

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

Heathrow Airport Terminal 4

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

29 October 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.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprison/about-our-inspections/>

Crown copyright 2019

This publication 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.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprison/>

Printed and published by:
Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons
3rd floor
10 South Colonnade
Canary Wharf
London
E14 4PU
England

Contents

Fact page	4
Introduction	5
About this inspection and report	6
Summary	7
Section 1. Safety	8
Respect	13
Preparation for removal and release	15
Section 2. Summary of recommendations	17
Section 3. Appendices	19
Appendix I: Inspection team	19
Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report	20
Appendix III: Photographs	22

Fact page

Task of the establishment

To hold newly arrived passengers pending a UK Border Force decision on their entry, and those being removed from the United Kingdom.

Location

Heathrow Airport Terminal 4 (Airside)

Name of contractor

Mitie Care and Custody

Last inspection

13 May 2015

Escort provider

Mitie Care and Custody

Introduction

Situated to the south of Heathrow Airport, Terminal 4 serves international carriers, mostly to and from non-European destinations. The non-residential short-term holding facility (STHF) 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.

Since our previous inspection in 2015, the short-term holding facility had been refurbished to a good standard. It comprised two rooms for detainees – one for adults and the other for families – and a staff area. Both holding rooms now had showers.

In May 2018, there was also a change in contract provider from Tascor to Mitie Care and Custody. We were told that this limited the amount of management data available. Despite it being contrary to practice in other STHFs, staff told us that mobile phones were no longer provided for detainees, limiting their ability to communicate with the outside world. This restriction was not applied at the nearby Terminal 3 holding room, which we inspected at the same time.

Two adult detainees were held during our inspection. In the previous three months, 766 detainees had been detained. In 111 cases, detainees were held for over 12 hours and in four for over 24 hours. The longest period of detention we identified was 32 hours and 25 minutes. Mitie was unable to provide consolidated figures on detention length; we derived our figures from raw data provided by Mitie Care and Custody. 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 detention¹

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.

¹ Non-residential STHFs are unsuitable for long stays and detainees should not be held in them for more than a few hours. This limits what activities can or need to be provided. We will therefore report any notable issues concerning activities in the accommodation and facilities section.

Summary

- S1 At our inspection in May 2015, we made 20 recommendations, five of which we found at this inspection were achieved, one partially achieved and 13 not achieved. For the remaining recommendation, neither Mitie Care and Custody nor the Home Office could provide sufficient information to enable us to judge whether it had been met.
- S2 Since our previous inspection in 2015, the facility had been refurbished to a good standard. Mitie Care and Custody had become the new contract provider in May 2018 and ran the facility on behalf of the Home Office.
- S3 Detainees were given a rub-down search on arrival and could make a telephone call. However, neither were sufficiently private, and detainees were no longer given mobile phones to use in the holding room, which limited their ability to speak to lawyers, friends and family.
- S4 Unrelated male and female detainees continued to be held together but detainee custody officers (DCOs) now had good views of the holding rooms. DCOs carried anti-ligature knives but had not received refresher training in self-harm prevention, and did not have sufficient knowledge of safeguarding and adults at risk in detention.
- S5 Force was rarely used in the facility. Detainees had limited access to legal support or advice, and no access to fax, email or the internet.
- S6 The two holding rooms were large and clean but had little decoration to create a relaxing environment for detainees, who were often held for many hours. The fixed tables and seats were in good condition. Some lounge style chairs had been installed but these were not suitable for detainees to sleep on for any lengthy periods. Showers and designated male and female toilets were now provided, which was an improvement.
- S7 Detainees could practise their religion and there was a multi-faith room in the main holding area. There were adapted facilities, including a shower and toilet, for those with disabilities. Complaint forms were available but not prominently displayed.
- S8 Snacks and hot and cold drinks were freely available in the holding rooms, and staff could provide microwave meals to detainees. A limited, but up-to-date, range of newspapers and magazines and books were available for detainees, and there were additional facilities for children in the family room.
- S9 Visitors were not allowed into the facility and no property could be left for detainees. Detainees transferring to immigration removal centres were given a small information card about their destination centre, including some useful information about visiting times and contact numbers.

Section 1. Safety

Arrival and reception

Expected outcomes:

Detainees travelling to and arriving at the facility are treated with respect and care.

Risks are identified and acted on. Induction is comprehensive.

- I.1 Mitie Care and Custody was unable to provide consolidated figures on where detainees had arrived from. However, most detainees arrived at the facility from a flight, and some from an immigration removal centre (IRC) or the community. In the absence of collated Mitie figures, we did not have exact percentages.
- I.2 The facility comprised two holding rooms and one staff office. It was open 24 hours a day, seven days a week and were staffed by two detainee custody officers (DCOs). We were told that at least one of the DCOs on duty would be a woman. There were two detainees in one holding room at the start of our inspection, and no further detainees arrived during the inspection. We were, therefore, unable to observe initial interviews. DCOs informed us that they would use professional telephone interpreting if necessary, and that they would not accept custody of a detainee without a completed authority to detain (IS91).
- I.3 Detainees were given a rub-down search on arrival and could make a telephone call. However, neither were sufficiently private, and staff told us they no longer gave detainees mobile phones to use in the holding room, which limited their ability to speak to lawyers, friends and family. We were later informed by Home Office staff that we had been inaccurately advised by DCO staff and that there were in fact two SIM-free mobile phones available for detainee use.
- I.4 Initial welfare/risk interviews took place in the same area, and could be overheard by other newly arrived detainees and staff visiting the office for other duties. These additional distractions could potentially limit the effectiveness of this initial interview to identify key risks.
- I.5 All detainees were offered a free telephone call on arrival, and staff would usually make a call on their behalf (including abroad) to advise their family and friends of the numbers of the payphones in the holding rooms to receive incoming calls; but there were restrictions on detainees using mobile phones (see paragraph I.50). Detainees' property was securely bagged, recorded and held in a storeroom.
- I.6 The DCOs provided a brief induction to the facility, and offered detainees food and drink, additional clothing and basic toiletries if required. A detention information booklet was freely available to detainees in a variety of languages, although some of the content was inaccurate and misleading – for example, it stated that detainees could use their own SIM cards and that DVDs were available to watch.
- I.7 No detainees were escorted to or from the facility during the inspection. However, escort staff continued to wear high visibility jackets routinely when transferring detainees to the gates, which could focus unnecessary attention on the detainees. We were told that once escort staff were airside it was a mandatory requirement to wear high visibility clothing.

Recommendation

- 1.8 Searches of detainees and initial welfare/risk interviews should take place in private.**

Safeguarding adults and personal safety

Expected outcomes:

The facility promotes the welfare of all detainees and protects them from all kinds of harm and neglect. The facility provides a safe environment which reduces the risk of self-harm and suicide. Detainees are protected from bullying and victimisation, and force is only used as a last resort and for legitimate reasons.

- 1.9** Although DCOs said that they had received safeguarding training while working for the previous contractor, they lacked knowledge of safeguarding procedures. For example, they were unaware of the Home Office *Adults at risk of harm in detention* policy, and could not point us to a Mitie Care and Custody adult or children safeguarding lead or policy.
- 1.10** DCOs did not know about the national referral mechanism to identify, protect and support victims of trafficking. DCOs told us they did not routinely get a full briefing from Border Force staff about the detainees and relevant safeguarding issues, such as those who were potential victims or perpetrators of trafficking.
- 1.11** DCOs said they would open care plans for detainees with disabilities and for children, but this was not extended to other vulnerable adults. The holding rooms displayed helpline telephone numbers for detainees to report female genital mutilation and modern slavery.
- 1.12** Border Force had an onsite safeguarding and modern slavery (SAMS) team that, in addition to dealing with children's cases, was responsible for suspected victims of trafficking, and had expanded to deal with other vulnerable individuals. Staff and managers told us that there was no formal forum for Mitie Care and Custody staff or Border Force to meet with Hillingdon social services, which could have expanded DCOs' knowledge of these issues (see paragraph 1.23).
- 1.13** 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 (ACDT) case management for detainees at risk of suicide or self-harm used in IRCs, but rarely had to apply these processes. If a detainee presented a risk of self-harm, DCOs opened a suicide and self-harm warning form that would accompany the detainee to their next place of detention, where a full assessment could be made. Both the DCOs carried anti-ligature knives.
- 1.14** As at our previous inspection, the facility had two holding rooms. However, one was now for adult males and females and the other for families, which meant that male and female detainees could not always be held separately. Although staff said they would use the family room flexibly, during our inspection a male and female detainee who were unrelated were located together, even though the family room was empty and available.
- 1.15** There were sufficient DCOs on duty to monitor and protect detainees from any potential victimisation. They had good views of the holding rooms, which were also monitored by closed-circuit television. The DCOs could not recall examples of detainee-on-detainee victimisation, but said they would speak to detainees to calm any tensions if they arose.

- I.16** Both DCOs had been trained in the Home Office manual for escorting safely and received refresher training every six to nine months. DCOs carried rigid bar handcuffs on their belts, which could be easily seen by detainees and were potentially intimidating for adults and children. Two sets of waist and leg restraint belts were kept in the staff office and checked daily.
- I.17** Mitie Care and Custody told us that there had been no use of force at the facility since it had taken on the new contract in May 2018.

Recommendations

- I.18** **Mitie Care and Custody managers should ensure that detainee custody officers (DCOs) are aware of the potential vulnerabilities of detainees and of safeguarding mechanisms. Custody staff should open care plans for all vulnerable adults, and these should be kept updated and address any safeguarding concerns.**
- I.19** **Border Force staff should provide a clear briefing to Mitie Care and Custody staff when a detainee is transferred into their care. The briefing should cover all relevant information on the detainee’s potential risks and vulnerabilities.**
- I.20** **Male and female detainees should not be held in the same holding room unless related.** (Repeated recommendation I.9)

Safeguarding children

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.21** In the previous three months, 86 children had been detained - 75 accompanied and 11 unaccompanied. Eight accompanied children were held for over 12 hours, with the longest held for 13 hours and 45 minutes. The longest that an unaccompanied child was held was seven hours and 55 minutes.
- I.22** The SAMS team was responsible for interviewing children and progressing their cases. The team comprised 25 staff, all of who had had enhanced checks from the Disclosure and Barring Service and attended a four-day course on all aspects of safeguarding and modern slavery.
- I.23** The meetings between Border Force officers from each terminal and Hillingdon social services that we found at the last inspection had not been held during the previous year. This was a missed opportunity for Border Force and Mitie Care and Custody, as these meetings provided a forum to learn and discuss issues (see also paragraph I.12).
- I.24** One DCO had received training in child safeguarding from Barnardo's, and the other had been on an initial training course. Staff were not aware of any recent detainees for who there were safeguarding concerns, but this could have been due to a lack of information sharing between DCOs and Border Force staff (see also paragraph I.9 and recommendation I.19). A care plan was completed for all children held in the facility, and we saw examples containing good basic information. DCOs checked on children held in the holding rooms every 15 minutes, and this was documented on the Mitie electronic detainee system (MEDS) computer recording system.

- I.25** Eight people were listed as ‘responsible adults’ (independent individuals who checked on the interests of a detained child being interviewed) to provide support to unaccompanied children. However, the Border Force staff we spoke to were unclear how they were recruited or who had oversight for their training. We were concerned that the individuals used were untrained, might not have an understanding of the role and might not be suitable for this task. As at the last inspection, Border Force appointed and coordinated the responsible adults, which could affect their independence.

Recommendation

- I.26** **Only trained and informed responsible adults should be used to provide support to unaccompanied children, and they should be recruited, trained and coordinated independently of Border Force.**

Legal rights

Expected outcomes:

Detainees are fully aware of and understand their detention, following their arrival at the facility and on release. Detainees are supported by the facility staff to freely exercise their legal rights.

- I.27** As at our previous inspection, detainees had limited access to legal advice. There were some notices in various languages promoting a telephone number for the Office of the Immigration Services Commissioner, which could help detainees to locate a registered immigration adviser.
- I.28** As the facility was located airside, legal representatives were unable to visit detainees and there was no access to a fax machine for detainees, even though there was one in the staff office. Detainees could maintain contact with their legal representatives by telephone, which was not in private and restricted because of limits on mobile phone use (see paragraph I.50). Detainees subsequently transferred to IRCs would be able to seek legal advice through Legal Aid Agency-funded duty advice surgeries.
- I.29** Detainees were given a copy of their reasons for detention (IS91R) in English only. We were told Home Office staff requested the presence of a professional interpreter or telephone interpreting to explain the contents of the notice.
- I.30** In the previous three months, 766 detainees had been held. In 111 cases, detainees were held over 12 hours and in four cases for over 24 hours. The longest period of detention we identified was 32 hours and 25 minutes. However, this analysis did not include the period that detainees were initially held in the controlled waiting area, near to the point of immigration, where they were detained before they were moved to the holding facility. Although, we were informed that Border Force staff tried to ensure that detainees did not remain in this location for more than 30 minutes, we saw logs that detailed stays of over two hours, and staff told us this was not uncommon in busier periods. This area, which was pejoratively referred to as ‘the pen’ by some staff, did not have adequate facilities.

Recommendations

- I.31 Detainees should be able to make telephone calls freely and in private.**
- I.32 Detainees should be issued with and allowed to keep the reason for detention (IS91R) document in a language they can understand.**
- I.33 Detainees should have access to a fax machine, and this facility should be advertised in the holding rooms. (Repeated recommendation I.28)**
- I.34 Detainees should only be held in the controlled waiting area for a minimum period.**

Respect

Accommodation and facilities

Expected outcomes:

Detainees are held in a safe, clean and decent environment. They are offered varied meals according to their individual requirements. The facility encourages activities to promote mental well-being.

- I.35** The facility had been refurbished since our previous inspection. It had two holding rooms, one for adults and one for families, separated by a staff office. The facility had addressed the problems with lighting and ventilation found at our previous inspection, and conditions were now good (see Appendix III - Photographs). The facility was clean and the furniture in good condition. There was only a limited range of information on display.
- I.36** Holding rooms were now a better environment for short to medium stays but still not acceptable for overnight stays (see paragraph I.30). Both holding rooms contained a television, a payphone with a privacy hood, and some fixed seating and tables. Although, there were some semi-recliner seats, they did not provide adequate sleeping facilities. There was a designated multi-faith/quiet room, which was positive, but more could have been done to make it a more welcoming environment (see Appendix III - Photographs).
- I.37** Both rooms now contained an adapted shower room and separate toilets for male and female detainees, which were improvements since the previous inspection. They were in good condition and private. Sanitary items for women were freely available. The family holding room had baby changing facilities, including a range of nappies, baby food was also available, and a travel cot was held in the storeroom if required. Clothing was now available for male and female detainees, and DCOs issued toiletry bags containing basic items.
- I.38** Catering arrangements were adequate, with a range of microwave meals, including halal, kosher and vegetarian options. Detainees could help themselves to crisps and snacks but no fruit was available. Both rooms had a vending machine with hot and cold drinks and a water fountain.
- I.39** There were sufficient activities for short stays. Both rooms contained a small range of books, and current newspapers and magazines, with some in foreign languages. There had been efforts to soften the environment of the family room, which had children's toys, play mats, bean bags, activity packs and some wall art. Notices in English promoted the Childline telephone number. There were no longer any DVDs or access to a Wii console. Detainees still had no access to the open air and there was no place for them to smoke, although staff could offer nicotine lozenges.

Recommendation

- I.40 Detention should be kept to a minimum period and detainees should not be held for an unreasonable time without access to sleeping facilities, fresh air or natural light.**

Respectful treatment

Expected outcomes:

Detainees are treated with respect by all staff. Effective complaints procedures are in place for detainees. There is understanding of detainees' diverse cultural backgrounds. Detainees' health care needs are met.

- I.41 Only two detainees were held during our inspection, and our ability to observe DCOs interacting with detainees was limited. However, DCOs were polite and respectful to the detainees held, and had some awareness of the stresses of detention. Welfare checks were conducted hourly for adults and every 15 minutes for children, and were recorded on the Mitie electronic detainee system (MEDS).
- I.42 Staff used an induction checklist to ensure that welfare and health and safety issues were explained, although elements of this required updating to reflect current provision. Officers wore identification badges.
- I.43 Detainees could complain using the standard Home Office complaint form, which was available in a variety of languages. However, these were not prominently displayed and were in an unmarked storage box. We had to ask a member of staff to find one for us, making it unlikely that detainees would know of their location. Child-friendly complaint forms were available. Staff told us that Home Office staff emptied the complaints boxes daily. There were no logs to show this happened, but visits by Border Force staff were recorded in their daily diary. We were told that there had been no complaints received since the inception of the contract in May 2018, and no data were available for complaints before this.
- I.44 DCOs had a basic awareness of diversity issues and completed a paper-based refresher exercise in equality and diversity annually. Prayer mats and religious texts were available in a small cupboard in the holding rooms but were not prominently signposted.
- I.45 The holding rooms were adequate for wheelchair users to move around in, and there were adapted toilet facilities for detainees with mobility problems. DCOs said they used disability care plans when required. There was no hearing loop facility and no information in Braille.
- I.46 Staff were aware of the professional telephone interpreting service, but we were not provided with any logs to demonstrate how often this was used.
- I.47 DCOs had no access to any medical helpline. They could contact the NHS 111 service for general advice or ring for an ambulance in an emergency. They were unclear about whether detainees could retain prescribed medication in their possession, and we found evidence of negative outcomes for detainees. During our inspection, one female detainee who had arrived with blood pressure medication was not allowed to retain it as it did not bear her name. However, her claims that she required medication could not be substantiated from records or verified by access and consultation with a medical professional. Detainees were not offered paracetamol.

Recommendations

- I.48 **Complaint forms should be prominently displayed in both holding rooms.**
- I.49 **There should be arrangements to ensure detainees have adequate access to medical services, including medication to manage longstanding conditions.**

Preparation for removal and release

Communications

Expected outcomes:

Detainees are able to maintain contact with the outside world using a full range of communications media.

- I.50** Detainees were not allowed to retain their own mobile telephones if they had cameras or internet access, which effectively meant that they had their phones taken away. Staff told us that alternative phones were no longer available for detainees to use with their own SIM card. We were later informed by Home Office staff that we had been inaccurately advised by DCO staff and that there were in fact two SIM-free mobile phones available for detainee use. Both holding rooms had payphones for detainees to receive incoming calls, and staff would assist them in converting their foreign currency into sterling so they could use them.
- I.51** Detainees could still not use email, video calling or social networks to contact friends, family or their solicitors. As at our last inspection, although there was a fax machine in the office, inexplicably neither staff or detainees could use it (see paragraph I.28 and recommendation I.33).

Recommendations

- I.52 Detainees should have access to the internet, including email, video calling and social networks.**

Leaving the facility

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.53** Mitie Care and Custody was unable to provide consolidated figures on where detainees went after leaving the facility. However, some would have been removed from the UK, some granted temporary admission or permission to enter the UK and some may have been transferred to an IRC.
- I.54** Visitors were not allowed into the facility because of its airside location. They were still not allowed to deliver property or cash to detainees. Information cards with the address and telephone number of IRCs were available for detainees transferring to further detention.
- I.55** We noted details of a married couple who had arrived the evening before our inspection and had removal directions set for approximately 24 hours later. In the meantime, they were transferred individually and held at separate IRCs. We were unable to establish if all other viable options to this distressing experience had been fully considered.
- I.56** We were unable to observe any escorts during our inspection. Staff informed us that force was not used to get non-compliant detainees on to aircraft, and in such cases removals were cancelled and rescheduled with overseas escort contractors.

Section 2. Summary of recommendations

Recommendations

To the Home Office

- 2.1 Border Force staff should provide a clear briefing to Mitie Care and Custody staff when a detainee is transferred into their care. The briefing should cover all relevant information on the detainee's potential risks and vulnerabilities. (1.19)
- 2.2 Only trained and informed responsible adults should be used to provide support to unaccompanied children, and they should be recruited, trained and coordinated independently of Border Force. (1.26)
- 2.3 Detainees should be issued with and allowed to keep the reason for detention (IS91R) document in a language they can understand. (1.32)
- 2.4 Detainees should only be held in the controlled waiting area for a minimum period. (1.34)
- 2.5 Detention should be kept to a minimum period and detainees should not be held for an unreasonable time without access to sleeping facilities, fresh air or natural light. (1.40)

Recommendations

To the facility contractor

Arrival and reception

- 2.6 Searches of detainees and initial welfare/risk interviews should take place in private. (1.8)

Safeguarding adults and personal safety

- 2.7 Mitie Care and Custody managers should ensure that detainee custody officers (DCOs) are aware of the potential vulnerabilities of detainees and of safeguarding mechanisms. Custody staff should open care plans for all vulnerable adults, and these should be kept updated and address any safeguarding concerns. (1.18)
- 2.8 Male and female detainees should not be held in the same holding room unless related. (1.20, repeated recommendation 1.9)

Legal rights

- 2.9 Detainees should be able to make telephone calls freely and in private. (1.31)
- 2.10 Detainees should have access to a fax machine, and this facility should be advertised in the holding rooms. (1.33, repeated recommendation 1.28)

Respectful treatment

- 2.11 Complaint forms should be prominently displayed in both holding rooms. (1.48)

- 2.12** There should be arrangements to ensure detainees have adequate access to medical services, including medication to manage longstanding conditions. (1.49)

Communications

- 2.13** Detainees should have access to the internet, including email, video calling and social networks. (1.52)

Section 3. Appendices

Appendix I: Inspection team

Tamara Pattinson	Inspector
Kam Sarai	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 clothing only when safety rules require it. (1.2, repeated recommendation 1.3)

Not achieved

Initial interviews, rub-down searches and telephone calls should take place in private. (1.6)

Not achieved

All detainees should be able to contact their friends, family and legal representatives. (1.7)

Achieved

Male and female detainees should not be held in the same holding room unless related. (1.9)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 1.20)

DCOs should have a clear view of the holding rooms to monitor detainees safely. (1.10)

Achieved

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)

Not achieved

Border Force should communicate safeguarding concerns about detainees to DCOs. (1.16)

Not achieved

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)

Not achieved

Tascor should be represented at the fortnightly safeguarding case conferences with Hillingdon social services and disseminate learning points to detainee custody officers. (1.18)

Not achieved

Responsible adults should be recruited, trained and coordinated independently of Border Force. (1.23)

Not achieved

Border Force officers should not carry batons inside the facility. (1.25)

Not achieved

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)

Not achieved

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

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 1.33)

Border Force should use interpreters when interviewing detainees with little or no English. (1.32)

Achieved

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)

Not 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 in the holding room for female detainees in a range of sizes, including underwear. (1.37)

Achieved

The rebuild of the facility should be implemented and should address the current poor lighting, ventilation and seating arrangements. (1.38)

Achieved

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

Not achieved

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)

Insufficient evidence provided to form judgement

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)

Partially achieved

Appendix III: Photographs

Adult holding room



Detainee search area



Multi-faith room

