncontact item if there is a history of non-contact behavior that is clearly not related to or facilitating the contact behavior, or if the noncontact behavior follows the contact behavior. We would not score the Noncontact item if the noncontact behavior is a single incident that is closely connected to and preceding a contact offense against the same victim.

Special rules for scoring ‘non-contact’ item for Internet related offenses.

In general, if the individual illegally exposes a minor to chat, photos or videos of sexual content, this would be scored as Noncontact. However, if the Internet offense involved attempting to set up a contact offense, then it would not be scored as Noncontact.

As indicated earlier, if the online illegal exposure to a minor led to a contact offense against the same victim within 24 hours, then the exposure would be treated as having been a steppingstone to the contact offense. Another indicator that the online illegal

exposure to a minor was intended as a steppingstone to a contact offense would be when the online chat starts to involve talking about meeting in person. Here it is important to consider whether mentions of meeting appear genuine/intentional or fantasy-based. If the individual starts to discuss logistics (e.g. travel planning, a day/time/location), then you can presume they are trying to set up a contact offense. If, however, the discussion of meeting is confined to vague statements made during sexual communications (with no clear attempt at follow through), it is more likely the discussion of meeting was more an expression of a fantasy than a real attempt to meet, and the Noncontact item can be scored.

Sometimes online offending involves the individual using blackmail, bribes, or some kind of manipulation to coerce the victim into performing a sexual act over the internet, this should be considered a contact offense. Even though no physical contact has occurred, the individual has coerced the victim into an activity. Similarly, if the individual has paid another person to abuse a child over the internet, this would also be considered a contact offense. However, if the individual were to record the minor being abused or engaging in sexual acts, and then either keep the recording on their own computer or exchange it with someone else, then these provide a basis for scoring the Noncontact item. Indeed, in such a case, the person could be considered to have committed both a contact offense and a scorable Noncontact offense.

In general, internet offenses should be judged based on the behavior as opposed to a blanket ruling on them being contact or non-contact.

Child Sexual Exploitation Material (CSEM)/Child Pornography Offences

If the individual's only sexual offense is an Internet sexual offense involving downloading or possessing indecent images of children, do not score as Noncontact. However, if the individual has both such an indecent images offense and a contact sexual offense, then you would score the Noncontact item based on this Internet offense. In such cases the individual could be considered to be closer in nature to the prototypical individual who commits contact sex offenses, and therefore it would be reasonable in such cases to count the indecent images offense as noncontact, and so score the Noncontact item.

Violent Appearances

A violent appearance is a court appearance at which the individual was sentenced for a non-sexual violence charge. Count as a violence charge any offense whose legal definition implies the use or threat of force against the person but do NOT score charges that solely imply sexual violence under this item.

Thus murder, manslaughter, wounding, assault, affray, robbery, arson, and abduction would be scored. Also treat cruelty to animals as a non-sexual violent charge. On the other hand, formal charges like rape, sexual assault, indecent assault, etc. would not be scored under this item.

Similarly, criminal damage / vandalism would not be scored as violent appearances (this is force against property, not people).

Charges like burglary, breaking and entering, theft, stealing cars etc. would not be scored though aggravated burglary does involve physical force against a person and so should count as a violent appearance.

Illegal Possession of a firearm would be scored as non-sexual violence if the firearm was being carried during another offense that might involve interpersonal confrontation (for example: a firearm carried during a burglary) but not scored otherwise under this item.

Note that a conviction for murder where examination of the scene of crime and forensic evidence indicated that the victim had also been raped would be scored both as a sexual appearance and as a violent appearance. However, a conviction for rape at which the individual had been exceptionally brutal but in which there were no charges other than rape related to these activities would be scored as a sexual appearance but not as a violent appearance.

As with sexual appearances and criminal appearances, to count as a new violent appearance, at least one of the violent offenses dealt with on the new sentencing occasion must have been committed after the last sentencing occasion; that is, the persistence after last punishment rule described above applies to violent appearances also in the same way that it applies to sexual appearances.

Any Burglaries

This includes any convictions for illegally breaking into a building (e.g., breaking and entering, burglary, house breaking, aggravated burglary and attempted burglary). This includes both breaking into homes and breaking into commercial premises (shops, factories, warehouses) and into other buildings (e.g. a school).

Being found equipped for burglary does not count, nor does theft from a dwelling.

Instructions for Scoring RM2000/S

This scale involves two steps. Instructions on the scoring of individual items are given in more detail above.

Instructions on scoring step one are given in table 3.

Table 3: Step One of RM2000/S

Age	18-24 = 2 points; 25-34 = 1 point; Older = 0 points
Sexual Appearances	1 = 0 points; 2 = 1 point; 3,4 = 2 points; 5+ = 3 points
Criminal Appearances	4 or Less = 0 points; 5 or more = 1 point

Points accumulated across these three items are then turned into four risk categories using table 4.

Table 4: Step One Categorization

Points	Label
0	Below Average
1-2	Average
3-4	Above Average
5-6	Well Above Average

Instructions for scoring Step two are given in table 5.

Table 5: Step Two: Aggravating Factors

Aggravating Factors	Scoring
Male Victim of Sex Offense	No = 0; Yes = 1
Stranger Victim of Sex Offense	No = 0; Yes = 1
Single (absence of 2-year co-habitation)	No = 0; Yes = 1
Non-Contact Sex Offense	No = 0; Yes = 1

Put risk up one category if Step Two score = 2 or 3. Put up two categories if score = 4. Do not change Step One Risk Category if score = 0 or 1.

Instructions for Scoring RM2000V

This scale involves just one step, and three items. Points are assigned for each item as indicated in table 6.

Table 6: Points Assigned for RM2000V Items

Risk Factor	Points Assigned
Age	18 to 24 = 3 points; 25 to 34 = 2 points; 35 to 44 = 1 point
Violent Appearances	0 = 0 points; 1 = 1 point; 2,3 = 2 points; 4+ = 3 points
Burglary	None = 0 points; Any = 2 points

Points accrued from each item are summed and V-scale categories assigned as indicated in table 7.

Table 7: RM2000V Categorization

Points	Label
0-1	Below Average
2-3	Average
4-5	Above Average
6+	Well Above Average

Instructions for Scoring Need Indicators

These indicators use items drawn from both S and V scales. Points per item are assigned as for the item in those scales.

Sexual Criminality		General Criminality	
<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Points</i>	<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Points</i>
Sexual Appearances	0 1 2 3	Criminal Appearances	0 1
Male	0 1	Violent Appearances	0 1 2 3
Stranger	0 1	Burglary	0 2
Noncontact	0 1		
Sexual Criminality Score		General Criminality Score	

Sum points to get scores.

Interpretation			
<i>Sexual Criminality Score</i>	Are criminogenic needs related to Sexual Deviance indicated?	<i>General Criminality Score</i>	Are criminogenic needs related to Antisociality indicated?
0	No	0	No
1	No	1	No
2+	Yes	2+	Yes

Where criminogenic needs related to Sexual Deviance are indicated this means that many people with this score will have clinically significant long-term vulnerabilities of a sexual kind, such as offense-related sexual interests, sexual preoccupation, or sexual coping. Accordingly, interventions relevant to these kinds of criminogenic needs should be considered for inclusion in a treatment plan.

Where criminogenic needs related to Antisociality are indicated this means that many people with this score will have clinically significant long-term vulnerabilities of a more general, antisocial kind such as impulsiveness, hostility, aggression, or oppositional reactions to authority. Accordingly, interventions relevant to these kinds of criminogenic needs should be considered for inclusion in a treatment plan.