

Report on an unannounced inspection of the
short-term holding facility at

Larne House

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

18 November 2013

Glossary of terms

We try to make our reports as clear as possible, but if you find terms that you do not know, please see the Glossary of terms on our website at:
http://www.justice.gov.uk/downloads/about/hmipris/Glossary-for-web-rps_.pdf

Crown copyright 2014

You may re-use this information (excluding logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/> or email: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk

Where we have identified any third party copyright material you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at the address below or:
hmiprison.enquiries@hmiprison.gsi.gov.uk

This publication is available for download at: <http://www.justice.gov.uk/about/hmi-prison>

Printed and published by:
Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons
Victory House
6th floor
30–34 Kingsway
London
WC2B 6EX
England

Contents

Fact page	4
Overview	5
About this inspection and report	6
Summary	7
Section 1. Safety	9
Respect	14
Activities	17
Preparation for removal and release	18
Section 2. Recommendations and housekeeping points	19
Section 3. Appendices	22
Appendix I: Inspection team	22
Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report	23

Fact page

Task of the establishment

To hold immigration detainees for up to five days

Location

Larne, Northern Ireland

Name of contractor

Tascor

Last inspection

1 – 2 November 2011

Escort provider

Tascor

Overview

Larne House is one of three residential short-term holding facilities (STHFs) in the Home Office detention estate. The facility opened in July 2011 and accommodates up to 19 detainees. In the three months before our inspection, 131 detainees were held for an average of three to four days. The majority arrived from Drumkeen House, the Home Office reporting centre in Belfast. Most detainees were subsequently transferred to an immigration removal centre (IRC) or removed from the UK. Six detainees were at the facility and none was transferred or released during the inspection.

In line with the Home Office published policy, the maximum period of detention is five days, or seven if removal directions have already been served. In the three months before our inspection, one detainee was held for more than the seven-day limit. The facility was managed effectively by helpful Tascor staff, but as at the last inspection there were too many risk-averse practices. A Home Office representative visited monthly. An Independent Monitoring Board monitored the facility.

Larne House short-term holding facility

About this inspection and report

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons is an independent, statutory organisation which reports on the treatment and conditions of those detained in prisons, young offender institutions, immigration detention facilities and police custody.

All inspections carried out by HM Inspectorate of Prisons contribute to the UK's response to its international obligations under the Optional Protocol to the UN Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (OPCAT). OPCAT requires that all places of detention are visited regularly by independent bodies – known as the National Preventive Mechanism (NPM) – which monitor the treatment of and conditions for detainees. HM Inspectorate of Prisons is one of several bodies making up the NPM in the UK.

All Inspectorate of Prisons reports carry a summary of the conditions and treatment of detainees, based on the four tests of a healthy prison that were first introduced in this inspectorate's thematic review *Suicide is everyone's concern*, published in 1999. The tests have been modified to fit the inspection of short-term holding facilities, both residential and non-residential. The tests for short-term holding facilities are:

Safety – that detainees are held in safety and with due regard to the insecurity of their position

Respect – that detainees are treated with respect for their human dignity and the circumstances of their detention

Activities – that the centre encourages activities and provides facilities to preserve and promote the mental and physical well-being of detainees

Preparation for removal and release – that detainees are able to maintain contact with family, friends, support groups, legal representatives and advisers, access information about their country of origin and be prepared for their release, transfer or removal. Detainees are able to retain or recover their property.

Inspectors kept fully in mind that although these were custodial facilities, detainees were not held because they had been charged with a criminal offence and had not been detained through normal judicial processes.

Summary

Safety

- S1 At our inspection in 2011, we made 15 recommendations in relation to this healthy establishment test, five of which were achieved, two partially achieved and eight not achieved.
- S2 Escort journey times were usually short and vehicles were appropriately equipped. Detainees were managed sensitively on arrival, but the initial booking-in process was not confidential. A nurse who was based at the facility each day screened all new arrivals in the dedicated health care room. The list of items removed from detainees on arrival was disproportionate to the levels of risk. Access to telephones was good. Regular welfare checks for new arrivals were not conducted between midnight and 7am.
- S3 There was little evidence of bullying and victimisation; however, both men and women were held at the facility and neither could lock their bedroom doors. CCTV in the corridor did not address the risk to women of men entering their rooms. Detainees we spoke to felt safe.
- S4 There had been no self-harm incidents in the previous six months. Some staff had received training in assessment, care in detention and teamwork (ACDT self-harm monitoring) procedures. Since 2011, three ACDT booklets had been opened; care plans and assessments were good but observational entries lacked detail.
- S5 There were no formal safeguarding adults protocols in place. The facility did not hold children. There had been one recent case of a detainee age dispute, which was managed appropriately. AccessNI (the criminal history disclosure service in Northern Ireland) checked the criminal histories of facility staff to ensure that none was barred from working with children.
- S6 Use of force was low with two incidents in the year to date. Incident reports indicated that force used was necessary and proportionate but in one case the documentation was inappropriately reviewed by the same manager who had authorised the use of force. There was a segregation cell; staff said it had never been used but we were not confident in the governance arrangements for its use.
- S7 Legal advisers and representatives could visit detainees. Chairs in interview rooms were bolted to the floor, which was a disproportionate security measure. Lists of local immigration advisers and other pertinent immigration information were displayed throughout the centre. All detainees had been given bail application forms when detained and the Bail for Immigration Detainees' handbook was available electronically.
- S8 In the three months before our inspection, 131 detainees were held for an average of about 3.75 days, but one detainee had been held beyond the maximum allowable period of detention. All detainees were held with the correctly completed documentation authorising their detention (IS91). There were some delays in arranging the return of detainees to the Republic of Ireland.

Respect

- S9 Detainee rooms had basic furnishings with no lockable cupboards, and they were clean. Frosted glass in some rooms gave them a claustrophobic feel and some rooms, which were formerly police cells, were small and retained a somewhat oppressive atmosphere. Extractor fans in some cells were noisy. Couples, including husbands and wives, could not share a single room.
- S10 Staff were polite and respectful, and detainees spoke very positively to us about the care they received. Telephone interpretation had been used 36 times since July 2013. Staff had all undertaken equality and diversity refresher training during the previous year. The centre was accessible to detainees with disabilities.
- S11 A designated, well equipped prayer room was accessible to detainees 24 hours a day, but not all staff removed their shoes when entering the room. A visiting chaplaincy service provided for most mainstream religions, but there was no Muslim chaplain.
- S12 The number of complaints was low, with three submitted in the year to date. The quality of the response to one complaint we saw was substandard. Detainees could use the dining room 24 hours a day, where snacks and drinks were freely available. A good range of frozen ready meals was provided. Meal times were reasonable.

Activities

- S13 There was a small association room equipped with a television, games console, board games and two computers. Foreign language newspapers and books were limited. Detainees could access the internet and specific email providers but some sites, including skype and social networks, were blocked, which was inappropriate for the population. Detainees did not have free use of the exercise yard, which remained an unappealing environment.

Preparation for removal and release

- S14 In the three months before the inspection, detainees were transferred to an immigration removal centre (44%), removed from the UK (27%), returned to the Republic of Ireland (16%) or granted temporary admission (10%). The remainder were taken to hospital or prison. Detainees were seen by a nurse on departure. Detainees boarding the ferry to Scotland en route to Dungavel IRC were routinely placed in handcuffs with no individual risk assessment. Detainees were permitted to have visits which took place in the two interview rooms. Staff provided detainees with small information cards with contact details and a map of where they were being taken.

Section 1. Safety

Escort vehicles and transfers

Expected outcomes:

Detainees under escort are treated safely, decently and efficiently.

- I.1 Tascor was contracted by the Home Office to escort detainees in Northern Ireland. In the previous three months, detainees arrived from Drumkeen House reporting centre in Belfast (40%), police stations (17%), Belfast docks (16%), one of Northern Ireland's airports (15%) or prison (8%), with the remainder arriving from hospital.
- I.2 One detainee arrived at the facility during the inspection; the escort vehicle used to transport him was clean and well stocked with water, a first aid kit and a welfare box. The detainee spoke positively of the care he had received from escorts. Escort staff were aware of the requirement to provide comfort and refreshment breaks, but most journeys were very short; for example it took approximately 35 minutes to drive from Drumkeen House to Larne House. The person escort record had been fully completed.

Arrival

Expected outcomes:

Detainees taken into detention are treated with respect, have the correct documentation, and are held in safe and decent conditions. Family accommodation is suitable.

- I.3 The centre was told in good time of detainees being escorted there and was able to prepare for their arrival. Detainees were dealt with sensitively and politely by staff on arrival. They were given a rub-down and wand search out of view of others. However, booking in and the room-sharing risk assessment were carried out at the reception desk in front of the waiting room, which lacked confidentiality.
- I.4 Health care cover was good. A nurse based at the facility was available 24 hours a day, seven days a week and had a dedicated health care room. All new arrivals underwent a health and self-harm risk assessment.
- I.5 While risk assessment was generally robust, some measures to prevent self-harm were disproportionate. Detainees were not allowed to keep scarves, phone chargers or other items deemed to present a threat of self-harm. This included mints which staff said detainees could break in two and cut themselves. We saw one detainee who was not permitted to keep his sweatshirt as it had ties on the hood. Toiletries were kept locked in an office cupboard, and detainees had to ask to use them irrespective of whether they had been identified as being at risk of self-harm (see section on self-harm and suicide prevention).
- I.6 Detainee welfare checks were undertaken at regular intervals throughout the day from 7am until midnight. After this time, new and potentially vulnerable detainees were not checked.
- I.7 New arrivals were offered a free five-minute telephone call and we observed this happening. Detainees were able to keep mobile phones with no internet access or cameras or they could borrow dummy mobile phones and insert their own SIM cards. Some areas of the centre had a poor mobile signal, but detainees we spoke to did not report difficulty in using their phones. There were two payphones with privacy hoods which accepted incoming calls.

Recommendations

- 1.8 Reception interviews should be conducted in private.** (Repeated recommendation 1.12)
- 1.9 Detainees' clothing and toiletries should not be removed unless an individualised risk assessment indicates otherwise.** (Repeated recommendation 1.13)
- 1.10 All new detainees should have an overnight welfare check during their first night in the centre.**

Bullying and personal safety

Expected outcomes:

Detainees feel and are safe from bullying and victimisation.

- 1.11** No women were held at the time of our inspection but men and women could be held at the same time. No detainees were able to lock their doors. Women were accommodated in three designated rooms on a single corridor. Men had to walk through the corridor to reach the dining room. We were told that the locking mechanism had been disabled for health and safety reasons, although the previous mechanism allowed staff to enter rooms locked from the inside in an emergency. This could clearly have left women feeling more vulnerable. CCTV in the corridor was not sufficient to prevent men entering their rooms. Communal areas were shared by male and female detainees.
- 1.12** Staff told us there was little evidence of bullying and detainees we spoke to said they felt safe. Staff had not received refresher training on bullying but said they would intervene to defuse tensions between detainees by talking to them.

Recommendations

- 1.13 Men and women should be held separately.** (Repeated recommendation 1.15)
- 1.14 All detainees should be able to lock their bedrooms from the inside, with a locking mechanism that allows staff to enter rooms in an emergency.**

Self-harm and suicide prevention

Expected outcomes:

The facility provides a safe and secure environment which reduces the risk of self-harm and suicide.

- 1.15** There had been no recent self-harm incidents, and we found none in the previous six months.
- 1.16** Some measures to prevent self-harm were disproportionate. For example, detainees were not allowed to keep their shaving kit and were only given a razor if they could convince staff that they were not a risk to themselves or others. They could then only use the razor under the supervision of a detention custody officer (DCO) (see section on arrival and recommendation 1.9).

- I.17** All officers carried anti-ligature knives. A first aid kit was available in the staff office and officers received regular first aid training.
- I.18** Not all staff had received training in assessment, care in detention and teamwork (ACDT) procedures to support detainees at risk of self-harm. Staff told us that not enough staff had undertaken case management training.
- I.19** Since the start of 2011, three ACDT booklets had been opened. Care plans and initial assessment interviews were good but observational entries lacked detail and did not adequately record interaction with the detainee in crisis. Escort staff could open Tascor suicide and self-harm warning forms.

Recommendation

- I.20 All staff should be trained in ACDT processes. Sufficient staff should be trained to act as case managers (see recommendation I.9).**

Safeguarding (protection of adults at risk)

Expected outcomes:

The centre promotes the welfare of all detainees, particularly adults at risk, and protects them from all kinds of harm and neglect.¹

- I.21** There were no formal links with adult social services, the Local Safeguarding Adult Partnership or the Department of Health, Social Services and Public Safety. Staff could not recall an occasion when they had held an adult who could not be adequately cared for. Detainees requiring extra support would be moved to the room for vulnerable adults (see section on accommodation).

Recommendation

- I.22 Tascor should develop local safeguarding processes with the Department of Health, Social Services and Public Safety and the Local Safeguarding Adult Partnership.**

Safeguarding children

Expected outcomes:

The facility promotes the welfare of children and protects them from all kinds of harm and neglect.

- I.23** The facility did not hold children. A few weeks before our inspection a young person had been arrested by police in Stranraer and brought to the facility where he told staff he was a minor. He was immediately moved to the vulnerable persons' room and a care plan was opened. A member of staff was appointed as the young person's carer. A Home Office immigration officer interviewed the young person and confirmed that he appeared to be under 18. Social services arranged for him to be taken into care, but before a social services

¹ We define an adult at risk as a person aged 18 years or over, 'who is or may be in need of community care services by reason of mental or other disability, age or illness; and who is or may be unable to take care of him or herself, or unable to protect him or herself against significant harm or exploitation'. 'No secrets' definition (Department of Health 2000).

age assessment could be completed the young person absconded. Immigration Enforcement contacted the Police Service of Northern Ireland who were working with the Garda Síochána in the Republic of Ireland to trace the young person.

- I.24** AccessNI checked the criminal histories of facility staff to ensure that none was barred from working with children.

Use of force

Expected outcomes:

Force is only used as a last resort and for legitimate reasons.

- I.25** Staff rarely used force. During the year before our inspection, force had only been used on two separate occasions when women had passively resisted transfer from the facility. Documentation indicated that force had been used proportionately and as a last resort. However, in one case the documentation had inappropriately been reviewed by the same manager who had authorised the use of force. All staff received annual control and restraint training and a number had received physical control in care training.
- I.26** Staff told us that the segregation cell had never been used. It had no toilet, sink or drinking water. It was bare and austere. A panel in the wall enabled staff to view the cell from the corridor. Staff said they had not received authorisation to use the cell and its purpose was unclear. There was no written guidance or procedural rules on use of the cell.

Recommendation

- I.27** **The segregation cell should be formally taken out of commission given the absence of guidance on its use or obvious need for it.**

Housekeeping point

- I.28** Use of force documentation should not be reviewed by a manager who has been involved in the incident.

Legal rights

Expected outcomes:

Detainees are fully aware of and understand their detention. Detainees are supported by the facility staff to exercise their legal rights freely.

- I.29** Legal advisers and representatives could visit detainees in one of the two interview rooms. Visits were usually booked in advance but staff said they exercised discretion if an urgent visit was required. Chairs were bolted to the floor in both interview rooms, which was a disproportionate security measure and unwelcoming.
- I.30** Lists of local immigration advisers and representatives were displayed throughout the centre, together with notices for the Northern Ireland Law Centre, Office of the Immigration Services Commissioner and the Community Legal Advice helpline. The latter was not applicable to Northern Ireland but of use to detainees being transferred to England.

- I.31** All detainees were given bail application forms when detained. A copy of the Bail for Immigration Detainees' handbook was available on the computer in the association room.

Recommendation

- I.32** Detainees should only be interviewed on chairs bolted to the floor after an individual risk assessment. (Repeated recommendation I.22)

Casework

Expected outcomes:

Detention is carried out on the basis of individual reasons that are clearly communicated. Detention is for the minimum period necessary.

- I.33** During the three months prior to our inspection, 131 detainees had been held for an average of three days, 18 hours 23 minutes. Twenty-seven detainees were held for more than five days. For reasons that were unclear, one detainee was held for longer than the legal limit of seven days. He was held for seven days, three hours 25 minutes.
- I.34** During our inspection, all six detainees were held with the correctly completed documentation authorising their detention (IS91). Staff confirmed that they would never accept a detainee without a completed IS91. DCOs said that a contract monitor from the Home Office attended the facility every month. Detainees retained copies of their immigration documents and understood the reasons for their detention. Detainees were given copies of their reasons for detention (IS91R), but only in English.
- I.35** Tascor and Immigration Enforcement staff reported delays by the Garda Síochána in arranging the return of detainees to the Republic of Ireland. We met a detainee who had agreed in writing to return to the Republic three days earlier, yet he was not scheduled for removal until the day after our inspection.

Recommendation

- I.36** Detainees should not be held in residential short-term holding facilities for longer than the published maximum periods.

Respect

Accommodation

Expected outcomes:

Detainees are held in a safe, clean and decent environment.

- I.37** The facility accommodated 19 detainees in 10 bedrooms. It comprised a reception area, a nurses' room, two interview rooms, an association room, exercise yard, prayer room, a segregation cell and staff offices.
- I.38** The bedrooms contained one, two, three or four beds and basic furnishings with no lockable cupboards. They were clean. Frosted glass and high windows in some rooms gave them a claustrophobic feel. Part of the facility had been a police station, and a few rooms were converted police cells. Despite efforts to soften them, they were small and retained a somewhat oppressive atmosphere. One detainee was held in such a room during our inspection. Three rooms on one corridor were dedicated to women (see section on bullying and personal safety). Extractor fans in some cells were noisy and could not be controlled by detainees.
- I.39** The separate toilets for male and female detainees were clean and could be locked from the inside. Staff could override the lock with a key in the event of an emergency. One cell was used for detainees who required additional support. It had a television and an intercom to reception.
- I.40** Couples, including husband and wives, could not share a room.

Recommendations

- I.41** **Bedrooms should be equipped with lockable cupboards.** (Repeated recommendation I.14)
- I.42** **Couples should be able to share a room.**

Positive relationships

Expected outcomes:

Detainees are treated with respect by all staff, with proper regard for the uncertainty of their situation and their cultural backgrounds.

- I.43** Staff were polite and helpful to detainees, and the atmosphere in the centre was relaxed. Staff were visible throughout the accommodation areas, and spent significant periods in the association area talking to detainees. Detainees spoke very positively to us about the care they received. We observed staff introducing themselves to a new arrival and they all wore name badges, although some were not easily legible.

Housekeeping point

- I.44** Staff name badges should be easily legible.

Equality and diversity

Expected outcomes:

There is understanding of the diverse backgrounds of detainees and different cultural backgrounds. The distinct needs of each protected characteristic, including race equality, nationality, religion, disability, gender, transgender, sexual orientation, age and pregnancy, are recognised and addressed.

- I.45** All staff had undertaken equality and diversity refresher training during the previous year. The facility had an external access ramp and an accessible toilet and staff were expected to open a care plan for all detainees with a disability. No detainees with an identified disability had been accommodated there.
- I.46** Telephone interpretation had been used 36 times since July 2013, a large proportion for Mandarin-speaking detainees. Staff also used an online translation website, although the accuracy of this could not be guaranteed.
- I.47** A designated prayer room was accessible to detainees 24 hours a day, and was well equipped with religious texts and prayer mats. Not all staff removed their shoes when entering the room. A visiting chaplaincy service provided for most mainstream religions, although at the time of inspection there was no Muslim chaplain. Staff we spoke to were aware of the requirements of Ramadan and told us that fasting times were sent through from head office and displayed for their information.

Recommendation

- I.48 A Muslim chaplain should be available to provide services to detainees.**

Housekeeping point

- I.49** Shoes should be removed when entering the prayer room except in an emergency.

Complaints

Expected outcomes:

Effective complaints procedures are in place for detainees which are easy to access and use, in a language they can understand. Responses are timely and can be understood by detainees.

- I.50** There were two complaints boxes, one in the waiting area and one in the association room, with complaint forms freely available in a good range of languages. The boxes were checked daily by the managing DCO. The facility said there had been three complaints in the year to date, which was low, although one relating to smoking restrictions and access to medication had subsequently been withdrawn. However central Tascor records did not correlate with this figure, indicating there had only been one complaint in the year to date. We obtained details of this complaint made in July 2013 about a lack of medical confidentiality. The detainee was very positive about staff but concerned that they had revealed his medical condition to other detainees through indiscreet talk. The investigation report was extensive but appeared focused on exonerating staff rather than establishing the facts. It led to no further action, when it would have been appropriate at least to issue a reminder to staff about the importance of medical confidentiality. During 2012 there had been three

complaints, two concerning blocked internet sites and television channels and the third concerning racially motivated comments by staff, although it was unclear whether this related to escort, facility or Home Office staff. All complaints were sent to the Home Office, and we were told that replies were sent to detainees at their new location. There were no copies of responses to complaints on site and we were unable to obtain them.

Recommendation

- 1.51 Complaint investigations should focus on establishing facts and addressing pertinent issues raised by the complainant.**

Housekeeping point

- 1.52** An accurate record of complaints should be maintained to provide an audit trail and ensure all complaints are dealt with

Catering

Expected outcomes:

Detainees are offered varied meals to meet their individual requirements. Food is prepared and served according to religious, cultural and prevailing food safety and hygiene regulations.

- 1.53** Detainees could use the dining room 24 hours a day, where crisps, biscuits, cereal and fruit and hot and cold drinks were freely available. A variety of frozen ready meals were provided, including vegan and Halal meals. The names of meals had been translated into a good range of languages and staff kept a record of if and when detainees ate. Meal times were reasonable, and staff told us they were flexible about providing meals for detainees arriving outside these times.

Activities

Expected outcomes:

The facility encourages activities to preserve and promote the mental and physical well-being of detainees.

- I.54** A small association room was equipped with a television, games console, board games and two computers. Only one Chinese foreign language newspaper was available and this was out of date. Books and magazines were predominantly in English. Detainees could use the internet and specific email providers, but one detainee told us that he was unable to access his college emails as the provider was blocked. Skype and social networking sites were also blocked. Staff did not know how to request that a site be unblocked.
- I.55** There was a small, cage-like exercise yard at the facility but it was kept locked, preventing free access by detainees, despite it being a secure area. Seating and a plastic roof had been installed since the last inspection, but it remained an unappealing environment. The yard was overlooked by neighbouring offices, and detainees were only allowed to smoke outside office hours and for half an hour at lunchtime.

Recommendations

- I.56** **Books and newspapers should be available in a range of languages, and detainees should have free access to the exercise yard.**
- I.57** **Detainees should be permitted access to legitimate websites and email, including Skype and social networking sites, subject to risk assessment.**

Preparation for removal and release

Expected outcomes:

Detainees are able to maintain contact with the outside world and be prepared for their release, transfer or removal. Detainees are able to retain or recover their property. Families with children and others with specific needs are not detained without items essential to their welfare.

- I.58** In the three months before the inspection, departing detainees were transferred to an immigration removal centre (44%), removed from the UK (27%), returned to the Republic of Ireland (16%) or granted temporary admission (10%).
- I.59** No detainees left the centre during the inspection, but we were told that on departure they were seen by the nurse, given a rub-down search by escorts, and asked to sign for their personal belongings and valuables. Escorts told us that the procedure for transferring detainees to the port and on to a ferry to Scotland, usually to go to Dungavel immigration removal centre, remained the same as at the previous inspection, when all detainees were handcuffed in insecure areas irrespective of individual risk.
- I.60** Detainees were allowed visitors, who could bring property into the facility for them, and the two interview rooms were used for this purpose. Telephone access enabled detainees to advise family, friends and legal representatives of their transfer. Staff provided detainees with small information cards with contact details and a map of where they were being taken to.

Recommendation

- I.61 Handcuffs should only be applied during transfer if justified by an individual risk assessment.** (Repeated recommendation I.55)

Section 2. Recommendations and housekeeping points

Recommendations

To the Home office

Legal rights

- 2.1 Detainees should only be interviewed on chairs bolted to the floor after an individual risk assessment. (1.32, repeated recommendation 1.22)

Activities

- 2.2 Detainees should be permitted access to legitimate websites and email, including Skype and social networking sites, subject to risk assessment. (1.57)

Recommendations

To the Home Office and facility contractor

Bullying and personal safety

- 2.3 Men and women should be held separately. (1.13, repeated recommendation 1.15)

Use of force

- 2.4 The segregation cell should be formally taken out of commission given the absence of guidance on its use or obvious need for it. (1.27)

Recommendations

To the facility contractor

Arrival

- 2.5 Reception interviews should be conducted in private. (1.8, repeated recommendation 1.12)
- 2.6 Detainees' clothing and toiletries should not be removed unless an individualised risk assessment indicates otherwise. (1.9, repeated recommendation 1.13)
- 2.7 All new detainees should have an overnight welfare check during their first night in the centre. (1.10)

Bullying and personal safety

- 2.8 All detainees should be able to lock their bedrooms from the inside, with a locking mechanism that allows staff to enter rooms in an emergency. (1.14)

Self-harm and suicide prevention

- 2.9** All staff should be trained in ACDT processes. Sufficient staff should be trained to act as case managers. (1.20)

Safeguarding (protection of adults at risk)

- 2.10** Tascor should develop local safeguarding processes with the Department of Health, Social Services and Public Safety and the Local Safeguarding Adult Partnership. (1.22)

Casework

- 2.11** Detainees should not be held in residential short-term holding facilities for longer than the published maximum periods. (1.36)

Accommodation

- 2.12** Bedrooms should be equipped with lockable cupboards. (1.41, repeated recommendation 1.14)
- 2.13** Couples should be able to share a room. (1.42)

Equality and diversity

- 2.14** A Muslim chaplain should be available to provide services to detainees. (1.48)

Complaints

- 2.15** Complaint investigations should focus on establishing facts and addressing pertinent issues raised by the complainant. (1.51)

Activities

- 2.16** Books and newspapers should be available in a range of languages, and detainees should have free access to the exercise yard. (1.56)

Preparation for removal and release

- 2.17** Handcuffs should only be applied during transfer if justified by an individual risk assessment. (1.61, repeated recommendation 1.55)

Housekeeping points

Use of force

- 2.18** Use of force documentation should not be reviewed by a manager who has been involved in the incident. (1.28)

Positive relationships

- 2.19** Staff name badges should be easily legible. (1.44)

Equality and diversity

- 2.20** Shoes should be removed when entering the prayer room except in an emergency. (1.49)

Complaints

- 2.21** An accurate record of complaints should be maintained to provide an audit trail and ensure all complaints are dealt with. (1.52)

Section 3. Appendices

Appendix I: Inspection team

Colin Carroll
Beverley Alden
Dr Ian Cameron

Inspector
Inspector
Criminal Justice Inspection Northern Ireland

Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report

The following is a list of all the recommendations made in the last report, organised under the four tests of a healthy establishment. The reference numbers at the end of each recommendation refer to the paragraph location in the previous report. If a recommendation has been repeated in the main report, its new paragraph number is also provided.

Safety

Detainees are held in safety and with due regard to the insecurity of their position.

Reception interviews should be conducted in private. (1.12)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 1.8)

Detainees' clothing and toiletries should not be removed unless an individualised risk assessment indicates otherwise. (1.13)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 1.9)

Men and women should be held separately. (1.15)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 1.13)

Detainees should only be interviewed on chairs bolted to the floor after individualised risk assessment. (1.22)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 1.32)

UKBA should attend the facility regularly. (1.46)

Achieved

Detainees should not be held in residential short-term holding facilities for longer than the published maximum periods. (1.28)

Not achieved.

Hard copies of bail application forms (B1), bail accommodation and support application forms (Section 4), and Bail for Immigration Detainees' handbook on bail should be freely available in different languages. (1.21)

Partially achieved

Contact details of local immigration advisers should be widely and prominently displayed. (1.23)

Achieved

Removal directions should be served in private. (1.29)

Achieved

ACDT booklets, rather than in-house Reliance 'suicide and self-harm warning' forms, should be opened when a detainee is at risk of self-harm. (1.35)

Achieved

Respect

Detainees are treated with respect for their human dignity and the circumstances of their detention.

Recommendation

Bedrooms should be equipped with lockable cupboards. (1.14)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 1.41)

Activities

The centre encourages activities and provides facilities to preserve and promote the mental and physical well-being of detainees.

Recommendations

Detainees should have access to books and newspapers in a range of foreign languages. (1.42)

Not achieved

Detainees should have free access to the exercise yard, which should have some seating. (1.43)

Partially achieved

Preparation for removal and release

Detainees are able to maintain contact with the outside world and be prepared for their release, transfer or removal.

Recommendations

Handcuffs should only be applied during transfer if justified by an individual risk assessment. (1.55)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 1.60)

Detainees should be able to meet visitors in the interview rooms. (1.56)

Achieved