

Report on unannounced joint inspections  
of Coquelles and Calais non-residential  
short-term holding facilities

6 – 7 November 2012

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons and

Contrôleur Général des Lieux de Privation de Liberté

## Glossary of terms

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

Crown copyright 2013

Printed and published by:  
Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons  
1st Floor, Ashley House  
Monck Street  
London SW1P 2BQ  
England

# Contents

Fact page	4
Overview	5
The healthy custodial establishment	7
1: Coquelles Tourist	13
2. Coquelles Freight	21
3. Calais Tourist	27
4. Calais Freight	35
5. Recommendations and housekeeping points	36
Appendix I: Photographs	44

# Fact page

## **Task of the establishments**

To hold people with no right of entry to the UK, usually before transfer to the French border police

## **Location**

Calais seaport and Coquelles Eurotunnel approach, France

## **Name of contractor**

Reliance

## **Numbers held**

In the previous three months, 352 people were held at Coquelles Tourist and 16 at Coquelles Freight. Two hundred and sixty seven people were detained at Calais Tourist, but only one at Calais Freight.

## **Last inspection**

All except the Calais Freight holding facility were inspected 2-3 August 2005. This was the first inspection of Calais Freight.

## **Escort providers**

Reliance Secure Systems Management and Eamus Cork Security

# Overview

---

## Coquelles and Calais Non-residential Short-Term Holding Facilities

Inspected: 6 – 7 November 2012

Last inspected: 2-3 August 2005 (excluding Calais Freight)

### Inspectors

Cédric de Torcy (CGLPL team leader)

Philippe Lavergne (CGLPL)

Hindpal Singh Bhui (HMIP team leader)

Jeanette Hall (HMIP)

Colin Carroll (HMIP)

Beverley Alden (HMIP)

This report represents the first joint inspection by HM Inspectorate of Prisons (HMIP) and Contrôleur Général des Lieux de Privation de Liberté (CGLPL) in France. Both organisations fulfil the responsibilities of the UK and French governments to establish a National Preventive Mechanism to independently inspect all places of detention which arise from their status as partner to the UN Optional Protocol to the Convention Against Torture (OPCAT).

We inspected four short-term holding facilities at Calais seaport and the Coquelles Eurotunnel approach, which detain people heading towards the UK from both the tourist and freight lanes. UK Border Force (UKBF) staff check freight, coaches, cars and foot passengers with the aim of reducing the number of people entering the country with inadequate documentation. The juxtaposed immigration controls that make this possible are set out in legislation and two published bilateral agreements<sup>1</sup>. UK detention service orders apply in all the facilities<sup>2</sup>.

The facilities are staffed by British detainee custody officers (DCOs) working for Reliance Secure Task Management across all sites. The facilities are overseen by local UKBF staff who make daily visits which are recorded. Detainees cannot normally be held for over 24 hours and nearly all were there for a few hours only<sup>3</sup>. All holding rooms are open 24 hours a day, closing only on Christmas Day. The two facilities located at the Eurotunnel site are known as Coquelles Tourist and Coquelles Freight, and those at Calais seaport ferry terminal are known as Calais Tourist and Calais Freight. The logs held by Reliance suggest that up to a hundred people a month are held in each Tourist facility, though only one person was detained over the course of the inspection. Children are also regularly detained, usually in family groups.

Apart from Calais Freight, which did not exist until 2006, all the facilities were last inspected in 2005 by HMIP at the invitation of the UK Border Agency. A lack of jurisdictional clarity meant that they could not be included in subsequent routine inspections by HMIP. However, when the French NPM – the Contrôleur Général des Lieux de Privation de Liberté (CGLPL) – was formed in 2008, it was agreed that the UK and French NPMs would conduct a joint inspection of these facilities.

---

<sup>1</sup> The legislative basis is set out in The Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act 2002 (Juxtaposed Controls) Order 2003. The arrangements for reciprocal immigration controls are set out in two published agreements: The Touquet Treaty covers Calais and the Sangatte agreement covers Coquelles (<http://www.official-documents.gov.uk/document/cm66/6604/6604.pdf>).

<sup>2</sup> During the course of the inspection we were told by staff that another similar holding facility was operating at Dunkerque, and discovered three UK police cells in the British controlled area above Coquelles Tourist. These areas will be included in future inspections.

<sup>3</sup> The 24-hour period may be extended up to 24 additional hours after obtaining the consent of the Prosecutor of the High Court (Tribunal de Grande Instance) in Boulogne-sur-Mer.

People detained at Coquelles Tourist were usually transported to the nearby headquarters of the French border police, the Police aux Frontières (PAF), within a few hours. The same applied to those detained at Calais Tourist, with the difference that PAF came to collect them. The PAF informed the Prosecutor of the High Court in Boulogne-sur-Mer if unaccompanied minors were transferred to their custody.

Coquelles Freight was no longer routinely used to hold detainees. Clandestine travellers picked up from freight vehicles were instead collected by Reliance escorting staff from a semi-secure area in the freight lanes and driven directly to the PAF. The holding room at Calais Freight was also used rarely and only to hold lorry drivers who had been facilitating illegal entry. Clandestine travellers were likely to have been hiding for some time in cramped and potentially dangerous conditions in lorries.

Calais Tourist was in a reasonable condition, but Coquelles Tourist was in need of substantial refurbishment and redecoration. The Freight facilities were some of the poorest that we have seen and the need to have them at all was not obvious given the small numbers held, and the availability of the other nearby holding rooms. Not enough had been done overall to respond to the specific needs of detainees held on French territory. There was not yet any routine monitoring by the Independent Monitoring Board.

# The healthy custodial establishment

- HE.1 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.
- HE.2 The Contrôleur Général des Lieux de Privation de Liberté (CGLPL) is an independent public body with the authority to inspect the treatment and conditions of people who are deprived of their liberty to check that their fundamental rights are respected. This is without prejudice to the prerogatives given by law to the judiciary or any court.
- HE.3 All inspections carried out by HM Inspectorate of Prisons, as well as by the Contrôleur Général des Lieux de Privation de Liberté, contribute to the responses of UK and of France to their 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, and CGLPL is the NPM in France.
- HE.4 The concept of a healthy prison was introduced in this inspectorate's thematic review *Suicide is Everyone's Concern* (1999). The healthy prison criteria have been modified to fit the inspection of short-term holding facilities, both residential and non-residential. The criteria 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 wellbeing of detainees
- Preparation for removal and release** – that detainees are able to maintain contact with family, friends, support groups, legal representatives and advisors, 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.
- HE.5 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.

# Coquelles Tourist

---

## Safety

---

- HE.6** People were detained at the Coquelles Tourist holding room after being refused entry to the UK or pending further enquiries into their circumstances. They were transported to the nearby Police aux Frontières (PAF) headquarters, usually after a few hours. We were told that some waited in the escort vehicle outside the PAF building for up to an hour and that detainees were occasionally transported back to the facility as there were not always enough police to receive the detainees. The inspected escort vehicles were clean and suitable for short journeys.
- HE.7** There were some occasions when there was no female detainee custody officer (DCO) on shift, and at such times we were told that UK Border Force (UKBF) staff were asked to assist with searching. Detainees were sometimes searched in the property cage, in full view of passengers. Belts and ties were taken from all detainees on entering the holding room without individual risk assessment, although shoe laces were not removed.
- HE.8** There had been no reported bullying and staff could easily see all parts of the holding room except the toilets. However, there was only a single holding room, and no separation of men, women or children. Staff could not remember any recent instances of self-harm. Ligation knives were not routinely carried by all staff.
- HE.9** Staff were aware of a triage advice line. In cases where they needed to call port emergency medical services, they had to refer to the chief immigration officer and could not call the services directly. This was unacceptable.
- HE.10** Eight unaccompanied children and 14 families had been held at Coquelles Tourist in the previous three months. Detention staff had not received any recent child protection training. UKBF had a children's and young persons' team, most of whom had received the first two levels of UKBA's child protection training, and some the level three training. The Reliance child protection policy applied, but the referral flowchart had little relevance in France. Reliance staff completed child care plans for children who were unaccompanied or without a parent. These described what was done with the children but provided little assessment of need. The information contained in them was not systematically passed to PAF. Similarly, information about detainees with any other vulnerability was not given to PAF, either by UKBF or Reliance. There was no understanding by UKBF staff of any referral mechanism for victims of trafficking (the National Referral Mechanism applies in the UK).
- HE.11** DCOs staffing the holding room were regularly trained in control and restraint techniques. There had been one use of force in the previous year. A detainee who had attempted to escape from the holding room had quickly been brought back to the room. The use of force appeared to be proportionate and documentation had been completed appropriately.
- HE.12** Detention staff were clear that they would not accept anyone without an IS91 authority to detain. Legal advice was very limited as the community legal advice line available to detainees in the UK and advertised in the holding room was of no use to those in France. Other notices gave details of defunct organisations.



## Respect

---

- HE.13 The holding room was in poor condition and in need of decoration and deep cleaning. Detainees often arrived in the early hours of the morning but there were no comfortable chairs to sleep on, though blankets and pillows were provided. The toilets were clean but there were no shower facilities. There was no heating in the room.
- HE.14 Sanitary protection for women was freely available. The generic Reliance information booklet giving information in 16 languages was in the holding room, and also displayed on the wall.
- HE.15 Staff appeared to be friendly and described a caring approach to detainees. They had received no recent training in equality and diversity. They were aware of detainees' possible religious requirements, and religious books and other items were freely available in the holding room. Interpretation was rarely used.
- HE.16 Complaint forms had to be requested and the complaints box was unlocked when we checked it, compromising confidentiality. The duty chief immigration officer was not aware that it was one of her responsibilities to empty the box.
- HE.17 Snacks, fruit and crisps and drinks were freely available in the holding room.

## Activities

---

- HE.18 There was a television with Freeview channels. Some out-of-date newspapers were provided, and the small number of foreign language papers were particularly old. There were a few toys. Detainees were unable to go into the fresh air; most were held for short periods.

## Preparation for removal and release

---

- HE.19 Detainees had good access to telephones. They could retain their mobile phone if it had no camera, and were otherwise provided with a Reliance phone. There was a telephone box in the room and detainees were also able to make one free five-minute call from an office. There was no access to email.
- HE.20 Reliance had a small supply of clothing. There was no other particular assistance or fund provided for detainees released in France.

## Coquelles Freight

---

### **Additional summary information**

---

- HE.21 The Coquelles Freight holding room was used infrequently, but three rooms were ready for use. Sixteen Vietnamese detainees had been held there two months previously. This detention was not recorded in the Reliance statistics, which indicated only that detainees had been picked up in the freight lanes before being transferred to PAF.

- HE.22 A ligature knife was attached to the wall outside the holding rooms, but not all staff carried them routinely. There had been one use of force on a detainee who attempted to evade transfer to PAF. The incident report suggested that this was handled adequately.
- HE.23 The rooms were cold and bleak. The smell from the squat toilets in the corner of the rooms was apparent even though they had not been used for some time. Only cold water came from the taps. Call bells in the rooms did not work when tested. There was no CCTV and supervision of the rooms was inadequate. There were no showers, even though most detainees held there would have arrived after lengthy journeys hidden in lorries. There were no pay telephones in the rooms, though detainees could borrow a phone from staff. The facility remained unfit for purpose and, given how infrequently it was used and the nearby Coquelles Tourist facility, the need to have it at all was unclear.
- HE.24 Complaint forms and hygiene packs were available in rooms. Most staff described a kind and caring approach towards detainees. The rooms had televisions which could show DVDs only.

## Calais Tourist

---

### Safety

---

- HE.25 People were detained at the Calais Tourist holding room after being refused entry to the UK or pending further enquiries into their circumstances. Belts and ties were taken from all detainees on entering the holding room without individual risk assessment, although shoe laces were not removed. They were picked up directly from the holding room by the Police aux Frontières (PAF), usually after a few hours.
- HE.26 There had been no reported bullying and staff could easily see all parts of the holding room except the toilets. However, there was only a single room, and no separation of men, women or children. Staff could not remember any recent instances of self-harm. Ligature knives were kept in the staff office but not routinely carried by all staff.
- HE.27 Staff were aware of a triage advice line. In cases where they needed to call port emergency medical services, they had to refer to the chief immigration officer and could not call the services directly. This was not acceptable.
- HE.28 In the previous three months, nine children had been held at Calais Tourist, eight in family groups and one unaccompanied. Detention staff had not received any recent child protection training. UKBF had a children's and young persons' team, most of whom had received child protection training. The Reliance child protection policy applied to DCOs but their referral flowchart had little relevance in France. Reliance staff had completed one child care plan for children who were unaccompanied or without a parent. These plans described what was done with the children but provided little assessment of need. The information contained in them was not systematically passed on to PAF. Similarly, information about detainees with any other vulnerability was not given to PAF, either by UKBF or Reliance. There was no understanding by UKBA staff of any referral mechanism for victims of trafficking (the National Referral Mechanism applies in the UK).

HE.29 There had been no use of force in the previous year. All detention staff were regularly trained in control and restraint techniques.

HE.30 Legal advice was very limited as the community legal advice line available to detainees in the UK and advertised in the holding room was of no use to those in France. Detention staff were clear that they would not accept anyone without an IS91 authority to detain. IS91 risk factors were not completed and reasons for detention were not filled in for a detainee held during the inspection. She was confused about her situation and could not obtain independent advice.

## Respect

---

HE.31 The holding room was in adequate condition and clean, and was kept at a reasonable temperature. However, detainees often arrived in the early hours of the morning and the room was not suitable for sleeping in, though blankets and pillows were provided. There were no shower facilities. Sanitary protection for women was freely available. The generic Reliance booklet giving information in 16 languages was in the holding room, and also displayed on the wall.

HE.32 Staff appeared to be friendly and described a caring approach to detainees. A detainee held during the inspection said she had been treated sensitively and respectfully by detention staff.

HE.33 Detention staff had received no recent training in equality and diversity. They were aware of detainees' possible religious requirements, and religious books and other items were freely available in the holding room. Interpretation was rarely used.

HE.34 Complaint forms were available in the room but the complaints box was unlocked. There had been no recent recorded complaints.

HE.35 Snacks, fruit, crisps and drinks were freely available in the holding room.

## Activities

---

HE.36 There was a television which could only show DVDs. Newspapers were provided, some in different languages, but were mostly out of date. There were a few toys. Detainees were unable to go into the fresh air; most were held for short periods.

## Preparation for removal and release

---

HE.37 Detainees had good access to telephones. They could retain their mobile phone if it had no camera, and were otherwise provided with a Reliance phone. There was a telephone box in the room and detainees were also able to make one free five-minute call from an office. There was no access to email.

HE.38 Reliance had a small supply of clothing. No other assistance or fund was provided for detainees released in France. The young female detainee was picked up by PAF and released shortly afterwards in Calais with few funds and no valid travel ticket.

# Calais Freight

---

## **Additional summary information**

---

**HE.39** Calais Freight holding room was very rarely used. It had been occupied only twice in the previous three months by lorry drivers who had facilitated illegal entrants. The illegal entrants themselves were normally transferred straight to PAF from the freight lanes by another private company, Eamus Cork Security.

**HE.40** The room was in a prefabricated building, and was basic and stark. There was a small caged area in front of the portaloos outside, where detainees could smoke. The room was not fit for regular use and the need to have it at all was unclear, given the very small numbers detained and the close proximity of Calais Tourist. We were pleased to learn that it was closed shortly after the inspection, in December 2012.

# Section 1: Coquelles Tourist

## Safety

---

### Escort vehicles and transfers

---

*Expected outcomes:*

*Detainees under escort are treated safely, decently and efficiently.*

- 1.1 Immigration officers at Coquelles Tourist terminal examined car and coach passengers' documents at a checkpoint immediately outside the holding room, and it was only a short walk from there to the detention area. It was normal practice for detainees refused entry to the UK subsequently to be transported to the nearby Police aux Frontières (PAF) headquarters. The escort vehicle we inspected was clean and fit for purpose, and journeys were short. However, transfers were not always well coordinated. We were told that when the PAF were busy, detainees had waited in vehicles for up to an hour and some had been taken back to the holding room until police officers were available to receive them.

### Recommendation

---

- 1.2 **Reliance and the PAF should coordinate transfers to ensure that detainees are taken into police custody expeditiously.**

### 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.*

- 1.3 No detainees were held in the facility during the inspection. Staff said they would not accept people into the holding room without the correct IS91 (authority to detain) documentation. Property was securely stored in a caged area. Searching was sometimes undertaken in this area in full view of other passengers. Detainees were able to retain their money, but had their belts and ties removed on entering the holding room without individual risk assessment; shoe laces were not removed. We were told that children were usually searched with a wand only, and never given a more intrusive rub-down search unless there was clear and specific intelligence to suggest risk. The facility was staffed by two detainee custody officers (DCOs), usually one male and one female, but there were some occasions when a female officer was not on shift. In these circumstances, DCOs said they requested assistance from nearby UK Border Force (UKBF) staff to undertake searching of women. Little information about the facility was provided to detainees, but the Reliance generic information booklet in 16 languages was displayed on the wall and copies were available on a bookshelf.
- 1.4 There was no on-site health care provision. If detainees arrived with medication or were feeling unwell, DCOs contacted a medical triage line based in the UK for advice. In the event of an emergency, DCOs were required to contact the chief immigration officer who decided if French emergency services should be called, potentially losing crucial minutes in a serious emergency.

## Recommendation

---

- 1.5 Detention officers should be able to call a medical service as soon as requested by a detainee and, if needed, the emergency services directly without having to seek permission.

## Housekeeping points

---

- 1.6 Detainees should be searched out of sight of other passengers.
- 1.7 Items of clothing such as ties and belts should only be removed from detainees to reduce a demonstrable risk of harm.

## Bullying and personal safety

---

*Expected outcomes:*

*Detainees feel and are safe from bullying and victimisation.*

- 1.8 DCOs had a clear view of the holding room and there was little evidence of bullying. On rare occasions staff said they had detected tensions between people smugglers ('facilitators') and the people they were transporting when both were held in the same room. At such times we were told that staff remained in the holding room with them. An information booklet displayed in the facility made brief reference to bullying. Men, women and children could not be held separately (see recommendation in accommodation section).

## Self-harm and suicide prevention

---

*Expected outcomes:*

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

- 1.9 Staff on duty could not remember any recent attempts by detainees to self-harm. However, a suicide and self-harm warning form had been completed in August 2012. The form was completed correctly but was not passed on to PAF. DCOs had not received refresher training on suicide and self-harm prevention and did not receive feedback from incidents at other holding facilities. DCOs on duty did not carry anti-ligature knives but there were three knives in the DCOs' office.

## Recommendations

---

- 1.10 Staff should routinely carry anti-ligature knives.
- 1.11 Staff should receive refresher training in suicide and self-harm prevention and be informed of learning from incidents at other holding facilities.

## 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.<sup>4</sup>*

- 1.12 There were no specific safeguarding procedures or links between the facility and French social services. However, given the location of the facility, it was unlikely that at-risk adults would be detained alone as they would invariably be travelling with someone else. Detainees were usually held for short periods and vulnerable adults received appropriate supervision while in the facility. UKBF staff had no understanding of any referral mechanism for victims of trafficking (the National Referral Mechanism applies in the UK).

## Recommendation

---

- 1.13 UKBF staff should be aware of central referral mechanisms for victims of trafficking.

## Safeguarding children

---

*Expected outcomes:*

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

- 1.14 Eight unaccompanied minors had been held at the facility in the previous three months, and 14 in family groups. It was not possible to determine the ages of the children from the statistics we were given. Detention staff were aware of the Reliance safeguarding policy but it had little relevance in France. Staff had not undertaken any recent child protection training. We were told that children, particularly if unaccompanied, could be held outside the holding room, but staff said this was not always feasible (see accommodation section).
- 1.15 Reliance staff completed child care plans for children who were unaccompanied or without a parent. These plans described how children were looked after, for example 'hot drinks offered' or '15-minute observations', but there was no individual assessment of need or identification of risk, nor were they consistently passed to PAF when the detainee was transferred.
- 1.16 Most of the UKBF children's and young peoples' team had undertaken the first two levels of UKBA's child protection training, and some the level three training. However, staff were not clear about their specific roles and one member of the team told us they 'ensured everything was OK' but could not elaborate further. We saw evidence of four referrals to children's services in the UK for young people allowed entry during 2012.

## Recommendations

---

- 1.17 DCOs should have up-to-date safeguarding training and be fully conversant with their statutory duty to protect children.
- 1.18 There should be a robust safeguarding policy which recognises the French jurisdiction and sets out referral pathways to the French authorities.

---

<sup>4</sup> 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).

- 1.19 Child care plans should contain an individual assessment of need and key risks. They should be shared with PAF when detainees are transferred.
- 1.20 UKBF should ensure that members of the children's and young people's team understand their roles and responsibilities, and are provided with the necessary training and support.

## Use of force

---

*Expected outcomes:*

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

- 1.21 Use of force was rare. It had last been used almost a year previously when a detainee had tried to escape. The detainee had run through the emergency exit and then stumbled and fell, and staff quickly brought him back into the holding room. Records had been completed correctly and indicated proportionate use of force. The report had been appropriately reviewed by a manager.
- 1.22 The facility was only staffed by two DCOs, and control and restraint techniques could not be used without a third member of staff in the vicinity. Staff underwent annual control and restraint training. Staff assured us that they would use de-escalation techniques when possible. Staff carried handcuffs which they could use in agreed areas.

## 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.*

- 1.23 Notices in the holding room advertised the services of the defunct Immigration Advisory Service and Refugee and Migrant Justice; there was also a notice promoting the Legal Services Commission's community legal advice line, which was unlikely to be relevant to detainees in the holding room. There was no information about French organisations which could advise detainees. A leaflet from the International Organisation for Migration advised irregular migrants that they could claim asylum with the French authorities or apply for assisted voluntary return (see section on preparation for release). Detainees had good access to telephones but could not send or receive faxes.

## Recommendation

---

- 1.24 Independent legal advice from French organisations should be available to detainees.

## Casework

---

*Expected outcomes:*

*Detention is carried out on the basis of individual reasons that are clearly communicated.*

*Detention is for the minimum period necessary.*

- 1.25 Detainees held in the facility had been refused entry to the UK and were being referred to the French authorities. Detainees were able to retain their written reasons for detention (IS91R), but these were only in English. In the three months before our inspection, 352 detainees had been held, nearly all for less than eight hours. Seven had been held for 8 to 12 hours. Twenty-two children had been detained, 14 with their parents and eight were unaccompanied minors.



Records confirmed that a chief immigration officer visited the facility almost every day.

## Respect

---

### Accommodation

---

*Expected outcomes:*

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

- 1.26 The holding room was in a poor condition; the floors were dirty and the walls stained and grubby (see Appendix I). There were a small number of children's posters on the wall but the decoration was otherwise stark. Hard seats were set out in rows and were unsuitable for sleeping on for detainees who arrived during the night, sometimes after long journeys. Blankets and pillows were provided. The toilets were clean and a baby changing facility and sanitary protection were available in the female toilet. There was a hot drinks machine and a water fountain.
- 1.27 There was no separate accommodation for women and children, and they were detained with unrelated men in the same room. DCOs working in the facility told us that there was no heating and that it could become very cold. A set of doors in the holding room led directly into the adjoining passport checking area. They were designated fire doors, which allowed detainees to open them at any time, increasing the risk of incidents (see use of force section).

### Recommendations

---

- 1.28 The holding room should be decorated and deep cleaned so that it is a clean and welcoming environment.
- 1.29 Reclining seats should be available for detainees who need to sleep.
- 1.30 There should be a separate area to detain women, children and families.
- 1.31 The fire exit doors should be replaced with emergency exit doors that can be controlled by staff.

### 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.*

- 1.32 There were no detainees in the holding room at the time of the inspection. Staff appeared friendly and caring. Officers wore name badges but some were obscured under clothing.

### Housekeeping point

---

- 1.33 Name badges should be visible at all times.

## 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,<sup>5</sup> including race equality, nationality, religion, disability, gender, transgender, sexual orientation, age and pregnancy, are recognised and addressed.*

- 1.34 DCOs had not undertaken recent equality and diversity training. They were not aware of the Equality Act 2010 and protected characteristics. Equality impact assessments had not been undertaken. They were familiar with the disability care planning process but said it was rarely required. Care plans were forwarded to a lead member of staff for disability in the UK. There were two accessible toilets in the holding room. Copies of the Bible, a prayer mat, Qur'an and a compass were kept on a bookshelf and freely available to detainees. Staff were familiar with the requirements of Ramadan. DCOs had access to telephone interpretation services but rarely used them.

## Recommendations

---

- 1.35 DCOs should receive up-to-date equality and diversity training which includes the requirements of equality legislation.
- 1.36 Equality impact assessments should be undertaken to help identify and address potential discrimination.
- 1.37 Pictorial prompts should be introduced to facilitate detainee-staff communication.

## 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.*

- 1.38 There were no records of complaints submitted during the previous 12 months. Detainees had to request a complaint form from a DCO. A complaints box in the holding room could be opened without a key. The complaints box was emptied regularly by a chief immigration officer (CIO), though one of the CIOs did not realise this was a required task. We submitted a test complaint and it was responded to the next day.

## Recommendation

---

- 1.39 Complaint forms should be freely available, and the complaints box should be securely locked.

---

<sup>5</sup> The grounds upon which discrimination is unlawful (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2010).

## Catering

---

*Expected outcomes:*

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

- 1.40 All detainees were offered a hot microwave meal. There were nine choices, including vegetarian options. Sandwiches were also stocked. Crisps, snacks, sweets and fresh fruit were freely available in the holding room. Detainees could help themselves to hot drinks and water. There was no comments book. Food storage and preparation areas were reasonably equipped and hygienic.

## Activities

---

*Expected outcomes:*

*The facility encourages activities to preserve and promote the mental and physical wellbeing of detainees.*

- 1.41 There was a television with digital channels and a DVD facility in the holding room, although there were no DVDs. Magazines and newspapers on a bookshelf were all out of date, some from 2009. There were two books, both in English. There was a small box of toys, although some of them were grubby and several of the colouring books had been used and not replaced from the available stock. Detainees had no access to exercise in the fresh air; most were only held for short periods of time.

## Recommendation

---

- 1.42 Detainees should have access to books and current newspapers in a range of languages.

## Housekeeping point

---

- 1.43 Toys should be kept clean and freshly stocked.

## 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.*

- 1.44 There was a payphone in the holding room and detainees could receive incoming calls. They could keep their mobile phones if they had no camera facilities, or use their SIM cards in a mobile phone loaned to them by DCOs. We were told that detainees with no money were given one free five-minute telephone call or could use the office telephone. There was no access to email. A small stock of clothing was kept for detainees who required it.
- 1.45 Staff told us they explained to detainees that they would be transferred to the custody of the PAF, but they knew little about the procedures beyond that point. Most detainees were released by PAF if they had legal status in France. No support or funds were available to those

released into France, including potentially vulnerable detainees. Leaflets displayed in the holding room described the assisted voluntary return scheme.

## Recommendations

---

- 1.46 Detainees should have free access to email, fax and controlled internet for communication and information purposes.
- 1.47 DCOs should be familiar with PAF procedures so that they can be explained to detainees.
- 1.48 Detainees with no independent means should not be released without assistance.

## Section 2: Coquelles Freight Safety

---

### Escort vehicles and transfers

---

*Expected outcomes:*

*Detainees under escort are treated safely, decently and efficiently.*

- 2.1 Irregular migrants found in the back of freight traffic heading for the Eurotunnel were no longer routinely detained in the holding room. DCOs went directly to the 'deep search' area where lorries suspected of carrying migrants were held, and transported migrants to the PAF offices nearby. If several people found on one vehicle could not all be transported at the same time, they were taken to the holding room until they could be dealt with. The escort vehicle that we inspected was clean and fit for purpose, and journeys were short.

### 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.*

- 2.2 The holding room had been used infrequently for the previous nine months, although three of the six holding rooms were ready for use. The other three were used as storage areas. No detainees were held at the time of the inspection.
- 2.3 Sixteen Vietnamese detainees had been held two months previously. This had not been recorded in Reliance statistics, which indicated only that detainees had been picked up in the freight lanes before being transferred to PAF.
- 2.4 Detainees entered the facility through a small, dark room with no seats, where they were required to wait if several arrived at the same time. We were told that they were dealt with one at a time and that searching was not undertaken in view of other detainees. Staff said they never undertook a rub-down search of minors. The facility was staffed by two DCOs, one male and one female whenever possible. On occasions when there was no female officer on shift, DCOs requested assistance from UKBF staff to undertake searching of female detainees. Little information about the facility was given to detainees; the Reliance generic information booklet in 16 languages was available in the holding rooms and on DVD.
- 2.5 There was no on-site health care provision. If detainees arrived with medication, or were feeling unwell, DCOs contacted a medical triage line based in the UK for advice. In an emergency, DCOs had to contact the chief immigration officer who decided if French emergency services should be called, potentially losing crucial time in a serious emergency.

### Recommendations

---

- 2.6 All use of the holding rooms should be rigorously recorded.
- 2.7 Detention officers should be able to call a medical service as soon as requested by a detainee and, if needed, the emergency services directly without having to seek permission.

## Bullying and personal safety

---

*Expected outcomes:*

*Detainees feel and are safe from bullying and victimisation.*

- 2.8 Detainees were held in three holding rooms and male and female detainees could be held separately. The holding rooms were separated from the DCOs' office: supervision of detainees was poor, there was no CCTV and detainees could not be constantly monitored. Domestic wireless door bells had been fitted in the three rooms but did not work. Detainees could not easily ask for help in an emergency. An information booklet available to detainees made a brief reference to bullying.

## Recommendation

---

- 2.9 Detainees should be able to request help easily if necessary.

## Self-harm and suicide prevention

---

*Expected outcomes:*

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

- 2.10 There were no recorded instances of self-harm during the previous year. Staff were aware of the potential for detainees to self-harm but had not received any recent refresher training. See Coquelles Tourist for further details.

## Recommendations

---

- 2.11 Staff should routinely carry anti-ligature knives.
- 2.12 Staff should receive refresher training in suicide and self-harm prevention and be informed of learning from incidents at other holding facilities.

## 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.<sup>6</sup>*

- 2.13 There were no safeguarding procedures or links between the facility and French social services. Given that detainees were trying to enter the UK clandestinely in lorries, it was unlikely that at-risk adults would be detained. UKBF staff had no understanding of referral mechanism for victims of trafficking (the National Referral Mechanism applies in the UK).

## Recommendation

---

- 2.14 UKBF staff should be aware of central referral mechanisms for victims of trafficking.

---

<sup>6</sup> 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.*

- 2.15 Records indicated that 13 minors had been transported to the PAF in the previous three months, although they had not been held in the holding rooms. One of the holding rooms had been designated to hold women, children and families. See Coquelles Tourist for further details.

## Recommendations

---

- 2.16 DCOs should have up-to-date safeguarding training and be fully conversant with their statutory duty to protect children.
- 2.17 There should be a robust safeguarding policy which recognises the French jurisdiction and sets out referral pathways to the French authorities.
- 2.18 Child care plans should contain an individual assessment of need and identify key risks. Plans should be shared with PAF when detainees are transferred.

## Housekeeping point

---

- 2.19 The role of the UKBF children's and young peoples' team should be clarified.

## Use of force

---

*Expected outcomes:*

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

- 2.20 Force had not been used inside the facility in the 12 months before our inspection. One detainee had been restrained in the freight lanes after trying to escape. Documentation indicated that force was necessary and used appropriately. See Coquelles Tourist for further details.

## 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.*

- 2.21 A notice promoting the Legal Service Commission's Community Legal Advice line was irrelevant to detainees who would not be continuing their journeys to the UK. There was no information about French organisations which could advise detainees. See Coquelles Tourist for further details.

## Recommendation

---

- 2.22 Detainees should be able to receive independent legal advice from French organisations.

## Casework

---

*Expected outcomes:*

*Detention is carried out on the basis of individual reasons that are clearly communicated.*

*Detention is for the minimum period necessary.*

- 2.23 The 16 detainees held in the facility had been arrested after trying to enter the UK clandestinely in a lorry. Two-hundred and fifty other people had been arrested by UKBF and handed directly to PAF, including 13 children. UKBF did not finger print or record detainees' details on their casework information database. After being handed to PAF, there were four outcomes for detainees. They could stay in France if they had leave to remain, claim asylum, apply for assisted voluntary return or be forcibly removed. In the last year the holding room had rarely been used and most detainees had been passed to PAF by Reliance without entering the facility (see arrival section).

## Respect

---

### Accommodation

---

*Expected outcomes:*

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

- 2.24 Despite staff efforts to make them more presentable, the three holding rooms were some of the worst we have seen and were not fit for purpose (see Appendix I). The walls were faded and grubby and the floors were bare concrete and very cold. In the corner of each room was a squat toilet with three-quarter length screening, each of which was dirty and smelly despite not having been used for some time (see Appendix I). A small stainless steel sink provided drinking water but no hot water. Solid block benches, which had thin plastic pads, blankets and pillows, ran along three walls.
- 2.25 Hygiene packs were provided but there were no shower facilities, which was inappropriate for detainees who had undergone long journeys hidden in lorries. There was a small heater at the rear of each room. The doors were metal cell-type doors with a small window which could be opened by staff. One room had been designated for holding women, children and families but was identical to the other rooms except for a baby changing mat, nappies and a few toys (see Appendix I).

### Recommendation

---

- 2.26 The holding rooms should be closed or completely refurbished and made fit for purpose, including the provision of hot water, clean and accessible toilets, new flooring and shower facilities.

### 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.*

- 2.27 Staff described a friendly, caring approach focused on detainee welfare, and most understood the physical shortcomings of the facility.



## 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,<sup>7</sup> including race equality, nationality, religion, disability, gender, transgender, sexual orientation, age and pregnancy, are recognised and addressed.*

- 2.28 The holding rooms did not have toilets accessible to people with disabilities. There was a notice on the wall informing detainees that they could be given religious items such as a prayer mat and Qur'an. See Coquelles Tourist for further details.

## Recommendations

---

- 2.29 DCOs should receive up-to-date equality and diversity training which includes the requirements of equality legislation.
- 2.30 Equality impact assessments should be undertaken to help identify and address potential discrimination.
- 2.31 Pictorial prompts should be introduced to facilitate detainee-staff communication.

## 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.*

- 2.32 Complaint forms were available in each of the three holding rooms. A single complaints box was located outside the holding rooms in view of officers. There had been no recorded complaints in the previous 12 months.

## Recommendation

---

- 2.33 Detainees should be able to submit complaints freely and unobserved.

## 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.*

- 2.34 A selection of microwave meals were available, together with snacks, sweets and crisps. Sandwiches were not available. Detainees could drink the water in the holding rooms.

---

<sup>7</sup> The grounds upon which discrimination is unlawful (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2010).

## Activities

---

*Expected outcomes:*

*The facility encourages activities to preserve and promote the mental and physical wellbeing of detainees.*

- 2.35 There was a television in each of the holding rooms but they were not connected to a digital service and no channels worked. There was a DVD facility in the staff office with three DVDs. There were a few out-of-date magazines and newspapers in each room and very few books, all of which were in English. There was a small box of toys in the family room. Detainees had no access to exercise in the fresh air; they were only held for short periods.

## Recommendation

---

- 2.36 Detainees should have access to a working television, books and current newspapers in a range of 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.*

- 2.37 There was no payphone in the holding room, and no assisted voluntary return leaflets. See Coquelles Tourist for further details.

## Recommendations

---

- 2.38 Detainees should have free access to phone, email, fax and controlled internet for communication and information purposes.
- 2.39 DCOs should be familiar with PAF procedures so that they can explain them to detainees.

## Section 3: Calais tourist

### Safety

---

#### Escort vehicles and transfers

---

*Expected outcomes:*

*Detainees under escort are treated safely, decently and efficiently.*

- 3.1 Detainees were held at Calais Tourist after being refused entry to the UK or pending further enquiries into their circumstances. They waited for no more than a few hours before being collected by the French border police (police aux frontières - PAF). No escort vehicles were used.
- 3.2 Very little information was transferred between UK detention staff and PAF. We were told that there was an oral briefing, but written documentation, such as care plans, was not passed on.

#### Recommendation

---

- 3.3 **Reliance and the PAF should ensure that important written information is passed over on transfer.**

#### 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.*

- 3.4 During the previous three months, 238 detainees had been held with IS91 authority. Clandestine travellers who had been detected in the freight lanes and handed over to the French police were detained without an IS91: the legal basis for their detention was unclear.
- 3.5 We did not observe anyone being taken into detention. A detainee in the holding room said that she had been searched sensitively and had been offered a meal and drink. A mobile telephone had been provided for her to make a free telephone call, and staff also offered use of the office telephone. We were told that children were given rub-down searches, which was inappropriate in the absence of information about risk.
- 3.6 A generic Reliance information booklet was displayed on the walls of the holding rooms in 16 languages. Copies of policies, complaints and suggestion forms were kept in untidy piles on a bookshelf and were not offered to detainees. One of the folders in the Tourist area had graffiti on it. Staff told us that they explained everything to detainees using interpretation if necessary, but the English-speaking detainee we spoke to was ill informed, for example about how to obtain legal advice.
- 3.7 A DVD of information for detainees in a number of languages was not used regularly, and staff were not familiar with its content or the languages available.
- 3.8 Staff were unable to locate a complete hygiene pack, although there was a good stock of toiletries, basic clothing (jogging trousers, t-shirts and flip flops), and sanitary products for women. Detainees were not told that these items were available and were only given them if

they asked, or if staff identified a need. There were blankets and pillows in the holding room, but they were not provided clean to each new detainee. Detainees were allowed to keep their own clothing, with the exception of ties and belts.

- 3.9 Detainees were allowed to administer their own medication, once staff had contacted a telephone triage service to determine what it was for. Staff were first aid trained. In a medical emergency, staff had to ask the chief immigration officer to call an ambulance which delayed the emergency response.

## Recommendations

---

- 3.10 Children should not be searched unless intelligence indicates that there is something concealed on their person.
- 3.11 The welfare items and services available should be publicised and reinforced verbally to all detainees.
- 3.12 Detention officers should be able to call a medical service as soon as requested by a detainee and, if needed, the emergency services directly without having to seek permission.

## Housekeeping points

---

- 3.13 The legal basis for the detention of clandestine travellers in the freight lanes should be clarified.
- 3.14 Items of clothing such as ties and belt should only be removed from detainees to reduce a demonstrable risk of harm.
- 3.15 Detainees should be offered clean blankets and pillowcases.

## Bullying and personal safety

---

*Expected outcomes:*

*Detainees feel and are safe from bullying and victimisation.*

- 3.16 There had been no reports of bullying. The Reliance information booklet displayed in the facility made brief reference to bullying. Staff had clear sight of the holding room at all times and supervision was good. Men, women and children could not be held separately (see recommendation in accommodation section).

## Self-harm and suicide prevention

---

*Expected outcomes:*

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

- 3.17 Staff on duty could not remember any recent attempts by detainees to self-harm. DCOs had not received refresher training in suicide and self-harm prevention and did not receive feedback from incidents at other holding facilities. DCOs did not routinely carry anti-ligature knives.

## Recommendations

---

- 3.18 Staff should receive refresher training in suicide and self-harm prevention and be informed of learning from incidents at other holding facilities.
- 3.19 Staff should routinely carry anti-ligature knives.

## 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.<sup>8</sup>*

- 3.20 There were no safeguarding procedures or links between the facility and French social services. Detainees were usually held for short periods and vulnerable adults received appropriate supervision. UKBF staff had no understanding of any referral mechanism for victims of trafficking (the National Referral Mechanism applies in the UK). Written information about vulnerable detainees was not given to PAF by UKBF or Reliance (see recommendation in safeguarding children section).

## Recommendation

---

- 3.21 UKBF staff should be aware of central referral mechanisms for victims of trafficking.

## Safeguarding children

---

*Expected outcomes:*

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

- 3.22 In the previous three months, nine children had been held at Calais Tourist, eight in family groups and one unaccompanied. Staff were aware of the child protection policy, but were unable to produce a copy or to speak confidently about its contents. The Reliance child protection policy had little relevance in France. Most of the UKBF children's and young persons' team had received the first two levels of UKBA child protection training, and some had received level three training. Despite their limited knowledge of policy, Reliance staff gave sound responses to scenarios put to them by inspectors, and were aware of the care planning procedure which applied to children who were unaccompanied or without a parent. This had been used once in the previous six months, and a useful log had been produced of actions to support the child in detention. However, there had been no rigorous needs assessment to facilitate individual care planning and the identification and management of child protection concerns. The documentation had not been handed over to the PAF with the detainee.
- 3.23 Staff tried to keep separate unaccompanied minors or children travelling in the company of adults, but the absence of a dedicated family room made this difficult. If the holding room was in use, children or families were placed in an interview room or in the main customs hall. Both environments were cold, in public view, and contained no information or toilet facilities. Staff

---

<sup>8</sup> 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).

sometimes preferred to look after children in the holding room when there were no other detainees present, even if they had not been formally detained.

## Recommendations

---

- 3.24 DCOs should have up-to-date safeguarding training and be fully conversant with their statutory duty to protect children.
- 3.25 There should be a robust safeguarding policy which recognises the French jurisdiction and sets out referral pathways to the French authorities.
- 3.26 Child care plans should derive from an individual assessment of need and should identify key risks. They should be shared with PAF when detainees are transferred, together with any other information about vulnerable detainees.

## Use of force

---

*Expected outcomes:*

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

- 3.27 Staff could not remember any recent use of force and there were no incident reports. The facility was staffed by two DCOs, and control and restraint techniques could not be used unless a third member of staff was in the vicinity. Staff underwent annual control and restraint training and were clear about the importance of de-escalation techniques. Staff carried handcuffs which they could use in agreed areas.

## 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.*

- 3.28 Notices in the holding room promoted the services of the defunct Immigration Advisory Service and Refugee and Migrant Justice. A notice about UK Community Legal Advice services was not relevant and there was no information about French organisations which could advise detainees. A leaflet from the International Organisation for Migration advised irregular migrants that they could claim asylum from the French authorities or apply for assisted voluntary return (see section on preparation for release). Detainees had good access to telephones but could not send or receive faxes.

## Recommendation

---

- 3.29 Detainees should be able to receive independent legal advice from French organisations.

## Casework

---

*Expected outcomes:*

*Detention is carried out on the basis of individual reasons that are clearly communicated.*

*Detention is for the minimum period necessary.*

- 3.30 Detainees held in the facility had been refused entry to the UK and were being handed to the French authorities. Detainees were able to retain their written reasons for detention (IS91R), but these were in English only. Most detainees were held for short periods. Reliance statistics indicated that nearly all the 238 people detained in the previous three months had left the holding room within eight hours, and only one had been held for more than 12 hours. A chief immigration officer from the adjacent UKBF team visited the facility regularly.

## Respect

---

### Accommodation

---

*Expected outcomes:*

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

- 3.31 The holding room was clean, appropriately heated and ventilated and contained 16 moulded plastic seats (see Appendix I). There was no natural light, but the room was well lit. Smoking was not permitted in the holding room and there was nowhere for detainees to smoke or to lie down comfortably. Some arrived overnight, often after long journeys. There was no provision for different groups of detainees to be separated.
- 3.32 There were clean toilet facilities for men and women, separated from the holding room by full length doors. Each had two lockable cubicles, one of which was wheelchair accessible with an alarm, but no grab rails. In an emergency, staff could lift the doors off their hinges, or open them from the outside. A limited range of sanitary products was available in the female facilities, together with a nappy changing table, for which staff supplied a soft mat and nappy changing products. There was hot and cold water and a hand dryer.
- 3.33 Detainee property was identified with a numerical tag and kept in an unlocked cage in the search area. We were told that detainees occasionally sat in this search area, for example to pray in private.

### Recommendations

---

- 3.34 Reclining seats should be available for detainees who wish to sleep.
- 3.35 There should be a separate area to detain women, children and families.

### 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.*

- 3.36 We spoke to a detainee in the Tourist facility who was very positive about her treatment by staff. She said she had been treated with respect and care, and we saw staff making an effort to engage with her. Staff name badges were visible.

### 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,<sup>9</sup> including race equality, nationality, religion, disability, gender, transgender, sexual orientation, age and pregnancy, are recognised and addressed.*

- 3.37 Staff had not received any diversity training since their induction. They were not comfortable explaining concepts of diversity and equality, but saw the need to treat all groups with respect. They were aware of the one-page 'Respecting detainee diversity' policy, which was also available to detainees in a number of languages.
- 3.38 Staff had rarely used the telephone interpretation service. A portable telephone enabled interpretation to take place anywhere in the detention area. Communicating with detainees from diverse backgrounds was not easy, and there was a missed opportunity to use pictorial prompts to aid communication, particularly on health care provision, telephone interpretation and the availability of welfare items.
- 3.39 Religious texts were provided in English, with the exception of the Qur'an, which was also in Arabic. The Qur'an was kept clean in a plastic bag with a prayer mat and compass. We were told that detainees were allowed to pray in the search area if they wanted privacy.
- 3.40 Staff awareness of disability was limited to an obvious physical impediment, such as use of a wheelchair. In these cases, they followed the 'detainees with a disability' policy which entailed completion of a questionnaire and creation of a care plan. This had happened in a few cases, but it was not carried out rigorously or communicated to the PAF.
- 3.41 Shift patterns were designed to ensure that there was always a female officer on duty. We found no evidence of equality impact assessments.

## Recommendations

---

- 3.42 DCOs should receive equality and diversity training which should include information on the requirements of equality legislation.
- 3.43 Equality impact assessments should be undertaken to help identify and address potential discrimination.
- 3.44 Pictorial prompts should be introduced to facilitate detainee-staff communication.

## 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.*

- 3.45 During the previous 12 months, there were no records of complaints submitted. Complaint forms were easily available but the complaints box in the holding room could be opened without a key. The complaints box was emptied regularly by a chief immigration officer (CIO).

---

<sup>9</sup> The grounds upon which discrimination is unlawful (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2010).



## Housekeeping point

---

- 3.46 The complaints box should be securely locked.

## 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.*

- 3.47 A range of 12 microwave meals were kept in the main store, but detainees only had a choice of five meals, including vegetarian and fish options, but nothing for vegans. Meals were heated in a microwave which was clean. There was also a choice of fresh sandwiches, but there were no vegetarian fillings at the time of the inspection.
- 3.48 Hot and cold drinks were available together with a supply of fruit, crisps, snack bars and sweets. Baby food and milk and some kosher biscuits were also stocked.

## Housekeeping points

---

- 3.49 A menu should be provided describing meal options in a variety of languages, with symbols to explain the key ingredients.
- 3.50 The range of sandwiches and microwave meals should include vegetarian and vegan choices.

## Activities

---

*Expected outcomes:*

*The facility encourages activities to preserve and promote the mental and physical wellbeing of detainees.*

- 3.51 Detainees were able to keep their own reading and writing materials. Some reading material was provided in the holding room, but only in English, French and Punjabi. On the first day of our inspection, this material was very out of date, but on the second day current British newspapers were provided.
- 3.52 A selection of DVDs, including some for children, could be shown in the holding room, but only in English. Toys, games and colouring materials were offered if children were present.
- 3.53 Detainees had no opportunity to spend time in the open air or to smoke.

## Housekeeping point

---

- 3.54 Detainees should have access to books and current newspapers in a range of 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.*

- 3.55 Detainees could keep their own mobile telephones if they were not internet enabled and had no camera facility. A telephone could be loaned to detainees and a payphone in the Tourist facility accepted incoming calls. There was no access to the internet or e-mail.
- 3.56 The Reliance staff we spoke to had very little knowledge of what would happen to detainees once they were handed over to the French police and were ill equipped to alleviate detainees' anxiety. We did not meet any of the Eamus Cork Security employees who searched detainees detected in the freight lanes.
- 3.57 The young female detainee whom we spoke to was to be released by the PAF at night with very little money and no travel tickets. We were told that there was no emergency welfare fund or release planning.

## Recommendations

---

- 3.58 Detainees should have free access to email, fax and controlled internet for communication and information purposes.
- 3.59 DCOs should be familiar with PAF procedures so that they can explain them to detainees.
- 3.60 Detainees with no independent means should not be released without assistance.

## Section 4: Calais Freight

---

- 4.1 We were told that the detention facilities were provided by the Calais chamber of commerce. At our last inspection, there had been no freight detention facility. It was very rarely used and the need to have it at all was unclear.<sup>10</sup> During the previous three months, only one lorry driver who had facilitated illegal entrants was detained in the facility because he could not be handed over immediately to the PAF. The facility was only staffed when required. Illegal entrants were usually transferred to PAF from the freight lanes by a private company, Eamus Cork Security. In most respects, the structures and staff at Calais Freight were the same as at Calais Tourist, and many of the same recommendations would apply if it was in use.
- 4.2 Accommodation consisted of a cold and grubby portacabin with similar seating to the Tourist facility (see Appendix I). Mobile phones were available for detainee use, and the staff telephone could also be used. Two portaloos attached to the side of the building were dirty and dingy. The very small secure area between the portacabin and the toilets could be used for smoking.
- 4.3 There was a limited stock of toiletry and food items, but these could be brought over from the Tourist facility to meet need. See Calais Tourist for further details.

---

<sup>10</sup> We were informed by UKBA that Calais Freight was closed shortly after the inspection, in December 2012.

# Section 5: Recommendations and housekeeping points

## Coquelles Tourist

---

### Recommendation

---

To UKBF

#### **Safeguarding (protection of adults at risk)**

---

- 5.1 UKBF staff should be aware of central referral mechanisms for victims of trafficking. (1.13)

### Recommendation

---

To Police aux Frontières

#### **Preparation for removal and release**

---

- 5.2 Detainees with no independent means should not be released without assistance. (1.48)

### Recommendation

---

To Reliance, UKBF and the facility contractor

#### **Arrival**

---

- 5.3 Detention officers should be able to call a medical service as soon as requested by a detainee and, if needed, the emergency services directly without having to seek permission. (1.5)

### Recommendations

---

To Reliance and UKBF

#### **Legal rights**

---

- 5.4 Independent legal advice from French organisations should be available to detainees. (1.24)

#### **Accommodation**

---

- 5.5 The holding room should be decorated and deep cleaned so that it is a clean and welcoming environment. (1.28)
- 5.6 Reclining seats should be available for detainees who need to sleep. (1.29)
- 5.7 There should be a separate area to detain women, children and families. (1.30)
- 5.8 The fire exit doors should be replaced with emergency exit doors that can be controlled by staff. (1.31)

## **Preparation for removal and release**

---

- 5.9 Detainees should have free access to email, fax and controlled internet for communication and information purposes. (1.46)

## **Recommendation**

To Reliance and Police aux Frontières

---

## **Escort vehicles and transfers**

---

- 5.10 Reliance and the PAF should coordinate transfers to ensure that detainees are taken into police custody expeditiously. (1.2)

## **Recommendations**

To the facility contractor

---

## **Self-harm and suicide prevention**

---

- 5.11 Staff should routinely carry anti-ligature knives. (1.10)
- 5.12 Staff should receive refresher training in suicide and self-harm prevention and be informed of learning from incidents at other holding facilities. (1.11)

## **Safeguarding children**

---

- 5.13 DCOs should have up-to-date safeguarding training and be fully conversant with their statutory duty to protect children. (1.17)
- 5.14 There should be a robust safeguarding policy which recognises the French jurisdiction and sets out referral pathways to the French authorities. (1.18)
- 5.15 Child care plans should contain an individual assessment of need and key risks. They should be shared with PAF when detainees are transferred. (1.19)
- 5.16 UKBF should ensure that members of the children's and young people's team understand their roles and responsibilities, and are provided with the necessary training and support. (1.20)

## **Equality and diversity**

---

- 5.17 DCOs should receive up-to-date equality and diversity training which includes the requirements of equality legislation. (1.35)
- 5.18 Equality impact assessments should be undertaken to help identify and address potential discrimination. (1.36)
- 5.19 Pictorial prompts should be introduced to facilitate detainee-staff communication. (1.37)

## **Complaints**

---

- 5.20 Complaint forms should be freely available, and the complaints box should be securely locked. (1.39)

## **Activities**

---

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

## **Preparation for removal and release**

---

- 5.22 DCOs should be familiar with PAF procedures so that they can be explained to detainees. (1.47)

## **Housekeeping points**

---

### **Arrival**

---

- 5.23 Detainees should be searched out of sight of other passengers. (1.6)
- 5.24 Items of clothing such as ties and belts should only be removed from detainees to reduce a demonstrable risk of harm. (1.7)

### **Positive relationships**

---

- 5.25 Name badges should be visible at all times. (1.33)

### **Activities**

---

- 5.26 Toys should be kept clean and freshly stocked. (1.43)

## **Coquelles Freight**

---

### **Recommendations**

---

To UKBF

#### **Safeguarding (protection of adults at risk)**

---

- 5.27 UKBF staff should be aware of central referral mechanisms for victims of trafficking. (2.14)

#### **Accommodation**

---

- 5.28 The holding rooms should be closed or completely refurbished and made fit for purpose, including the provision of hot water, clean and accessible toilets, new flooring and shower facilities. (2.26)

## Recommendations

To UKBF and Reliance

---

### Arrival

---

- 5.29 Detention officers should be able to call a medical service as soon as requested by a detainee and, if needed, the emergency services directly without having to seek permission. (2.7)

### Legal rights

---

- 5.30 Detainees should be able to receive independent legal advice from French organisations. (2.22)

### Preparation for removal and release

---

- 5.31 Detainees should have free access to phone, email, fax and controlled internet for communication and information purposes. (2.38)

## Recommendations

To the facility contractor

---

### Arrival

---

- 5.32 All use of the holding rooms should be rigorously recorded. (2.6)

### Bullying and personal safety

---

- 5.33 Detainees should be able to request help easily if necessary. (2.9)

### Self-harm and suicide prevention

---

- 5.34 Staff should routinely carry anti-ligature knives. (2.11)
- 5.35 Staff should receive refresher training in suicide and self-harm prevention and be informed of learning from incidents at other holding facilities. (2.12)

### Safeguarding children

---

- 5.36 DCOs should have up-to-date safeguarding training and be fully conversant with their statutory duty to protect children. (2.16)
- 5.37 There should be a robust safeguarding policy which recognises the French jurisdiction and sets out referral pathways to the French authorities. (2.17)
- 5.38 Child care plans should contain an individual assessment of need and identify key risks. Plans should be shared with PAF when detainees are transferred. (2.18)

## **Equality and diversity**

---

- 5.39 DCOs should receive up-to-date equality and diversity training which includes the requirements of equality legislation. (2.29)
- 5.40 Equality impact assessments should be undertaken to help identify and address potential discrimination. (2.30)
- 5.41 Pictorial prompts should be introduced to facilitate detainee-staff communication. (2.31)

## **Complaints**

---

- 5.42 Detainees should be able to submit complaints freely and unobserved. (2.33)

## **Activities**

---

- 5.43 Detainees should have access to a working television, books and current newspapers in a range of languages. (2.36)

## **Preparation for removal and release**

---

- 5.44 DCOs should be familiar with PAF procedures so that they can explain them to detainees. (2.39)

## **Housekeeping point**

---

## **Safeguarding children**

---

- 5.45 The role of the UKBF children's and young peoples' team should be clarified. (2.19)

# **Calais Tourist**

---

## **Recommendations**

---

To UKBF

### **Arrival**

---

- 5.46 Detention officers should be able to call a medical service as soon as requested by a detainee and, if needed, the emergency services directly without having to seek permission. (3.12)

### **Safeguarding (protection of adults at risk)**

---

- 5.47 UKBF staff should be aware of central referral mechanisms for victims of trafficking. (3.21)



---

## Recommendation

To Police aux Frontières

---

### Preparation for removal and release

---

- 5.48 Detainees with no independent means should not be released without assistance. (3.60)

---

## Recommendations

To UKBF and Reliance

---

### Legal rights

---

- 5.49 Detainees should be able to receive independent legal advice from French organisations. (3.29)

### Accommodation

---

- 5.50 Reclining seats should be available for detainees who wish to sleep. (3.34)
- 5.51 There should be a separate area to detain women, children and families. (3.35)

### Preparation for removal and release

---

- 5.52 Detainees should have free access to email, fax and controlled internet for communication and information purposes. (3.58)

---

## Recommendation

To Reliance and Police aux Frontières

---

### Escort vehicles and transfers

---

- 5.53 Reliance and the PAF should ensure that important written information is passed over on transfer. (3.3)

---

## Recommendations

To the facility contractor

---

### Arrival

---

- 5.54 Children should not be searched unless intelligence indicates that there is something concealed on their person. (3.10)
- 5.55 The welfare items and services available should be publicised and reinforced verbally to all detainees. (3.11)

### Self-harm and suicide prevention

---

- 5.56 Staff should receive refresher training in suicide and self-harm prevention and be informed of learning from incidents at other holding facilities. (3.18)
- 5.57 Staff should routinely carry anti-ligature knives. (3.19)

## **Safeguarding children**

---

- 5.58 DCOs should have up-to-date safeguarding training and be fully conversant with their statutory duty to protect children. (3.24)
- 5.59 There should be a robust safeguarding policy which recognises the French jurisdiction and sets out referral pathways to the French authorities. (3.25)
- 5.60 Child care plans should derive from an individual assessment of need and should identify key risks. They should be shared with PAF when detainees are transferred, together with any other information about vulnerable detainees. (3.26)

## **Equality and diversity**

---

- 5.61 DCOs should receive equality and diversity training which should include information on the requirements of equality legislation. (3.42)
- 5.62 Equality impact assessments should be undertaken to help identify and address potential discrimination. (3.43)
- 5.63 Pictorial prompts should be introduced to facilitate detainee-staff communication. (3.44)

## **Preparation for removal and release**

---

- 5.64 DCOs should be familiar with PAF procedures so that they can explain them to detainees. (3.59)

## **Housekeeping points**

---

### **Arrival**

---

- 5.65 The legal basis for the detention of clandestine travellers in the freight lanes should be clarified. (3.13)
- 5.66 Items of clothing such as ties and belt should only be removed from detainees to reduce a demonstrable risk of harm. (3.14)
- 5.67 Detainees should be offered clean blankets and pillowcases. (3.15)

### **Complaints**

---

- 5.68 The complaints box should be securely locked. (3.46)

### **Catering**

---

- 5.69 A menu should be provided describing meal options in a variety of languages, with symbols to explain the key ingredients. (3.49)

- 5.70 The range of sandwiches and microwave meals should include vegetarian and vegan choices.  
(3.50)

**Activities**

---

- 5.71 Detainees should have access to books and current newspapers in a range of languages.  
(3.54)

# Appendix I: Photographs

---

Coquelles Tourist holding room



Coquelles Freight holding room



Coquelles Freight holding room toilet



Coquelles Freight family/mother room



Calais Tourist holding room



Calais Freight holding room

