

Detainees under escort:
Inspection of escort and removals to

Pakistan

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

14–15 February 2018

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.justiceinspectrates.gov.uk/hmiprison/about-our-inspections/>

Crown copyright 2018

This publication, excluding logos, is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. To view this licence, visit nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3 or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

Where we have identified any third party copyright information 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.justiceinspectrates.gov.uk/hmiprison/>

Printed and published by:
Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons
Clive House
5th floor
70 Petty France
London
SW1H 9EX
England

Contents

Fact page	4
Introduction	5
Section 1. Summary	6
Section 2. Background	8
Section 3. Safety	9
Section 4. Respect	13
Section 5. Preparation for reintegration	16
Section 6. Summary of recommendations	17
Section 7. Appendices	18
Appendix I: Inspection team	18
Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report	19
Appendix III: Axiom leaflet	21

Fact page

Departure airport

Stansted

Destination country

Pakistan

Destination airport

Islamabad

Escort contractor

Tascor

Number of detainees escorted

34

Number of escort staff

85

Health care staff

6 (2 on flight)

Length of journey

17 hours (maximum)

Introduction

We have inspected the regular charter removal to Pakistan on two previous occasions, in December 2013 and June 2015. The positive and negative features we had seen at previous inspections were largely unchanged. We saw staff dealing with detainees respectfully and keeping them informed about the process, although some detainees did not receive sufficient notice of their removal. In 2015 many escorts had fallen asleep on the aircraft next to the person in their charge. On this occasion, while the problem was less pronounced, we still found a few escorts asleep next to detainees they were meant to be supervising.

At our previous inspection, we commented on a series of mechanical breakdowns on the coaches used for transfers. On this inspection, a fire broke out on one of the coaches transporting detainees to the airport, which could have had more serious consequences.

Professional interpreting was still not used enough. There was no interpreter on the coach that had the fire, and some detainees in a frightening emergency situation may not have understood what was said to them or been able to communicate effectively with escort staff.

The need for restraints was in most cases assessed in an appropriate and proportionate manner. However, they were still applied for too long and with no recorded evidence of need in some cases. We also noted the persistence of other measures that create anxiety and intimidate detainees, such as filming them without explaining why, crowding around them when they are speaking with immigration officers, and using 'guiding' holds on them despite full compliance. These recurrent problems need to be addressed.

Overall this operation was completed reasonably efficiently, but nine of our 11 previous recommendations were not achieved and there is too little focus on improvement.

Peter Clarke CVO OBE QPM
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

April 2018

Section 1. Summary

- 1.1** This flight carried 34 detainees. Several removals were cancelled at short notice, including some after a fire on one of the coaches. Inspectors were on the coach that had left the centre after this one, and arrived on the scene later. A Home Office investigation outcome was still pending at the time of writing. Three women were on the flight. The longest journey time from leaving the immigration removal centre (IRC) to arriving in Islamabad was 16 hours. Despite the recurrence of practices criticised at the previous inspection, other aspects of the removal were conducted satisfactorily.
- 1.2** At the Spectrum House¹ staff briefings, the focus on security was appropriate and risks were conveyed in a proportionate way. However, staff were instructed that if waist restraint belts were used, they could only be removed after the plane had taken off. This did not reflect the requirement that the use of restraints should be proportionate to the risks and only continue for as long as necessary. The briefing did not remind staff of the importance of detainee welfare and the stresses that detainees being forcibly removed might be experiencing.
- 1.3** Most detainees had been at the IRC for at least 48 hours before departing. No reserve detainees were identified for this flight. Three detainees were to be removed under 'operation perceptor', which meant they were arrested and taken to the flight on the same day.
- 1.4** Searching was proportionate, the movement of detainees on to coaches was reasonable and escort staff were courteous. There was not enough privacy in some cases: for example, at Harmondsworth we observed a detainee having his money (over £1,000) counted out in front of other detainees.
- 1.5** Handovers between IRC staff and escorting medical staff only took place at two of the four centres we attended. At some centres the paramedics routinely read all medical notes, and some discussed medical matters in the hearing of others, both of which compromised confidentiality.
- 1.6** Four waist restraint belts were applied to male detainees and in at least two cases their use was not proportionate or necessary. We only observed staff at Yarl's Wood informing detainees that they would be filmed boarding the plane and explaining why. A few detainees were clearly concerned about being filmed. Detainees were not told that escort staff would hold their arms or elbows on boarding the aircraft, or why.
- 1.7** We observed generally good interactions between detainees and escort staff, although professional interpreters were not routinely provided. The only time detainees were referred to by name was at the IRC when greeted by the coach commander. In all other interactions the detainees were referred to only by their number, which was impersonal and unlikely to ease anxiety. Doors were still held open when detainees used the toilet on the coaches and aircraft.
- 1.8** All detainees were advised that they could make telephone calls on the coaches and some did so. 'Speak Freely' information sheets on making a complaint about Tascor staff were handed out to detainees, but we saw no provision for making complaints about the Home Office.

¹ Spectrum House is Tascor's head office, near Gatwick Airport.

- I.9** During the flight, some escorts tried to engage with detainees to check on their welfare and reassure them while others did not, and a few staff fell asleep while supervising detainees.
- I.10** The positioning and number of escort staff during the immigration surgery was intimidating and not proportionate to risk, which we were repeatedly told by staff and managers was low. Alighting from the plane was swift and orderly.

Section 2. Background

- 2.1** 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 monitors the treatment of and conditions for detainees. Escorts are included in this remit. HM Inspectorate of Prisons is one of several bodies making up the NPM in the UK.
- 2.2** This was the third charter flight to Pakistan that we have inspected. The aircraft was chartered by the Home Office Directorate of Immigration Enforcement, and Tascor was the escort contractor. Detainees were collected from five immigration removal centres (IRCs): Colnbrook, Brook House, Harmondsworth, Yarl's Wood and Campsfield House.
- 2.3** There were 34 detainees on the flight, fewer than the 65 expected because of legal intervention for some detainees and a fire on one of the coaches during the journey to Stansted. We await outcomes of the investigation into this incident. All these detainees were returned to the IRCs. The entire process was inspected, from the point at which detainees were collected from IRCs to arrival in Islamabad. Inspectors attended Colnbrook, Brook House, Harmondsworth and Yarl's Wood IRCs before the arrival of the escort teams. An inspector also attended the initial staff briefing. More than one coach left some IRCs, and in these cases inspectors boarded the last coach. Two inspectors travelled on the flight, which took off from Stansted at approximately 12.25am on 15 February 2018. It landed in Islamabad at approximately 7.40am (12.40pm local time).
- 2.4** The longest journey time from leaving on the coach at the IRC to alighting at Islamabad was 16 hours. The records for the last three flights to Pakistan were examined as part of this report. Those removals took place on 5 and 19 December 2017 and 9 January 2018. The number of detainees on those flights was, respectively, 37, 28 and 15.

Section 3. Safety

Expected outcomes:

Detainees are escorted in safety and due regard is given to individual needs and risks. Removals are conducted in accordance with law. Security and good order are maintained through proportional operational arrangements and force is only used as a last resort.

Preparation and departure from removal centres

- 3.1** The operation started with two staff briefings at Spectrum House in Gatwick. We attended the second briefing. Not all staff were listening and some at the back of the room were talking among themselves. Staff were instructed not to use electronic devices during the outward flight. No guidance was given on welfare issues, such as the stress that detainees might be experiencing and the importance of treating them decently (see also paragraph 3.10).
- 3.2** Most detainees had been at the immigration removal centre (IRC) for at least two nights before the flight. However, the manifest indicated that two had travelled the previous day from Dungavel to Harmondsworth and one had only travelled from Dungavel on the day of the flight.
- 3.3** Many detainees were unaware of the exact date of the flight. All had been served a notice that outlined a period in which they could be removed, but some only became aware of the exact time when they were woken in the middle of the night. Three detainees were also being removed under ‘operation perceptor’ which involved Home Office immigration enforcement teams arresting people with no legal right to reside in the UK and taking them to a flight on the same day; all three were removed from the escort before they boarded the aircraft following legal intervention. At Yarl’s Wood, detainees were given no time to pack their own property, which staff had to do for them.
- 3.4** At all IRCs, the coach commander (the officer in charge of each coach) greeted detainees by name in most cases, shook their hand and explained what would happen. They advised detainees who raised legal issues that a telephone would be made available for them to contact their solicitors from the coach.

Recommendation

- 3.5 Managers should ensure that staff are attentive through the initial staff briefing and that guidance is given on welfare issues.**
- 3.6 Detainees should have time to pack their own belongings before removal.**

Safeguarding adults and personal safety

- 3.7** Searching was proportionate and respectful and staff engaged detainees in informal conversation. In some cases, privacy was inadequate. At Harmondsworth we observed a detainee with over £1,000 being counted out in front of other detainees. At Yarl’s Wood the toilet door was kept ajar when women wished to use it, which was degrading and unnecessary. In some cases, an officer placed a hand on the detainee’s back with no apparent

need. We observed one detainee alighting from the coach at Brook House, after his removal had been cancelled following legal intervention. He was taken back into reception in a 'guiding hold' (holding the detainee's hand and elbow), which was unnecessary.

- 3.8** The staff-detainee ratio was set at 1.5. As detainees were withdrawn from the flight, staff stood down accordingly. Staff were calm and confident and understood the procedures. They told us that they had received Home Office training on escorting detainees safely, and most had also been on a refresher course. Escorting staff were dressed informally, although handcuffs attached to their belts were visible in most cases. A Tascor operational manager accompanied the flight to supervise practice and support supervising officers.
- 3.9** Detainees were filmed while boarding the plane to provide a record for the purposes of accountability, in case detainees resisted and force was used. Person escort records (PERs) indicated that detainees had been told this would happen, but we only saw this information being given to detainees at Yarl's Wood. Several detainees boarding the aircraft were surprised to be filmed and asked the reason. One escort told a detainee that it was 'for his benefit' and 'not for him to worry about'.
- 3.10** During the initial briefings for escorting staff, the focus on security was appropriate and the risks posed by the detainees, which were generally low, were not overstated. However, on the coach and on the aircraft detainees could only use the toilet if they left the door ajar, apparently to reduce the risk of disruptive behaviour. This practice was not based on individual risk assessment and was an unnecessary intrusion on privacy.
- 3.11** Coach commanders undertook a risk assessment of each detainee to determine if a waist restraint belt should be used. This was straightforward for most detainees whose known risks were low, but for a minority the information on risk was inadequate. Several PERs read 'disruptive on transfer', but provided no further detail on the nature of the risk.
- 3.12** In most cases commanders demonstrated an appropriate and proportionate consideration of risk and contributed to the relaxed but professional way in which the operation was carried out. Four detainees were placed in waist restraint belts before they left their IRCs but in two cases they did not appear necessary or proportionate. One detainee was reluctant to leave but offered no active resistance. Another had presented as unwell but was cleared to travel by health care staff. He was slow to comply with staff instructions but did not actively resist and the belt was applied. Use of force paperwork stated that the belt had been used because he was 'slowing things down'.
- 3.13** One of the belts was removed on the coach when a detainee's removal was cancelled. Two more were removed when the seat belt sign was switched off after leaving Stansted. The detainees had been fully compliant throughout the journey, but staff did not test compliance or attempt to remove the belts earlier.
- 3.14** The fourth belt was removed when the detainee was handed over to the Pakistani authorities in Islamabad. There was evidence of risks to be managed in this case. He had repeatedly told staff that he had a weapon on him and would harm himself if he had the opportunity. The detainee had a history of self-harm and concealing weapons. At the time of his removal he was on an ACDT² and had been on constant supervision at the IRC. During the flight his wrists were checked appropriately by medical staff and his restraint belt was placed in the restricted position when he needed to eat, drink or use the toilet. The detainee had later told staff that he was happy to return to Pakistan and did not in fact have a weapon.
- 3.15** Records from the previous three removals to Pakistan showed, respectively, one, five, and one uses of force, including passive restraints, on these operations. Similar concerns about

² Assessment, care in detention and teamwork case management of detainees at risk of suicide or self-harm.

restraints emerged from the incident reports that we examined. For example, on the most recent previous removal on 9 January 2018, two women were placed in waist restraint belts. The reasons given in the incident report paperwork were:

‘On arriving at Colnbrook, told that 18 and 19, mum and daughter don’t want to return. They are clinging to each other. In their room.’ ... ‘Waist restraint belt is used to discourage any further plans of possible disruption. By keeping it in restricted maintains proportionality. It is necessary to ensure the family unit don’t attempt anything untoward.’

This did not demonstrate that use of the restraint belts, which remained on until the aircraft took off, four hours 15 minutes later, was necessary. There was no evidence of disruption or plans to disrupt, or any attempt to engage with the women and take steps to ensure compliance short of using restraints. The women were compliant throughout.

- 3.16** During their initial briefing staff had been instructed that waist restraint belts could only be removed with the authorisation of a senior manager and only after the flight had taken off. This instruction did not reflect the requirement for the use of restraints to be proportionate to risk and to continue only while necessary. It was routine practice to hold detainees by both elbows while boarding the aircraft. Given the risks at the moment of boarding, this could be justified as proportionate, but detainees were not told that they would be held and were surprised by it. While on the aircraft, it was not clear why fully compliant detainees had to be held by one or both wrists while being taken to their seats.
- 3.17** The Home Office Chief Immigration Officer (CIO) held a surgery to answer detainees’ questions, which was positive. However, when he spoke to individual detainees during the flight, security measures were disproportionate. At least four officers surrounded the detainee while the CIO leant over the seat in front to speak to him.
- 3.18** Two detainees were on ACDTs. However, the PER of another detainee referred to threats of self-harm in the current risk section. He had not been placed on an ACDT by centre staff. The flight manifest given to escort staff at Brook House indicated that he was a suicide risk and had repeatedly threatened to kill himself if he was removed. The detainee was later removed from the coach and returned to the centre following legal intervention.

Recommendations

- 3.19** **Unless an individual risk assessment indicates otherwise, detainees should be able to use the toilet in complete privacy.** (Repeated recommendation 3.10)
- 3.20** **Escorts should not lay hands on detainees without a specific cause, justified in writing in each individual case.** (Repeated recommendation 3.17)
- 3.21** **Physical restraints should only be applied for as long as necessary for safety or effective removal. Staff should remove restraints if they assess that the risks have reduced.**
- 3.22** **Only the minimum number of staff required for security and safety should be positioned around a detainee during the immigration surgery conducted by the chief immigration officer on the aircraft.**

Legal rights

- 3.23** Staff provided appropriate support to detainees with legal concerns. All detainees were advised during the discharge process at the IRC that they would be given access to a mobile phone on the coach to call solicitors or family and friends (see paragraph 3.4). Detainees were able to make calls on the coach and at the airport until just before take-off, and many took advantage of this opportunity. Detainees could keep legal documents with them on the coach. Detainees we spoke to complained of poor legal advice from some providers which had cost them a great deal.

Section 4. Respect

Expected outcomes:

**Detainees are escorted in decent physical conditions and individual needs are addressed.
Detainees are treated with humanity and respect.**

Physical conditions and property

- 4.1** The coaches we travelled on were warm and clean, with adequate storage. The first coach departing from Harmondsworth caught fire on the motorway and had to be evacuated. Inspectors were on a coach that was following some distance behind and attended the incident to collect detainees and staff. Detainees had all been placed in handcuffs, which were removed as they boarded the coach with staff. Some detainees had been given ponchos to keep them dry. They were offered hot drinks and food and were taken to Stansted airport where they were transferred to another coach and returned to the IRC. On arrival at Heathrow all the detainees on the coach were seen by a member of a health care team. The detainees and staff involved did not travel to Pakistan that evening. One detainee who had fallen and hurt his wrist was taken to hospital for treatment before being returned to the IRC.
- 4.2** We received conflicting reports about the evacuation procedure and a Home Office investigation had not reported at time of writing. We requested incident reports from Tascor in relation to this incident. A single generic use of force document was completed for all detainees, which did not show how long detainees were in handcuffs, exactly when they were applied, or whether the risks of injury from the coach fire were taken into account.
- 4.3** Some detainees spent excessive periods on coaches even before the long flight had started. Detainees on the coach from Brook House waited for two hours 45 minutes before boarding the aircraft.
- 4.4** Detainees were provided with cold drinks and a choice of sandwiches, crisps and fruit soon after the coach left. All detainees were served before staff were offered food and drinks.
- 4.5** The plane was clean and warm. Hot food and drinks were provided on the flight and meals were suitably balanced and diverse to meet the needs of the detainees. Two hot meals were served which included halal sausages and vegetarian options. Detainees could not use the toilets in private (see paragraph 3.10), no sanitary products were available in the toilets and detainees were not offered blankets or pillows.
- 4.6** Detainees had very little property with them. They could note down key phone numbers from their personal SIM card before their phones were taken from them for the journey. Detainees could wear belts and could keep paper money with them, but not coins. We observed escort staff handling property well. It was placed in the storage compartment of the coach and on arrival at the airport it was removed, screened and placed in the hold of the aircraft. Detainees and staff travelling on the coach which caught fire lost all their property.

Recommendations

- 4.7 Detainees should spend the shortest possible time on coaches.**
- 4.8 Detainees should be given pillows and blankets during flights subject to a risk assessment.**

Respectful treatment

- 4.9** Escort staff greeted detainees by name at the IRCs but otherwise referred to them by their manifest number. This was impersonal and did not convey a commitment to the care and welfare of each detainee. Otherwise most staff engaged well with detainees and provided support, information and reassurance. This helped to mitigate the lack of notice for the flight that some detainees had spoken of (see paragraph 3.3). One detainee, who told us he had been given two hours' notice that he was on the flight, was particularly complimentary. He said his escort was 'excellent' and had done much to reassure him and 'help him calm down'.
- 4.10** Towards the end of the coach journey, a few staff became less attentive and spoke among themselves in loud and jocular voices over the heads of detainees. One staff member who was following a football game on social media cheered loudly at one point, which was unprofessional.
- 4.11** 'Speak Freely' information sheets on making a complaint about Tascor staff were handed out to all detainees and were available in different languages. Detainees did not receive any information on how to complain about Home Office staff.
- 4.12** Escort staff did not know which detainees did not speak English. Two escorts stationed on the coach at Brook House spoke Urdu and Punjabi and at Colnbrook an IRC staff member was available in reception to interpret. However, the availability of interpreters was inconsistent at IRCs and on escort.
- 4.13** There had been a recent outbreak of flu at Brook House and IRC health care staff were present throughout the operation so that detainees could be given a final health check before flying. A member of health care staff was available at Yarl's Wood to hand over medical information about detainees. The presence of health care staff ensured good liaison with the escorting paramedics but health care staff did not attend reception at other IRCs. At Harmondsworth, the medical notes of two detainees had become mixed leading to confusion over whether one detainee was diabetic. The detainee himself made several attempts to confirm that he was not diabetic. This was discussed in the main discharge area in the vicinity of staff and other detainees. Some paramedics opened and read all medical notes even if there was no reason to do so, compromising confidentiality.
- 4.14** IPRS Aeromed staff (supplier of travel related medical services) checked on detainees throughout the flight, distributed tablets to detainees who felt unwell and monitored a diabetic detainee. On arrival in Islamabad, sealed medical notes and medication were given to each detainee, but some detainees did not appear to understand what the envelope contained.
- 4.15** Detainees were seated appropriately throughout the plane. Female detainees were at the front of the aircraft and were able to talk to each other, which was positive. The detainees in waist restraint belts were positioned discreetly towards the back of the plane in the centre seats with a member of escort staff on either side. Other detainees were seated in a window seat or in the centre of the plane with a member of escort staff next to them.

- 4.16** Some staff appeared to be asleep or dozing during the flight rather than supervising the detainees. Others remained awake but we observed good communication between staff and detainees in only a few cases.

Recommendations

- 4.17** Detainees should be told how to make complaints or submit comments about Home Office or escort staff during or after the removal. (Repeated recommendation 4.16)
- 4.18** Escort staff should be informed in advance of detainees who do not speak English, and professional interpretation should be provided routinely.
- 4.19** There should be a consistent health care handover process from IRC health care staff to those responsible for health care during the removal. Escort staff should only open and read confidential medical records when there is evidence of a cause for concern.

Section 5. Preparation for reintegration

Expected outcomes:

**Detainees are prepared for their arrival and early days in the destination country.
Any unacceptable behaviour in destination countries is appropriately challenged.**

- 5.1** There was little preparation for removal or reintegration. No group surgeries had taken place to explain the process of removal. Some detainees who had had limited notice of removal (see paragraph 3.3) told us they did not know what was happening until they met the escort staff.
- 5.2** Tascor no longer gave detainees a copy of the useful booklet, *Coming Home to Pakistan*. They were given a leaflet by an organisation called Axiom International, which provided some free support and services for detainees on their arrival in Pakistan (see Appendix III). However, there was no systematic understanding of or approach to the reintegration needs of detainees. Some detainees were uncertain what they would do once they arrived in Pakistan or what support was available.
- 5.3** No female staff from the Pakistani immigration authority were present to receive female detainees as they came off the plane. Two of the returning male detainees were ex-prisoners on the sex offenders register and highlighted as a risk to women. The Home Office confirmed that relevant information about risk to the public was passed on to the Pakistani authorities by ACRO (the police criminal records office),³ via Interpol.
- 5.4** A short time into the flight, detainees were asked if they wished to speak to the chief immigration officer (CIO) who was on the flight and why. All detainees, including women, were taken in turn to a seat at the rear of the front section of the aircraft, next to the toilets. The CIO dealt thoroughly and courteously with all detainees, including interpreting for them, but the security procedures were disproportionate (see paragraph 3.16).

Recommendation

- 5.5 Detainees should be given information about their destination country, including the help and support that is available on their return. Such information should be given in advance of the removal, and detainees helped to contact sources of support and advice.**

³ <https://www.acro.police.uk/home.aspx>

Section 6. Summary of recommendations

Recommendation

To the Home Office

- 6.1** Detainees should have time to pack their own belongings before removal. (3.6)

Recommendations

To the Home Office and Tascor

- 6.2** Managers should ensure that staff are attentive through the initial staff briefing and that guidance is given on welfare issues. (3.5)
- 6.3** Physical restraints should only be applied for as long as necessary for safety or effective removal. Staff should remove restraints if they assess that the risks have reduced. (3.21)
- 6.4** Detainees should be told how to make complaints or submit comments about Home Office or escort staff during or after the removal. (4.17, repeated recommendation 4.16)
- 6.5** Escort staff should be informed in advance of detainees who do not speak English, and professional interpretation should be provided routinely. (4.18)

Recommendations

To Tascor

- 6.6** Unless an individual risk assessment indicates otherwise, detainees should be able to use the toilet in complete privacy. (3.19, repeated recommendation 3.10)
- 6.7** Escorts should not lay hands on detainees without a specific cause, justified in writing in each individual case. (3.20, repeated recommendation 3.17)
- 6.8** Only the minimum number of staff required for security and safety should be positioned around a detainee during the immigration surgery conducted by the chief immigration officer on the aircraft. (3.22)
- 6.9** Detainees should spend the shortest possible time on coaches. (4.7)
- 6.10** Detainees should be given pillows and blankets during flights subject to a risk assessment. (4.8)
- 6.11** There should be a consistent health care handover process from IRC health care staff to those responsible for health care during the removal. Escort staff should only open and read confidential medical records when there is evidence of a cause for concern. (4.19)
- 6.12** Detainees should be given information about their destination country, including the help and support that is available on their return. Such information should be given in advance of the removal, and detainees helped to contact sources of support and advice. (5.5)

Section 7. Appendices

Appendix I: Inspection team

Tamara Pattinson	Team leader
Kam Sarai	Inspector
Deri Hughes-Roberts	Inspector
Maureen Jamieson	Inspector

Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report

The following is a summary of the main findings from the last report (30 June – 1 July 2015) and a list of all the recommendations made, organised under the three broad tests of healthy detention practice. 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 escorted in safety and due regard is given to individual needs and risks.

Recommendations

Only the minimum number of staff for security and safety should be positioned around a detainee. (3.9)

Not achieved

Escorts should not lay hands on detainees without a specific cause, justified in writing in each individual case. (3.17)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 3.20)

Physical restraints should be applied only for as long as they are needed for safety or to effect removal. (3.18)

Not achieved

Senior managers should ensure that staff are able to undertake their duties effectively and safely at all times while they are responsible for the care of detainees, especially when they are caring for detainees with an identified risk of self-harm. (3.24)

Not achieved

Risk assessments should outline risk factors clearly so that any member of staff escorting a detainee can refer to them easily. (3.25)

Not achieved

Respect

Detainees are escorted in decent physical conditions and individual needs are addressed. Detainees are treated with humanity and respect.

Recommendations

Unless an individual risk assessment indicates otherwise, detainees should be able to use the toilet in complete privacy. (3.10)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 3.19)

All coaches should have toilets that work and adequate air-conditioning. (4.4)

Achieved

Detainees should be told how to make complaints or submit comments about Home Office or escort staff during or after the removal. (4.16)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 4.17)

Female detainees should be kept separate from male detainees at all times. (4.12)

Achieved

Professional interpretation should be used to enhance communication throughout the removal process. (4.13)

Not achieved

There should be a consistent, agreed process for handover of medical information from IRC health care staff to those responsible for health care during the removal. (4.19)

Not achieved

Appendix III: Axiom leaflet

Greetings,

Axiom International team welcomes you upon your return to the homeland and is available at airport public area to further facilitate you in getting back home. Our representatives wearing white caps are accessible at airport exit terminal to help you access the following services free of cost;

- Calling Home
- Refreshment
- Onward Travel Assistance
- Overnight Stay
- Medical Facilitation (if Required)
- Air Tickets (For Quetta & Karachi only)
- Lost Baggage Claim



Axiom International

Helpline: +92 (0) 348 111 5050

Email: ask@axiom-international-ltd.com

Website: www.axiom-international-ltd.com



اسلام علیکم!

ایگزیم انٹرنیشنل ٹیم آپ کو وطن واپسی پر خوش آمدید کہتی ہے اور ایئر پورٹ پر آپ کی گھروں کو روانگی کی سہولت فراہم کرنے کے لئے موجود ہے۔ ایئر پورٹ ایگزٹ ٹرمینل پر موجود سفید ٹوپی پہنے ہمارے نمائندے آپ کو مندرجہ ذیل سہولیات فراہم کریں گے۔



Axiom International
Helpline: +92 (0) 348 111 5050
Email: ask@axiom-international-ltd.com
Website: www.axiom-international-ltd.com

گھرفون کرنے کی سہولت

ایئر پورٹ سے گھر پہنچنے میں مدد

طبی سہولت (اگر ضرورت ہو) ہوائی جہاز کا ٹکٹ (صرف کوئٹہ اور کراچی کے لئے)

