

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

Heathrow Airport Terminal 4

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

13 May 2015

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 in our 'Guide for writing inspection reports' on our website at: <http://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/about-our-inspections/>

Crown copyright 2015

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: hmiprisons.enquiries@hmiprisons.gsi.gov.uk

This publication is available for download at: <http://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons>

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	15
Activities	18
Preparation for removal and release	19
Section 2. Recommendations and housekeeping points	20
Section 3. Appendices	23
Appendix I: Inspection team	23
Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report	24
Appendix III: Photographs	27

Fact page

Task of the establishment

To hold individuals and families who are of interest to Border Force.

Location

Heathrow Airport Terminal 4 (airside)

Name of contractor

Tascor

Last inspection

3 March 2011

Escort provider

Tascor

Overview

Situated to the south of Heathrow Airport, Terminal 4 serves international carriers, mostly to and from non-European destinations. The short-term holding facility is located next to the arrivals hall, and is one of the busiest in the UK. It is used to hold passengers undergoing investigation by Border Force officers and those who have been refused entry to the UK. A few detainees arrive directly from immigration removal centres. The facility's two holding rooms are cramped, old and not suitable. We welcome plans by Border Force to rebuild the facility. During our inspection, four adults and a child were held. In the previous three months, 1,276 detainees were held for an average of six hours and 39 minutes. An Independent Monitoring Board visited the facility regularly.

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 12 recommendations in relation to this healthy establishment test, five of which were achieved, one partially achieved and six not achieved.
- S2 Escort staff wore high visibility vests, drawing unnecessary attention to detainees. Rub-down searches of new arrivals did not take place in private. Most detainees could make calls from the holding room's payphone, but sometimes too many detainees were held to be able to access this phone easily. The sightlines for detainee custody officers (DCOs) into the holding rooms were inadequate. Detainees were not locked into the holding rooms and could freely enter the DCOs' office. Male and female detainees could not always be held separately. DCOs carried anti-ligature knives and opened suicide and self-harm warning forms where necessary, but required better training in adult safeguarding.
- S3 The Border Force safeguarding and trafficking team was well trained and safeguarded children when needed, including referring some to the national referral mechanism.¹ The responsible adult scheme (providing independent people to check on the interests of children being interviewed) required improvement. DCOs had completed training in a new restraint package tailored to immigration detainees under escort. Force was rarely used. Border Force officers carried batons in the facility, which was inappropriate. Detainee access to legal representation was poor. In the previous three months there had been 1,276 detentions, the longest for 29 hours and 40 minutes. In some cases detention was unnecessarily prolonged.

Respect

- S4 At our inspection in 2011, we made four recommendations in relation to this healthy establishment test, one of which was achieved, one partially achieved and two not achieved.
- S5 The accommodation was poor, and the mixing of the fingerprint, interview and holding rooms within the facility was inappropriate, but there were plans to rebuild it. The facility did not stock spare clothing for women. DCOs were polite and were focused on detainees' welfare. Refresher training in equality and diversity was basic. Detainees could practise their religion. The facility was not suitable for wheelchair users. Detainees could complain, but some investigations that should have substantiated complaints did not. Catering arrangements were adequate.

Activities

- S6 At our inspection in 2011, we made two recommendations in relation to this healthy establishment test, one of which was achieved and one not achieved.
- S7 There were insufficient activities for detainees held for long periods. The selection and range of books and DVDs were poor, and detainees could not access the fresh air.

¹ Put in place in the UK in April 2009 to identify, protect and support victims of trafficking.

Preparation for removal and release

- S8 At our inspection in 2011, we made two recommendations in relation to this healthy establishment test, one of which was partially achieved and one not achieved.
- S9 Visitors were not permitted. Detainees could not use the fax machine in the DCOs' office. DCOs gave detainees transferring to further detention written information about the immigration removal centre.

Section 1. Safety

Escort vehicles and transfers

Expected outcomes:

Detainees under escort are treated safely, decently and efficiently.

- I.1 There were no escorts or transfers into or out of the holding room during our inspection so we were unable to inspect escort vehicles or transfers. Escort staff continued to wear high visibility clothing routinely, which drew unnecessary attention to detainees when they were transferred through public areas for flights.

Recommendation

- I.2 **Escort staff should wear high visibility clothing only when safety rules require it.**
(Repeated recommendation I.3)

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 In the previous three months, 70% of those entering the facility had arrived at the airport on a flight, 15% from an immigration removal centre (IRC), 6% following a period of temporary admission, 5% from another terminal or short-term holding facility (STHF) at Heathrow and information was not known for a further 3%. The remainder arrived from prisons or hospital. The holding room was open 24 hours a day, seven days a week, and was staffed by two detainee custody officers (DCOs), including at least one woman. Three detainees arrived during our inspection, two women and a man. We also saw a man who had reported following a period of temporary admission and a mother with her daughter who were stopped at the border pending further investigation. Staff carried out rub-down searches in the middle of the office and with no privacy. We were told that detainees were not admitted to the holding room without an 'IS91' authority to detain. Detainees' property was tagged and securely stored in an adjacent locked room, with CCTV coverage.
- I.4 Detainees were not permitted to keep mobile phones with cameras and internet access. Alternative phones were available, but they were not routinely given to detainees to use with their own SIM card. Detainees were encouraged to give their friends, family and legal representatives the number of the payphone in the holding room for incoming calls, and were offered a free phone call for this purpose, but it was not private. A detainee told us that when he had been detained previously, demand for the telephone had been so high that his friends had not been able to contact him. Staff told us that the international telephone cards used to facilitate free international calls did not work on the payphone, but detainees were allowed to use the office telephone for such calls, which had to be kept short. When the airport facilities were open, staff could change detainees' foreign currency into sterling and buy telephone cards for them, but they did not routinely inform detainees of this. Detainees therefore had limited access to the outside world and contact with friends and family.

- 1.5** A basic detention information leaflet was freely available to detainees in 16 languages. All detainees were offered food on arrival and toiletry packs were available.

Recommendations

- 1.6** Initial interviews, rub-down searches and telephone calls should take place in private.
- 1.7** All detainees should be able to contact their friends, family and legal representatives.

Bullying and personal safety

Expected outcomes:

Detainees feel and are safe from bullying and victimisation.

- 1.8** The facility contained two holding rooms: one for males and one for females and families. This meant that male and female detainees could not always be held separately. DCOs had poor views of the holding rooms and could not see into them easily from their office. CCTV was used to monitor the holding rooms but the images on the screen were small and not an adequate safeguard. The risks were offset because the holding room doors were not locked, and detainees could enter the DCOs' office and request help in an emergency. DCOs said they would speak to detainees if necessary to defuse any tensions that might arise between them. As a final step, they could request a detainee to be moved to Cayley House short-term holding facility (STHF).²

Recommendations

- 1.9** Male and female detainees should not be held in the same holding room unless related.
- 1.10** DCOs should have a clear view of the holding rooms to monitor detainees safely.

Self-harm and suicide prevention

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.11** DCOs on duty had received self-harm prevention training during their initial training course but had not completed refresher training. They were familiar with assessment, care in detention and teamwork processes to support detainees at risk of self-harm, but rarely applied these processes. If a detainee presented a risk of self-harm, DCOs opened a suicide

² Cayley House is short-term holding facility located airside at Heathrow Airport near Terminal 3. It is non-residential but larger than facilities in the terminals. It is primarily used to hold detainees who have been transferred from immigration removal centres and are waiting their flight. HMIP inspected Cayley House in October 2014: www.justicespectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2015/03/2014-CAYLEY-HOUSE-STHF-final-report.pdf.

and self-harm warning form that would accompany the detainee to their next place of detention. Both the DCOs carried anti-ligature knives.

Recommendation

- 1.12 Staff should receive regular refresher training in suicide prevention and the assessment, care in detention and teamwork self-harm monitoring process.**
(Repeated recommendation 1.39)

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.³

- 1.13** Border Force had an on-site safeguarding and trafficking (SAT) team which, in addition to dealing with children's cases, was responsible for suspected victims of trafficking, both adults and children. Border Force was considering expanding the remit of the SAT team to cover all vulnerable adults.
- 1.14** DCOs were not aware if there was a safeguarding adults policy and could not recall having any safeguarding training. They said they would benefit from training to assist them deal with detainees with mental health issues. DCOs were not aware of the national referral mechanism (NRM) to report suspected victims of trafficking or trafficking indicators, and said these matters were Border Force's responsibility. They were unaware of any recent cases of suspected trafficking victims, which indicated that Border Force officers did not routinely share concerns about specific detainees with them (see also paragraph 1.21). Otherwise, staff were generally sensitive to the background of detainees, and specific individuals. Care planning was limited to children and people with disabilities.
- 1.15** Despite these limitation, detainees were generally held for short periods and their potential risks were recognised; DCOs understood the guidance and procedures to help reduce the risk of harm. However, Tascor did not attend the regular meetings between Border Force and Hillingdon social services (see paragraph 1.20), which could have expanded DCOs' learning opportunities.

Recommendations

- 1.16 Border Force should communicate safeguarding concerns about detainees to DCOs.**
- 1.17 DCOs should open care plans for all vulnerable adults, as well as children, and care plans should be kept updated and address any safeguarding concerns.**
- 1.18 Tascor should be represented at the fortnightly safeguarding case conferences with Hillingdon social services and disseminate learning points to detainee custody officers.**

³ 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).

Safeguarding children

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.19** In the previous three months (February to April 2015), 67 children were held: 55 accompanied and 12 unaccompanied. Accompanied children were held for an average of six hours and eight minutes, the longest for 19 hours and 15 minutes. Unaccompanied children were held for an average of five hours and one minute, the longest for nine hours and 40 minutes.
- I.20** The Border Force SAT team was responsible for interviewing children and progressing their cases, and all members had received enhanced checks from the Disclosure and Barring Service. Training was good; team members who interviewed children were required to have attended a four-day safeguarding course. There were fortnightly pan-Heathrow SAT case conference meetings, attended by officers from each terminal and Hillingdon social services, which provided an opportunity to share learning and discuss operational issues. We saw some examples of active safeguarding work with children, including the referral of a suspected victim of trafficking under the NRM.
- I.21** DCOs had received training in child protection from Barnardo's, but had mixed awareness of the issues. All children had a care plan that identified the staff caring for them during their stay and which was updated at shift changes. Plans contained good basic information, but did not comment on the child's mood. Staff were not aware of any recent detainees for whom there were safeguarding concerns, and we were not assured that Border Force routinely shared such concerns with them (see also paragraph I.14). For example, the care plan for a 17-year old suspected victim of trafficking detained shortly before the inspection stated there were no safeguarding concerns when in fact Border Force had made an NRM referral.
- I.22** There was a list of responsible adults to support unaccompanied children. They had a familiarisation briefing, but no formal training for their role. There were not enough responsible adults, although Border Force had recruited more volunteers who were waiting security clearance. Border Force case records indicated that some unaccompanied children had been fingerprinted, interviewed and detained without a responsible adult. A 14-year old boy was screened without a responsible adult because none was available. Records also indicated that there was no responsible adult available to support the suspected victim of trafficking referred to above. Border Force appointed and coordinated the responsible adults, which might have inhibited their independence.

Recommendation

- I.23 Responsible adults should be recruited, trained and coordinated independently of Border Force.**

Use of force

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.24** Force had been used twice in the last 12 months: both incidents involved detainees disrupting their removal at the gate. The related documentation assured us that force was used as a last resort and for no longer than necessary. DCOs on duty had received training

in the new Home Office Manual for Escorting Safely (HOMES) but had not used force since then. They were positive about the new training package and felt it was more suitable to the risks they faced. DCOs now carried rigid bar, rather than chain, handcuffs.⁴ Two HOMES kits were kept in the facility and comprised a backpack with a restraint belt that went around a detainee's waist and secured their arms, and leg restraints. The belt and leg restraints were nylon and secured by Velcro straps. Staff had not used force recently and said they would not use force to enforce a removal. Instead, the detainee would be taken to an IRC and the removal rebooked with overseas escorts. Border Force officers carried extendable batons, which was disproportionate.

Recommendation

I.25 Border Force officers should not carry batons inside the facility.

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.26 Detainees had poor access to legal representation. No advice agency or solicitors' numbers were displayed in the holding room. An old poster gave a Legal Aid Agency contact number, but this would have been of little practical use to detainees who did not speak English. As the facility was airside, legal representatives were unable to visit detainees. Although all arriving detainees were offered a free telephone call (see paragraph I.4), this was not in private. Detainees did not have access to a fax machine.

Recommendations

I.27 Border Force should negotiate with the Legal Aid Agency to offer telephone advice to detainees through an interpreting service similar to that used in its police station telephone immigration advice line.

I.28 Detainees should have access to fax machines, and this facility should be advertised in the holding room.

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.29 Most detainees had arrived on incoming flights: some had been refused entry to the UK and others were awaiting a decision on whether they would be allowed into the UK. A few detainees had been held in IRCs and were being removed from the UK via the facility. Written reasons for detention were not translated. In the previous three months, there

⁴ Handcuffs comprise two metal parts that go around a detainee's wrists and that are joined either by a short chain or a rigid bar. Chain handcuffs are difficult to apply to a detainee resisting their application but allow them more movement when applied. Rigid bar handcuffs are easier to apply and can be used to apply pain compliance techniques.

were 1,276 detentions.⁵ The average length of detention was six hours and 39 minutes. Twenty-five detainees had been held for 24 hours or more. The longest period of detention was 29 hours and 40 minutes. .

- I.30** DCOs refused to accept detainees without the necessary authority to detain (on form IS91). The form was retained by DCOs, and all were completed correctly, although in many cases only a photocopy had been provided.
- I.31** There was some evidence that detention was unnecessarily prolonged. In one case, consideration was delayed for some hours because no interpreter could be found to interview the detainee. The detainee was detained at 7.30pm, but not interviewed until 10.45am the following morning. He was granted temporary admission at 4.40pm but the reasons for this further delay were not clear from the Border Force's case management system. Shortly before our inspection, another detainee had been held for over 21 hours. In all these cases detainees were held too long without access to sleeping and washing facilities, fresh air or natural light.

Recommendations

- I.32** **Border Force should use interpreters when interviewing detainees with little or no English.**
- I.33** **Detention should be kept to a minimum period and detainees should not be held for an unreasonable time without access to sleeping and washing facilities, fresh air or natural light.**

⁵ Some detainees were held more than once in the three-month period. For example, some were stopped at the border, refused entry, transferred to an IRC for the night and returned the next day. Others were refused entry but granted temporary admission to close their affairs in the UK, and returned to the facility a few days later.

Respect

Accommodation

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.34** The accommodation continued to be poor. The facility comprised two holding rooms (one for adults and one for families) separated by a DCOs' office. Border Force interview rooms were next to the holding rooms and access to a fingerprint room was from the adult holding room. This mixing of functions was inappropriate and meant that some passengers who had not been detained had to pass through holding rooms to the interview rooms – which were also not adequately soundproofed. The décor was old, but there were plans to rebuild the facility. The holding rooms were poorly lit and poorly ventilated.
- I.35** Both holding rooms had male and female toilets that were small but properly screened. The family room had a baby change facility. There had been efforts to soften the environment in the family room by displaying posters, and there were children's play mats and a bean bag. Both holding rooms were cramped and had a long glass wall along a corridor that Border Force staff used to monitor detainees, but screening had created some privacy. The holding rooms lacked adequate sleeping facilities, other than a lounge-type chair. A travel cot was available for babies. Clothing was available for male detainees, and clothes for women could be obtained from Cayley House.
- I.36** The only shower facility was in Cayley House, a short minibus ride away. It was clean, and had fresh towels, but it smelled unpleasant. Signs in the holding room informed detainees that they could request a shower, but only two detainees had taken this opportunity in the previous 10 days. Showers were not offered routinely on arrival, but were offered to long-stayers.

Recommendations

- I.37** **There should be a stock of clean clothing in the holding room for female detainees in a range of sizes, including underwear.**
- I.38** **The rebuild of the facility should be implemented and should address the current poor lighting, ventilation and seating arrangements.**

Housekeeping point

- I.39** A shower should be offered to all detainees soon after they arrive.

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.40** DCOs were courteous and attentive to detainees' welfare. Both DCOs made good efforts to reassure elderly sisters who were concerned by their detention, speaking to them in their native language. Both officers wore name badges but the writing on them was too small to read clearly.

Housekeeping point

- I.41** DCO name badges should clearly display their name and status.

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.42** One of the DCOs had completed paper-based training on equality and diversity provided by Tascor's parent company, Capita. This was not specifically tailored to immigration detainees but did cover direct and indirect discrimination and protected characteristics. Detainees could practise their religion. Holding rooms contained a selection of religious books and prayer mats were available. A notice indicated the direction of Mecca and detainees could also request a compass. DCOs opened care plans for detainees with disabilities. The holding rooms were cramped and would have been difficult for wheelchair users to move around.

Recommendation

- I.43** There should be a disability impact assessment of the plans for the new facility, which should incorporate the findings from the assessment.

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.44** Complaint forms were freely available in a variety of languages in the holding rooms but not all detainees knew they could complain. A Border Force officer emptied complaint boxes daily, but the key to the boxes was kept in the DCOs' office and was accessible to DCOs on duty, which was inappropriate.

I.45 In the previous 12 months, three detainees had submitted complaints. Two were classified as ‘service complaints’ and one as ‘ill-treatment’. Tascor investigated complaints but the outcomes were sometimes incorrectly recorded. One detainee complained that she was not able to shower and the investigation found that she was not taken to Cayley House for a shower, yet the complaint was recorded as unsubstantiated. Another detainee held with his son for more than 24 hours complained about the inadequate sleeping facilities, overcrowding and temperature of the room, which were all legitimate grievances for detainees held for such a long time, yet this complaint was also found to be unsubstantiated. The third complaint was about a long wait and the poor conditions; although the investigations described the situation as ‘regrettable’ it went on to find the complaint unsubstantiated. In these three cases, there was no evidence that the investigator had attempted to contact the detainee to explore their complaint.

Recommendation

I.46 **Formal complaints should be dealt with fairly, investigations should carefully consider the evidence for and against upholding the complaint, and Tascor should contact complainants to discuss their complaint, recording the contact made.**

Housekeeping point

I.47 Keys to the complaint boxes should not be accessible to DCOs.

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.

I.48 Catering provision was adequate. A range of microwave meals, including halal and vegetarian options, and sandwiches were available. Detainees could help themselves to snacks, fruit and water in the holding room, but had to ask for other drinks. Baby food was available. The fridge and microwave were clean. Detainees had to eat hot food on their lap or on low tables.

Activities

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.49** There were insufficient activities for detainees held for long periods. The holding rooms had television, newspapers (including foreign language titles) and magazines. The selection of books was poor and there were few in foreign languages. A hand-held DVD player and Wii were available, but the selection of DVDs was poor. The child held during our inspection was offered the option to use the Wii. Activity packs were available for younger children. Detainees could not access the fresh air.

Recommendation

- I.50** The facility should provide a suitable range of activities including a wide range of books, magazines and DVDs in English and other languages.

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.51** In the previous three months, 32% of detainees had been removed from the UK, 25% were granted temporary admission, 24% were granted permission to enter the UK on leaving the facility and 14% were transferred to an IRC. The remainder were transferred to the police, hospital or Cayley House STHF.
- I.52** Visitors were not permitted in the holding room as it was airside. Subject to staff availability, detainees could log on to the internet in the office for short periods to check flight and ticket details but not for general web-browsing. However, this provision was not routinely explained to detainees. Although there was a fax machine in the office, detainees were not able to use it (see recommendation I.28). Information cards with the address and telephone number of IRCs were available for detainees transferring to further detention.

Housekeeping point

- I.53** Detainees should be told that they can request supervised access to the internet to check flight and ticket details.

Section 2. Recommendations and housekeeping points

Recommendations

To Home Office

- 2.1 Border Force should communicate safeguarding concerns about detainees to DCOs. (1.16)
- 2.2 Responsible adults should be recruited, trained and coordinated independently of Border Force. (1.23)
- 2.3 Border Force officers should not carry batons inside the facility. (1.25)
- 2.4 Border Force should negotiate with the Legal Aid Agency to offer telephone advice to detainees through an interpreting service similar to that used in its police station telephone immigration advice line. (1.27)
- 2.5 Border Force should use interpreters when interviewing detainees with little or no English. (1.32)
- 2.6 Detention should be kept to a minimum period and detainees should not be held for an unreasonable time without access to sleeping and washing facilities, fresh air or natural light. (1.33)

Recommendation

To the escort contractor

Escort vehicles and transfers

- 2.7 Escort staff should wear high visibility clothing only when safety rules require it. (1.2, repeated recommendation 1.3)

Recommendations

To the facility contractor

Arrival

- 2.8 Initial interviews, rub-down searches and telephone calls should take place in private. (1.6)
- 2.9 All detainees should be able to contact their friends, family and legal representatives. (1.7)

Bullying and personal safety

- 2.10 Male and female detainees should not be held in the same holding room unless related. (1.9)
- 2.11 DCOs should have a clear view of the holding rooms to monitor detainees safely. (1.10)

Self-harm and suicide prevention

- 2.12** Staff should receive regular refresher training in suicide prevention and the assessment, care in detention and teamwork self-harm monitoring process. (1.12, repeated recommendation 1.39)

Safeguarding (protection of adults at risk)

- 2.13** DCOs should open care plans for all vulnerable adults, as well as children, and care plans should be kept updated and address any safeguarding concerns. (1.17)
- 2.14** Tascor should be represented at the fortnightly safeguarding case conferences with Hillingdon social services and disseminate learning points to detainee custody officers. (1.18)

Legal rights

- 2.15** Detainees should have access to fax machines, and this facility should be advertised in the holding room. (1.28)

Accommodation

- 2.16** There should be a stock of clean clothing in the holding room for female detainees in a range of sizes, including underwear. (1.37)
- 2.17** The rebuild of the facility should be implemented and should address the current poor lighting, ventilation and seating arrangements. (1.38)

Equality and diversity

- 2.18** There should be a disability impact assessment of the plans for the new facility, which should incorporate the findings from the assessment. (1.43)

Complaints

- 2.19** Formal complaints should be dealt with fairly, investigations should carefully consider the evidence for and against upholding the complaint, and Tascor should contact complainants to discuss their complaint, recording the contact made. (1.46)

Activities

- 2.20** The facility should provide a suitable range of activities including a wide range of books, magazines and DVDs in English and other languages. (1.50)

Housekeeping point

To the Home Office

- 2.21** Keys to the complaint boxes should not be accessible to DCOs. (1.47)

Housekeeping points

To the facility contractor

- 2.22** A shower should be offered to all detainees soon after they arrive. (1.39)
- 2.23** DCO name badges should clearly display their name and status. (1.41)
- 2.24** Detainees should be told that they can request supervised access to the internet to check flight and ticket details. (1.53)

Section 3. Appendices

Appendix I: Inspection team

Colin Carroll	Inspector
Jeanette Hall	Inspector
Deri Hughes-Roberts	Inspector

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.

Recommendations

Escort staff should wear high-visibility jackets only when safety rules require it. (1.3)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 1.2)

UKBA managers should liaise with airport and airline managers to encourage appropriate and sensitive approaches to managing and addressing people being removed. (1.4)

Partially achieved

A female detainee custody officer should be present in the holding room whenever a woman is detained there and for the duration of her detention. (1.18)

Achieved

Personal searching should take place in privacy. (1.19)

Not achieved

Detainees without suitable mobile telephones or cash should be routinely offered a free telephone call. (1.20)

Achieved

Detainees should not be held in the facility for more than 24 hours. (1.32)

Not achieved

Detainees should be given written reasons explaining why they are being detained in a language they understand. (1.33)

Not achieved

The authority to detain (IS91) form should be fully completed and include photographs before the detainee enters the holding room and is transferred into the custody of G4S. (1.34)

Not achieved

Staff should receive regular refresher training in suicide prevention and the assessment, care in detention and teamwork self-harm monitoring process. (1.39)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 1.12)

Detainee custody officers should routinely carry anti-ligature knives. (1.40)

Achieved

Detainees should only be held where the necessary written authority (IS91) has been issued. (1.49)

Achieved

Children should only be held in the family room. (1.50)

Achieved

Respect

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

Recommendations

There should be a stock of clean clothing for both male and female detainees in a range of sizes, including underwear. (1.21)

Partially achieved

Detainees should not be held for substantial periods or overnight without sufficient sleeping facilities. (1.22)

Not achieved

A disability impact assessment should be carried out and its findings implemented. (1.56)

Not achieved

The holding room should have a food comments book, with its purpose explained in a range of languages, which should be checked regularly by UKBA and the contractor for feedback on the meals and refreshments. (1.66)

Achieved

Activities

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

Recommendations

Detainees should not be held for substantial periods without access to exercise in the fresh air. (1.58)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 1.50)

There should be activities for school-age children in the holding rooms. (1.59)

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

Detainees should be able to receive visits. (1.72)

Not achieved

Detainees should have access to fax, email and internet. (1.73)

Partially achieved

Appendix III: Photographs

Main holding room



Female / family holding room

