

**Independent Monitoring Board  
HMP Blundeston,  
Blundeston, Suffolk**

**Annual Report  
July 2012 to June 2013  
and a closure report to January 2014  
  
for the Secretary of State  
at the Ministry of Justice**

## **Contents**

1. The Statutory Role of the Board
2. Closure
3. The Closure Process
4. The Prison
5. Report Summary and Overview and Issues raised by the report
6. Question to the Minister
7. Questions for NOMS
8. Mandatory Reporting Areas
  - a) Diversity
  - b) The Segregation of Prisoners
  - c) Learning and Skills
  - d) Safer Custody
  - e) Healthcare including Mental Health
9. Analysis of the difficulties experienced in the prison in April and May 2013
10. Other areas
11. Closure Ceremony
12. The Board
13. The Board Statistics

1. Statutory Role of the Independent Monitoring Board

The Prisons Act 1952 and the Immigration and Asylum Act 1999 require every prison and IRC to be monitored by an Independent Board appointed by the Home Secretary from members of the community in which the prison or centre is situated.

The Board is specifically charged to:

1. Satisfy itself as to humane and just treatment of those held in custody within its prison and the range and adequacy of the programmes preparing them for release.
2. Inform promptly the Secretary of State, or any official to whom he has delegated authority as it judges appropriate, any concern which is has
3. **To report annually to the Secretary of State on how well the prison has met the standards and requirements placed on it and what impact these have on those in custody.**

To enable the Board to carry out these duties effectively its members have right of access to every prisoner and every part of the prison and also to the prison's records.

## 1. Closure.

The closure of Blundeston Prison was announced in September 2013 and this report was originally prepared for the Minister for the period up to the end of June 2013. It was about to be submitted by the IMB when the closure was announced. A decision was made to hold back the report and submit a final report once the closure programme was completed as a comment both on Blundeston prison as it was, the IMB's view of the closure, and way the closure was managed. In many ways much of what the report says may be considered irrelevant, as the original report was written looking to the future, and making comments on the good things, and the areas of operation which, in the IMB's view, needed some improvement. The closure means that the prison has no future and this report can only reflect on what might have been and what has been lost as a result of the closure. Leaving a good part of the report as it was, is helpful, as it sets out Blundeston prison as it was and will allow those who read to judge for themselves as to the correctness of the decision to close, which, so we have been told, was based on the long term maintenance costs. No figures have been officially published, as far as the IMB are aware, even though requests, we understand, were made in Parliament. It could be said that until those figures are published, and maybe at this stage they never will, there will always be the thought that the decision was flawed, as a great deal of expensive refurbishment had taken place in the 2 or 3 years prior to closure. In addition new equipment was being fitted right up to the closure announcement and some new flooring continued to be fitted after the announcement.

For those who read we would be grateful if you would bear all the following in mind. Some parts of the original report have been removed as being without purpose; parts amended have been put in italics, important areas have been put in bold and new areas underlined. We are not permitted to make any areas coloured, though a coloured version may be sent to the media and this will allow highlighting of the most relevant areas of the report. Areas of recent expenditure on the fabric of the prison are "starred" ( \* ) to show the amount of money spent in recent years and months which is must be considered wasted with the closure of the prison.

**David Bamford the Governor during the period of this report was suddenly removed from his post to another task in July and a new Governor Roy Stevenson on detached duty from HMP Littlehey, was appointed to take charge and the closure was announced 3 week later. Naz Nicholson had arrived as a new deputy Governor just a few weeks before Roy Stevenson was appointed, so a very new team were given the task of managing the closure. The IMB's view, in what was a thankless and almost impossible task, is that they did very well and were able to embrace the culture and history of Blundeston prison in the work they did. The IMB are grateful that every courtesy was extended to us, involving us in all the meetings etc. around the closure and even allowing our longest serving member to speak at the closing ceremony.**

It is helpful to start with the IMB's comments on the closure and how it was carried out.

## **2. The Closure process.**

**This belated report has commented on the prison as it was around the time the closure was announced and even the short period of disruption from prisoners had very much come to an end. Whether the decision to close the prison was right or wrong may be judged from seeing what the prison was achieving with prisoners, in a prison with an excellent and perhaps irreplaceable relationship between prisoners and staff. There had also been a huge expenditure on building repairs, maintenance, equipment and other areas of improvement during the previous 3 years. The Governor and all staff had worked very hard to improve the prison and provide an excellent regime for prisoners achieving the “top end of level 3 status “ against the background of reduced funding and staffing levels. The emphasis had been very much on rehabilitation, in line with Government policy with progress towards full week working in workshops, prisoners working in the community on ROTLs and interventionist programmes to address offending behaviour. The prison had some unique and excellent functions, the workshops of example, but also the Therapeutic Community. A legal challenge to the closure of the prison was to be made by a prisoner on the Therapeutic Community (TC), as it seems the terms of the community were to be breached by the closure at such short notice. In the end the whole unit was moved “lock stock and barrel” to HMP Norwich and then eventually the unit will be moved to Warren Hill prison, a former YOI, which is being re-rolled. Lots of equipment from Blundeston is being moved to Warren Hill as part of their re-roll; there was little equipment, so the IMB was told, at Warren Hill for adult prisoners. For prisoners on the TC this means 2 unsettling moves in a short period of time, when they are meant to be working on their rehabilitation.**

**The IMB sat in on many of the weekly closure meetings which updated everyone on progress on the extensive plan, skilfully drawn up by the Deputy Governor. The IMB appreciated the skill of those involved and their knowledge of their role and part of the prison. All these complimentary contributions worked to move prisoners on and also to deal with the infrastructure. Everything from the locks to the computers had to be removed, with all the relevant security requirements. The IMB were particularly impressed with the work of the accountant, and the person in charge of works, and the lady in charge of all the IT, in addition to the Governor and Deputy.**

**The whole closure process is/was extremely complicated and how much it will cost is not known but will be very expensive. The costs of skips, boxes, transport and storage are immense and yet all went very well at least at a local level. The decommissioning will continue until the middle of February 2014. There will be a requirement for 24 hour security surveillance until the whole site is eventually sold. Whether any developer will want to buy such an area of land for re-development, in the current economic climate, in what is a residential area is open to conjecture. Until, if and when, the property is sold two security officers will be there 24/7 and all the cameras required are being installed in what was the visitors building, a building of poor construction which itself will need constant maintenance. An additional cost of the closure is the need to provide a security fence around the whole of the prison on the outside. This will seal off the area in front of the prison with the some of the car parking space and so on. Gates will be provided across the roadways to allow access when required. The IMB assume this is due to Health and Safety requirements, needing to ensure that the prison has been properly sealed off until such time as**

the whole site can be sold. There used to be fences to keep the prisoners in and now there will be one to keep the public out.

The major problem for prisoners, and in some ways prison staff, came over a 6 week period when no prisoners were moved. The official position is that prisoner moves were ahead of schedule, the unofficial view was that prisons were full and there were no spaces. To be fair, all the prisoner moves were completed on time and yet that period when there were no moves caused huge uncertainty among prisoners. All the prisoners were all to be moved within the East of England but the IMB's information is that such a promise was never fulfilled and some prisoners settled in other Eastern region prisoners were moved to make place for prisoners from Blundeston and some prisoners from Blundeston were moved out of the Eastern Area.

The whole closure was very upsetting for staff, especially as they wondered what more they could have done to provide a good regime for prisoners. Many staff, not only uniformed staff, have worked faithfully and loyally for the prison for many years. Of course no redundancy is permitted for Civil Service staff but a number of experienced staff have taken the Voluntary Early Departure Scheme. Some through age, but others totally disillusioned by the way they have been treated by the Prison Service. For staff who have stayed in the employment of the Prison Service they have had to move to HMP Norwich or HMP Bure which adds an average of 1 hour each way to their travel time to work. Some of those who have accepted a move have told the IMB that they will be looking for alternative employment meaning the loss of experienced staff to the Prison Service. The cost of "travel to work" for all the transferred staff will be paid for 3 years. This must in itself be a huge cost given the mileage involved and again is part of the cost of closure. Some staff were unhappy about the way their interviews, as to what their options for the future were, were handled. The information given seemed to be different for different staff with the same situation and also changed as the days went by; so some staff were therefore unsure as to what was on offer, adding to their uncertainty.

To be fair, in the end the decision letters were on time and most staff got their "first choice" and some have already settled well in their new posts. There were some confusing decisions made about the travel arrangements for some staff, as they were expected to travel by train when it was quite impractical and in some cases impossible for them to do so. There was clearly a lack of correct information available to those responsible for making such decisions and all this added, again, to the uncertainty for staff.

Whether prison closure announcements should ever be made in the way the closure of Blundeston was announced, must be in doubt. Surely a long term plan for NOMS should be in place rather than Ministers making statements in Parliament which seem more about politics and vote winning than the realities of life and surely this is not the way to treat employees who have worked loyally over many years.

There have been concerns about the level of waste of valuable equipment when prisons are closed. New equipment for the workshops, fitted but never used (see the section on workshops) has an uncertain future. Many skips have come and gone and again to provide a balance much of the old furniture was only fit for being thrown away. All prisons in the country were circulated, the

local and Eastern region prisons first, and then the rest of the country, with an inventory of all the available equipment and some of the items have gone to a new home. However much will be thrown away and, the IMB is informed, some will be “mothballed”, being placed in large hangars at HMP Bure. The question is whether this is just a way of covering up the wastage, in view of the criticism about wastage at the closure of other prisons or not. The IMB here has no way of checking what happens to items when they leave the prison. Procurement rules for Government departments prevents resale, or even items being given to charity, as no bias is meant to be shown for one organisation above another. It seems again that the politics is not practical and in such times of alleged austerity anything which may be re-usable by anyone should so be and that lack of waste should more important than any political notion.

It would seem to the IMB with all the qualities of Blundeston prison and all it had to offer together with all the recent expenditure on new structures that the wisdom of the closure must be in question. We would ask whether those at the top on NOMS are so far removed from the practical operations of the prisons to be unaware of their prisons and therefore whether the advice they give to Ministers, who are even further away from the realities of their prisons, is sound.

The closing ceremony was moving for those involved in the prison for many years, particularly seeing the officers all marching in their uniforms, it brought a tear to many an eye and it was good to be part of the ceremony and praise the staff for all they had achieved over so many years; that can never be taken away. Indeed it was good to have been part of the whole prison community, for some IMB members, for many years and to have gained so much from working with so many excellent Prison Staff.

### 3. The Prison

HMP Blundeston *was* a category C prison situated in North East Suffolk about 4 miles north of Lowestoft. The prison was opened in 1963 with four wings of single cell accommodation intended for 288 prisoners. The cells in the original 4 wings *were* of minimal size, with two further wings of multiple cells being added to the main prison block in the 1970s. Two further wings, prefabricated in structure, *had* been added to the prison accommodation, the latter being opened in 2008. Both of these wings *provided* a good standard of accommodation with integral sanitation and showers.

The CNA *had* increased to 524, there *had been* no increase in the past 12 months, and although a new kitchen *had been* built in the 1990's, other areas of the prison such as the gymnasium, workshops and office block *still had* the same capacity as when the prison opened in the “60's”. The only additions since 2008 *were* some pre-fabricated class rooms/meeting areas. A very recent HMIP report *had said* that a new gymnasium should be provided but the IMB (formerly BOV) *had repeatedly recommended this since 1993 and of course such a recommendation is now pointless but had never been followed.*

As *had been* mentioned in every report, and *would have continued to be* so until changes *were* made the “Night Sanitation” provision on the original prison wings. A, B, C and D *was* totally unsatisfactory in these modern times. “Night San” *allowed* prisoners out of their cells, one at a time, in periods when they *were* locked up, to access toilet and washroom facilities. The cells, 284 of them, *did* not

therefore have in cell sanitation. \*Recently gates *had* been provided on B wing to allow a dormitory type arrangement to be provided; prisoners' cell doors not being locked and these prisoners having access to toilets at all times. This therefore improved their access to sanitation. These prisoners *had* been placed on trust to cooperate knowing the consequences of non-compliance and *until the prison closure the arrangement had worked well\** and the intention was to "roll out" the arrangement across all 4 of these wings.\* Some experimentation *also took place* to provide in cell sanitation in 2 to 4 cells on C wing and to see how that *performed* and the costs of such provision\*. There was debate about the size of the cells and their suitability for in cell sanitation. A price tag of £5,000,000 *had* been set for the work to provide in cell sanitation on the four wings, but by experimenting with these 4 cells, the hope was to find a way to provide the sanitation at a much reduced cost. Initial results *had* proved positive. The IMB would say that at least the prison was looking at alternatives to resolve the sanitation issue, but it is fair to say that the Board *had* few complaints and that some prisoners actually like the single cell accommodation. The problems *came* with those prisoners with medical needs and the IMB notes that it took a long time to move such a prisoner, during this past year, to a cell with a toilet and success was only eventually achieved through IMB/SMT negotiations. One addition problem with the "Night san" came when a member of staff *went* onto one of the landings meaning the whole system *had* to be reset. The "queue" order for those wanting to be released to go to the toilet may *have changed* leading to some prisoners having to wait a very long time for access to the toilet. A way of addressing *this should have been looked into some years ago*.

The IMB questioned in the last year's report as to why the in cell sanitation *had not been* provided at the same time as the new heating system was fitted when one wing at time had been decanted to allow that work to take place. The question still remains, perhaps the closure had been planned a long time ago and that is why the work had not been undertaken to provide the in cell sanitation but in which case why replace the heating?

It is likely that the lack of integral sanitation on these 4 wings was a major factor in the decision to close the prison. In reality it caused less problems to prisoners than expected, but of course is not good politically in these modern times and although the court cases brought by prisoners seeking compensation for "degrading and inhumane treatment" had so far failed, the possibility of success, at some time, must have been of concern to the Government. The potential for a large number of expensive compensation pay outs must always be there; as there are other prisons within the Prison Estate without integral sanitation the potential for cases been successful at those prisons must surely remain. In which case it may be that retrospective claims may come for the 50 years Blundeston has been open, from those prisoners who can prove they were in the prison and the length of time they were there.

The multiple occupancy cells, on F and G wings, *provided* poor accommodation, but some prisoners *liked* this arrangement as they *appreciated* the opportunity to share a cell with others. F and G wing cells *did* at least *have* integral sanitation, even though it was shared by other prisoners. The shower facilities on F and G wing *were* very poor and constantly *had* to be refurbished to cope with peeling paint etc. \*but in recent weeks, before the closure was announced, new showers *had* been provided on F wing 3<sup>rd</sup> floor and further work *would have been carried out* to fit new showers on all floors on F and G wings\*. It *would have been* interesting to see whether the new designs *would have provided* more durability as to performance and maintenance.

As mentioned in last year's report the \*new dispensary for prisoners on IDTS on D wing and the refurbished Healthcare centre *had provided much improved* healthcare facilities\*.

\*The IMB is reliably informed that new roofs to the workshops and the central part of the prison cost £6,000,000. £4,000,000 was spent on the new heating for the main part of the prison i.e. A,B,C,D,E,F and G wings and this work was completed less than 2 years before the closure was announced. In addition a new electronic key issuing system for all staff and the IMB was only fully operational one month before the closure was announced. No cost of this installation has been discovered, but it must have cost 10s of thousands of pounds.\*

## **5. Report Summary and Overview and issues raised by the report**

Blundeston prison *performed* at level 3 within NOMS system of recording performance and the only KPT missed in the past two years *related* to staff sickness levels. A very recent unannounced inspection by HMIP provided a positive report giving recognition for the improvements achieved in the 2 years since the previous inspection. The HMIP report *gave* the prison scores of 3 for Safety, Purposeful Activity and Resettlement and only 1 for respect. This latter poor score *related*, so the IMB are informed, to issues around Healthcare provision, more of which in the section on Healthcare.

The past few weeks of the reporting period *had* been what could be called the "Silly Season", with more incidents of barricades and roof top protests and some violence between prisoners than the IMB can remember for some years. None of the incidents were major ones, just part of the general disruption caused by unhappy prisoners.

On 30<sup>th</sup> May the Governor wisely issued a "Notice to staff and prisoners" about how prisoners causing disruption and seeking to move out of the prison through the segregation unit were to be managed. The directive *was* robust and yet fair and practical and for the wellbeing of all the prisoners at Blundeston. About the same time a decision *was made* to suspend ROTL for prisoners working outside on "day release". Not to *have mentioned* these issues in the report *would have been* dishonest, they led to more call outs for IMB members in a few weeks than we have experienced in the past few years. At the same time, there *must be an imperative* not to let those incidents detract from the very good things *which were* going on in the prison with all the innovation and *working* towards providing a 36 hour working week for more and more prisoners, in accord with Government policy. The IMB would also endorse the HMIP findings in their report, of course now irrelevant, of considerable progress in the 2 years since their previous visit.

The difficulties in areas like Healthcare *were* always that such provision, *as with all prisons*, *was* the subject of a contract with a provider and not under the Governor's direct control. He *could* only then go to the provider and request suitable provision but *was* dependent on what is put in place by the contractor. Such arrangements seem good in theory with many areas of "Prison life", being contracted out, and we understand that more areas, works, workshops and so on *would soon have been contacted out*, but they cause all sorts of headaches for prison Governors, who spend too many hours having to deal with contractors in what becomes an increasingly fragmented system. (This applies in all prisons and will do so in the Probation Service too, or what will replace much of the work Probation Service, and it will be interesting to see if the contracting out will ever work).

It should be mentioned that the “Fair and Sustainable” (F&S”) working *had* been introduced for all staff and that “Completion Benchmarking” *had* also taken place. The latter *provided* no further cuts in staffing, but only as the cuts *had* already been made. The Governor, David Bamford, *seemed* to have “been ahead of the game”. The prison *achieved* very high scores in the security audit, “quality of life” for prisoners also scored highly, as did the survey into “job satisfaction” among the staff. However the IMB would make the comment that the survey of staff *had* been undertaken before “F&S” was introduced and we would suggest that a survey *carried out in July* may *have had* a different result. It seems, like the majority of prisons in the Eastern Region, Staff Morale *had* dropped in recent weeks and this *had had* a knock on effect to prisoners.

**After the closure was announced prison officers continued to work with the highest integrity and professionalism in the true tradition of Blundeston prison. There were no incidents of concern, in fact the prison became a quieter place, especially as prisoner numbers were reduced. This is in keeping with the view of many, including the IMB over many years, that the relationship between staff and prisoners at Blundeston had been excellent and was part of the success of the prison and was invaluable and irreplaceable.**

Blundeston *had* an excellent and skilled Governor and good and well-motivated staff, however as the IMB *had* been saying for the last few years the reduction in budgets and therefore staff numbers reduces the capacity to cope in difficult times. *So as the prison was so doing well, in so many ways, why were there the levels of disruption in the period around April and May? The IMB would suggest there is little doubt that the root of much of the problem was the cuts in funding over recent years, about which we have repeatedly expressed concern. These cuts eventually “came home to roost”.* Prisons are becoming again much more about containment and all the so called “Rehabilitation Revolution” little more than rhetoric.

The IMB *was* also informed of ways in which the prison budget management *had* changed since “competition bench marking” has been carried out. Previously the Governor *would have been* given a budget for the prison, it *was* around £11 million, which he *would have had* the freedom to allocate to provide for staff, training, food, Healthcare and so on. The IMB’s understanding *was* that in the future the Governor *would have been given* funding for exactly the number of staff agreed under competition benchmarking and exactly the amount of funding required and agreed to provide what is called “No pay” expenses, food for example. There *would have been* far less, if any, flexibility for Governors in the spending of the funding for the prison. The IMB would suggest (WE STILL DO) that such restrictions are unhelpful to Governors and prevent them responding to developments within their establishments by putting money where it could be best used. Such action *we understand would have even limited* the Governor’s freedom to support Christmas dinner and Ramadan as with the recent reduction in the daily food allowance for prisoner from £2.09 to £1.91 *there would not have been* enough money to service those special areas as had been possible in previous years. All these things add to the pressure within prisons and make them more difficult to manage, when at the same time there are less staff to cope with any disruption.

As mentioned above there *had* been a high level of staff sickness. It is not for this report to analyse the reasons, as we are not privy to the medical situations nor talked to by the staff. We are aware that some staff *had been* dismissed, but again are not privy to the terms of those dismissals. However all this *took* time and, *so tight are the budgets*, no new staff *could* be employed until the

other staff left. *That put* an increasing strain on the “fit and well staff” as they *worked* extra hours and *found* TOIL difficult to reduce. Holidays and days off *became* much more difficult to take with the increasing pressure of such a workload.

The IMB *were* aware that, for example, Sentence Plans *were* way behind schedule and the backlog *was* principally because the staff responsible for writing the reports *had* been on “Long term sick”. There *was* no slack in the system at all, the IMB, in June, found a prisoner who *had* been in the prison for over 6 months and still without a Sentence Plan. This *delayed* his progress through the system and his rehabilitation and other delays *added* to the pressure within the prison. As an IPP prisoner it is likely that these delays would have meant he may have spent longer in prison than necessary, unable to access courses without a valid sentence plan.

## **6. Questions for the Minister**

1. In view of this report would the Minister accept that he was ill advised as to the closure of Blundeston prison?
2. Would he accept that some of the work done at Blundeston was invaluable and irreplaceable and that the outworking of the Government’s policy to rehabilitate prisoners is reduced by the closure of the prison?
3. Would the Minister agree that there are indeed huge current and ongoing long term costs on the closure of any prison and Blundeston in particular due to its unique geography?
4. Would the Minister accept that the statement that the main reason for the closure of the prison was “the future maintenance costs” is not factual and indeed much of the upgrading work had already been carried out, at considerable cost?
5. Would the Minister accept that until the figures re the future maintenance costs are properly produced there remains a question over the rightness of the decision to close the prison and that such closure was more about a political agenda than the practical realities of rehabilitating prisoners?
6. Would the Minister accept that the lack of proper long term planning by NOMS has led to an empty prison with beautiful new roofs and heating which will now never be used and the full value of the refurbishment will never be realised?
7. Would the Minister accept that there are too many Quangos, Inspectorates etc. involved in all aspects of the nation and that they need to be rationalised. When the Government came to power they promised to close many quangos but as far as prisons are concerned there still seem to be too many. (IMBs are vital to the welfare of prisoners as being on the job day in day out and properly aware of prison life, and we are voluntary).
8. Would the Minister accept that the contracting out of all sorts of parts of “Prison Life”, healthcare for example, creates a fragmented and complicated system which

demands too much time from Senior Managers and takes them away from the real job they are assigned to do?

9. Finally would the Minister accept that the whole process from the announcement of the closure through to re-deployment is not the way to deal with Prison Staff who have loyally served the country through for many years?

## **7. Questions for the NOMS.**

1. Would the Senior Management of NOMS agreed that they were not fully aware of all the good things going in on in the prison and its value to the community and that by recommending closure to the Minister, to fulfil a political expedient, it has failed prisoners, prison staff and the nation as a whole?
2. Would it be accepted that the failure to have a proper long term plan for the Public Prisons has meant a good deal of spending on refurbishment and equipment at Blundeston for which the true value will never be realised?
3. Would it also be accepted that the way that staff re-deployment, interviews, information etc. was handled was poor and did nothing to give Prison staff any confidence in the National Offender Management Service?
4. Would it be agreed that the promise to move all prisoners “within area” was not kept and that prisoners established in other prisons were moved to make room for those being transferred from Blundeston?
5. Would it be agreed that there was a failure to appreciate the legal requirements of the terms of prisoners on the Therapeutic Community and that rapid re-planning was required to solve the issue and that prisoners having to move twice within a few months is disruptive to their rehabilitation.

## **8. Mandatory Reporting Areas**

### **a) Diversity**

The Board *had* recently received an excellent presentation on diversity management within the prison by the very helpful Equalities Manager. Later the IMB was informed that the post *would no longer have been available* under “competition benchmarking” and therefore the work *would have been given* to a Governor who already *had* a large workload. This *seemed* a strange situation given the importance of diversity issues within society and the increased range of protected characteristics following the making of the Equalities Act. This need to change the allocation of the work may *have undermined* the very good work done within the prison *which ensured* equality and fairness for all those protected characteristics. *There was* an Equalities Action Team, chaired by the number one Governor, which *met* regularly to oversee diversity/equality issues within the prison. There *was* a subcommittee also which *met* to look at the impact of decisions and so on in relation to diversity and equality. This committee *looked* at the statistics and SMART data available for many aspects of prison life, for example, adjudications, prisoners located in the segregation unit, use of force and so

on. This *was* to ensure that there *was* no inequality or apparent inequality in any of these areas. Sometimes the sample *was* so small as to make judgements quite difficult. The IMB *had* been told that the statistics *showed* that the level of white prisoners seeking their own protection *had* been very high for some months. Blundeston prison *had* rather re-rolled in the past year or so and *had* become much more a prison for offenders from the East of England area. This *meant* that the ethnic profile of the prisoners *had* changed. A couple of years ago almost 50% of the prisoners would *have been* from BME backgrounds, that *had become* less than 30%. However the IMB *was* pleased to comment, this *was* confirmed by the HMIP report, that there *were* remarkably few racial issues within the prison and, if and when, there were problems these *usually developed* between different minority ethnic groups.

All new receptions at the prison *received* an "Equalities induction" telling them of behaviour that *was* unacceptable and how they *could* help to promote equality within the prison. They *were* all given a questionnaire about their background, ethnicity, "sexual orientation" and so on. This induction also *told* the prisoner how to make a complaint if they *believed* that they have been treated unfairly. All the nine protected characteristics under the equality act *were* positively promoted within the prison to make everyone aware of the requirements and unacceptable behaviour, such as homophobia, *was firmly* challenged. Cultural events, such as "Black History Month" *were* held to promote awareness among the prison population.

The HMIP report in 2011 *had* highlighted concerns about older prisoners within the prison population and work *was* being done to promote the welfare of older prisoners within Blundeston prison, of whom there *were* about 40 over 50 years of age. The prison *had* limitations because of its design, in that most of the cell accommodation *was* not on the ground floor, however J wing, which was added about five years ago, *had* a very easy access and the ground floor *was being used* to accommodate older prisoners. This *had* proved very popular and in addition \*ramps *had* been fitted to one or two accesses to the main prison building to help prisoners, particularly those of more senior years\*. There *had* been an appointment of an "Older Prisoner Liaison officer". "AgeUK" *came* from Norwich and *provided* a social group for senior prisoners. There *was* also the special gym session for those prisoners over 50 years of age. Some instruction *had been* given to staff on dementia and the issues surrounding this illness. All this detail is given, perhaps, to show how positively the prison *was* looking into all aspects of equality and promoting a characteristic which *had* possibly a lower profile than some of the more familiar protected characteristics.

Each wing *had* an Equalities Rep to promote all equality strands and all reps *came* together for meetings and the intention *was* for them to feed back information to their wings. An impact assessment *was to have been made* on the introduction of the new IEP scheme.

DIRF forms *were* available for anyone who *wished* to make a complaint of unfair or unequal treatment and these *were* fully and properly investigated. Some incidents would be dealt with on an informal basis. Possibly, to sum up, it is fair to say that Blundeston *managed* the diversity/equality issues within the prison well, *promoted* the protected characteristics and *left* few, if any issues, of concern.

## **b) Segregation of prisoners.**

The past 12 months *had* been challenging for the segregation unit, the level of segregated prisoners *had been* comparatively high, particularly compared with a year ago. Following the closure announcement the unit quickly became very quiet as prisoners moved on to other prisons and the need for those prisoners trying to seek a move through the segregation unit was removed. The reasons for the busy and difficult time are identified in the section of the report on the “silly season” which tries to explain the reasons why so many prisoners *requested* to go to the segregation unit. The IMB *was* informed that in one month 28 prisoners *had been* moved from the unit to other prisons. That *was* almost one prisoner per day and *placed* a huge demand on the staff *making* the arrangements. Often these moves *resulted* in difficult prisoner(s) moving to Blundeston and bringing their problems with them. *The segregation unit was sometimes too small to accommodate all the prisoners and segregated prisoners had to be located in other parts of the prison.* In spite of all this the successful management of prisoners by staff on the segregation unit *worked* to turn round prisoners and improve their behaviour within the prison. This is because the strict but fair regime *could* often confront prisoners with their behaviour issues and cause them “mend their ways”.

*No prisoner spent more than a few hours in the special accommodation.* The IMB *witnessed* some of the control and restraint procedures and *were* entirely happy with the way things *were* handled. Indeed we would go further and compliment staff on the way they *handled* such situations so professionally, sometimes in the face of strong provocation. The anger and violence demonstrated at times by prisoners almost *had* to be seen to be believed.

IMB members *attended* the vast majority of the statutory 14 day reviews of prisoners within the unit. We are pleased to say that “Healthcare” *were* regularly in attendance and often a representative from the chaplaincy. Healthcare *also visited*, as required for segregated prisoners, on a daily basis and when prisoners *were* moved to the unit and/or *were* accommodated in the special cells. There *was* therefore more than adequate medical supervision and the doctor *also visited* the unit regularly. Reviews *were* carried out sympathetically, trying to find a way forward for the prisoner. In many situations the only alternative, regrettably, *was* for the prisoner to move to another prison

The IMB in addition *visited* every segregated prisoner once a week and sometimes more often especially if there *were* issues with that prisoner. All new “arrivals” in the unit *would* be seen within that week. All this *was* over and above the normal reviews but *enabled* the IMB to ensure that all segregated prisoners *were* monitored and any issues identified early so as to provide for a rapid resolution.

The no smoking policy *had worked* well.

Adjudications took place in the unit and prisoners were brought to the unit for the adjudication to take place. *\*The room was recently been reduced in size to make way for more office space and was only just fit for purpose\*.*

The IMB are grateful (*We still are*) to the segregation unit staff for their continued courtesy in opening cells doors, going with us on our rounds and providing us with the information we *required*. They *were* most helpful and have been for many years.

### **c) Learning and Skills**

HMP Blundeston, as a training prison, *provided* a wide range of both training and education for prisoners. The education *ranged* from basic numeracy and literacy to Open University courses. Classes *were* well attended and also *included* IT courses and training. The IMB *had* very few applications related to education and understand that it *continued* quite normally.

**Workshops provided training in welding, woodworking, painting and decorating and printing and all operated at a high standard. As mentioned in last year's report the welding workshop won the Elton trophy for being the best workshop in the whole of the Prison Service and the same high standards remained both in the work produced and the training received. It was just like a "proper workshop" with well-motivated prisoners and, because of the qualifications achieved, a good prospect of employment on release. The woodworking shop also worked to a similar high standard and both workshops had a huge back order of work to complete demonstrating a great future for the prison and prisoners and these factors are ample reason why no consideration should have been given to closing Blundeston prison. (This has now been put into the past tense but was written in the present tense before the closure was announced and where is all the work that Blundeston workshops would have done being carried out?)** \*Both workshops *were* being expanded to be able to store the work when completed or during manufacture and so allow adequate space for the workmen\*. In the woodwork shop a diploma *could* be achieved for each different machine which the prisoner *learned* to use. The expansion of both the workshops *was* to allow a 36 hour week to be worked in accordance with Government policy and *would also have included* facilities to provide food for prisoners and so prevent their return to the wings for the midday meal. All this demonstrates as mentioned above the innovation and forward thinking of the Governor and SMT. \*The IMB were informed that new equipment was provided in the welding shop costing £80,000. The equipment was never used and will cost money to remove and relocate; if that ever happens of course, and the equipment is not just mothballed\*.

A 36 hour week working *had been* started initially in the print workshop but the outworking of the plan *was* hindered by lack of work. This *was* due to contracts promised for work not being fulfilled and the contracts *remaining* with outside companies. The IMB understands that expensive equipment was placed into two other East of England prisons to provide printing jobs for prisoners and like Blundeston the work promised just *did* not come. The Governor at Blundeston *managed* to get some bookbinding work to fill in the gap, but that ***was not*** like the fulfilling work promised and this *was* the *situation when the prison closed*. There *was* just enough work to keep the prisoners going during the normal hours they *would have worked* within the prison regime, but not enough work to *have provided* a full 36 hour working week for any prisoner. This *was* disappointing as the management of the logistics to *have allowed* a 36 hours working week in the print shop was challenging; *only to have fallen down due* to HMPS's failure to provide the promised work.

**\*A new laundry had been provided at the prison to do the laundry for other prisons in the East of England. The whole project was a shambles, not through the fault of local Governors, some of the**

**wrong sort of equipment was used in the design; there was poor flooring and ventilation too. It cost a fortune, took months to provide and is of course now totally redundant\*.**

16 to 18 Prisoners *were* being released each day on ROTL from a dedicated wing to work outside the prison. Their employment *was* varied and could *have been* anything from the prison farm to businesses in Norwich and Lowestoft. With the change in prisoners *coming to the prison, there had been less time to assess them as suitable for ROTLs, so fewer prisoners were going out to work, also fewer prisoners were applying for ROTL, to work outside, as there was a huge pressure on them to bring back illicit substances.*

*\*There was also the "Re-cycling" Unit which provided work and training for a good number of prisoners and at the same time saved the prison almost £100.000 in waste management costs\*. The kitchen of course provided work and training. Work was allocated through labour control which was located in the most excellent \*"Resettlement facility" \* This also served as a drop in centre, with many outside agencies, as well as internal departments, visiting during the week and prisoners free to come, at the appropriate time, to receive assistance to resolve many of their issues \*.*

*The prison ran HRP (Healthy Relationships Programme) to help with domestic violence issues and there was always a long waiting list, and prisoners came to Blundeston to do the course so where do they go now? The thinking skills programme also operated.*

*There used to be a successful industrial cleaning course which provided work and training.*

*Work was only available for 80-85% of prisoners on a daily basis.*

#### **d) Safer Custody**

*There were many positive things about "Safer Custody" in the prison and indeed the HMIP report gave the prison a "3" in this area with prisoners *feeling* safer than during their previous visit. There was a robust Violence Reduction Programme in operation and appropriate action *was being* taken against those suspected of bullying.*

*Prisoners arriving with no canteen and unable to get canteen were vulnerable and likely to get into debt, especially if they had no money in their accounts. The prison had worked hard to resolve these issues. There was a long delay, 3 weeks it seems, for DHL to return money to a prisoner's account for canteen ordered but not received at the sending prison, before they come to Blundeston. This was totally unacceptable and *seemed* not to have been resolved in spite on many concerns *being* expressed.*

*It was interesting to hear of the Government's plans to ban smoking in all prisons later in the year. In many ways the proposal has huge repercussions in many areas of prison life and the mental well-being of prisoners *who seem to rely very much on tobacco to "survive" during their sentences.* The removal of tobacco would at least reduce these canteen issues and may work to reduce bullying, but may cause more problems than it solves. It is imperative, the IMB strongly suggests, that at the same time medical support is put in place for all prisoners if and when they are compelled to give up smoking. Many have a lifetime of dependence. **(This still applies in all prisons and the comments are still relevant; again is the plan more about politics than really helping prisoners?)***

ACCT documents *were* well prepared and an excellent standard of support and care *was* provided if and when prisoners *were* likely to self-harm at any level, even to threatening suicide. ACCT assessors who *came* from all areas of prison staff *did* a great job. The “Listeners” *worked* within the prison to a high standard helping troubled prisoners. The Listeners *were* very well supported by the local Samaritans.

*Sadly there was a death in custody in the last few weeks of the prison’s operation and only the 4<sup>th</sup> in the 50 years the prison had been open. The IMB were involved at the time and all the procedures were followed through properly and the IMB’s information is that there is no criticism, as a result of the investigation, of the staff involved or the management of the situation. It would be inappropriate to comment on any details here which might identify the prisoner and the IMB pass on our condolences to his family. The inquest has not yet taken place.*

### **e) Healthcare including Mental Health**

Providing Healthcare within any prison provides many challenges that would not be there when providing similar Healthcare in the community. The very fact that prisoners are incarcerated and unable of themselves to access Healthcare is of great concern to many. There is a perception, almost certainly a false one, but nevertheless very real to many prisoners, that they do not receive adequate Healthcare and that, if and when, there is an emergency or they have a serious medical problem they will not be treated properly and the access they need to a hospital or a doctor will either be denied or delayed. ***(Still relevant in any prison)*** There is no doubt that the Healthcare workers have a lot responsibility and it is their decision will affect what happens to a prisoner. Healthcare staff endure a great deal of pressure from prisoners to grant requests, provide medication and assistance and so on. There is also now the requirement that prisoners receive the same standard of Healthcare as would be given to people living in the community. *This remains the same in any prison and was so at Blundeston right up to closure.*

The IMB *received* a number of applications about Health Care issues during the year. Some of them we *referred* to PALS but some we *looked* into ourselves. In the majority of occasions we *found* that the Healthcare staff “got it right” and that often the prisoner *was* only telling us “half the story”. Whether the prisoner *was* trying to manipulate the system or genuinely *had* a real concern and fear *was* difficult to judge. As is mentioned later the issue of both prescribed and illicit drugs *was* a major one within the prison. As mentioned in last year’s report 87% of prisoners *were* on some sort of medication. Perhaps that *reflected* the problems that many prisoners have coping with prison and many years of incarceration, with more and more time behind cell doors and less constructive work to do. There *was* a very definite attempt to reduce the level and type of prescribed medication within the prison. The IMB *received* a number of applications about this issue. While in general we *supported* such action, there *were* individual cases where medication prescribed at the hospital *had* been changed by the local prison doctor without seeing the prisoner. Of course the IMB *had* no medical expertise but it *seemed* important to us that each prisoner, who is really a patient, *should have been* treated individually and “a broad brush” approach not used. It takes a large amount of discipline from all Healthcare staff, as it does from of the IMB itself, to be able to deal with prisoners individually, remain caring and compassionate and not make assumptions before actually talking to the individual. *This still applies in any prison.*

---

The HMIP report severely criticised the provision of Health Care within the prison. At the last inspection two years and more ago there were very few concerns about healthcare and from the IMB's point of view little *had* changed outwardly, rather the Healthcare facilities had been refurbished and much improved. The criticism *centred* over the issues of medication management, Primary Mental Health Care and Care Plans. Since the HMIP report the Care Quality Commission (CQC) *had visited* the prison and issued enforcement notices, to be complied with by the end of July 2013. The Governor told us that he *had been* expressing concerns to the Healthcare provider for up to 2 years. Enquiries by the IMB *told* us that the Healthcare staff themselves *were* unaware of the reasons for the criticism or for the reason why their manager had been suspended from duty. We made further enquiries *and it was suggested to us* that and that the whole issue *was* considered to be "political" but there *was* little that the provider *could* add while they *investigated* the matter. It seems that HMIP *had* started to look at Health Care in a new way and this may explain the reasons for the findings in their report. The provider of the Secondary Mental Health Care we *understood* was wishing to bid for the provision of Primary Mental Health Care, which we *understood, at that point, had* been in the remit of the doctor. This *may have worked* but demonstrates the way with "Contracting out" how everything becomes fragmented and a managerial nightmare for the Governor.

***\*Primary Mental Health Care provision actually started in November 2013 when the prison was half empty, six weeks before the final prisoner moved, and was part of the efforts by the Healthcare provider to meet the requirements, the IMB assumes, of the enforcement notice. It all seemed quite farcical and perhaps demonstrates how with so many interested parties all having the role to fulfil there is just "No joined up thinking". Perhaps Government should take stock, look at how many of these organisations are really necessary and remove those that are not. It seems that as with a doctor as problems arise with a patient they just provide more medication without a proper review of the whole picture and sometimes these treatments work against each other. With Government as problems arise a new Quango, Inspectorate, law etc. is introduced at huge cost and many do the same thing or part of the same thing or work against each other. Everything gets more complicated making life increasing difficult for those doing the real work.***

***All these issues of course are irrelevant to HMP Blundeston but there remain many unresolved issues around the provision of healthcare in the prison estate\*.***

*The outcome of the HMIP report and all that happened around it was unhelpful to the morale of all the healthcare staff, especially those doing the day to day job of looking after prisoners and their wellbeing.*

---

## **9. In depth analysis of the reasons for the difficulties experienced in the prison in April and May 2013**

The IMB would suggest the following factors.

1. With the rapid closure of 7 prisons in the country under the Government's prison closure programme, we were told, due to spending cuts, the majority of transport available to move

prisoners was taken up in decanting those 7 prisons. The IMB have said before that the provision of transport in the contract was already inadequate so the use of these resources in the closure of 7 prisons, in such a hurry, was unhelpful and meant that moves from the prison became difficult and at times impossible to arrange. Even “segregated prisoner” moves were slow to come about, with prisoners spending too long in the unit and yet “Segregation Moves” took priority over other moves, even those which were progressive and agreed for the prisoner. This situation went on for a few months. The feeling among prisoners was that the only way out of the gaol was through the segregation unit; so the trend started and built up a head of pressure which *was still there until the closure was announced*. The IMB in that period of time *had a large number of applications from prisoners about moving from the prison and “Why was their agreed move delayed”*. The answer *we repeatedly gave was for the reason above*. If you *were* part of the prison community, as the IMB *were*, then you *would have understand* the pressure of incarceration on prisoners and the frustrations when things either planned or promised *did not work out*. So *were* the origins of the “silly season” down to Government policy? Probably yes although the situation *may not have been envisaged and anticipated beforehand perhaps it should have been*, and maybe the origins are to be found in the “lack of transport” problem.

2. The prison *had been re-rolled to accommodate more prisoners from the East of England Area*. This was to give the prison more of an identity in its function and prolong its future and usefulness. (Of course the idea failed completely and Blundeston has been closed, so the notion that having such an identity would ensure the prison’s future was a totally false one. High hopes had been raised for all prison staff, making the announcement of the closure more difficult for them to accept). This *meant* that the prisoners in Blundeston *came* from a smaller geographical area and may well *have met* before in the other prisons in the area. The ethnic profile *had changed with at the time of the closure announcement* about 30% of prisoners coming from a BME background. Many of the prisoners *would have had issues with one another in other prisons and perhaps outside too and had been in rival groups*. As soon as some *arrived* at the prison they *identified* another prisoner with whom they *had* a history and from whom they *felt* under threat and at the same time *were* told that they *would not be moved for some months*, as stated above, moves *were* very difficult to find at this time. The IMB *were* informed that prisoner moves *had to be within the East of England cluster, which exacerbated the problem and moving prisoners “out of area” was very difficult*.
3. More of the prisoners at Blundeston *were* short term prisoners; they *had* “a different attitude”. We *were told they had less to lose* from bad behaviour. Sometimes when placed on report for bad behaviour, by asking for legal representation, to which a prisoner is entitled, and thus having their adjudication adjourned for a month for the next visit by the independent adjudicator the prisoner *would have left* the prison and therefore no sanction could be applied. One prisoner on “Dirty protest” said exactly that to the IMB.
4. Some prisoners *told* the IMB that their concerns *had not been listened too* and what the prisoner *insisted was* a serious predicament and the threat they *were* under *was not taken seriously*. Prisoners in desperation do something dramatic, like make a barricade, there *was no serious intention* and the alleged victim *was part of the plan; it was just to get noticed and get some sort of response*. The IMB *had been with Governors to interview prisoners who had done just as above so we were totally aware of the issues; this was as part of our monitoring activities being concerned as to what was going on and ensuring we were “on top of things”*. Also some staff *told* the IMB their concerns about possible violence and friction between gangs *were not*

always listened too with the inevitable consequences. On the other hand what more *could* senior members of staff do? Blundeston *was* a small compact prison with limited accommodation and the bare minimum of staff. After a roof top incident in 2012, once the matter was resolved, so many staff were involved with the 3 perpetrators that one officer told us “when the 60+ prisoners all surged back onto his wing he was completely on his own”. Happily there were no problems but he was aware of his vulnerability.

5. The increase in the level of illegal drugs in the prison. The availability of “Spice,” a synthetic cannabinoid, *rose considerably for a short period of time*. The IMB understands that this *was* true for other prisons within the UK. The substance although legal to take is still illegal to bring into the prison and such an attempt or action must lead to prosecution. The IMB *was* aware of the arrest of a visitor in May for trying to bring in a substantial amount of the substance. Our understanding is that the drug is sprayed onto a material so that it can be smoked and it induces an effect similar to that of cannabis. There are many dangers as reactions to the substance can vary, as can its strength, and there must be concern over a possible death in custody. (*Still relevant for all prisons and all those who ever think to use “Spice”*). “Spice” *was* not detectable by the “Drug Dogs” and therefore if well secreted on prisoners coming back to the prison from work outside or visitors, or other methods, it *was* very difficult to detect and prevent from coming into the prison. The Governor, at the beginning of June, very wisely closed the ROTL wing so that no prisoners *would* be allowed out to work for a period of weeks, to bring a control to that avenue of access. (Please see more in the section on learning and skills). As with all illegal drugs and indeed prescribed drugs when they are used as currency a whole culture forms around supply and payment. This culture leads to prisoners getting into debt with the subsequent threats of violence and indeed on some occasions actual assaults on prisoners. This causes a rise in tension within *any* prison and a battle for supremacy between rival suppliers. The result is that prisoners at Blundeston who *believed* they *were* under threat having got into debt then *asked* for protection and a move to the segregation unit and a move away from the prison. *In April and May the situation became acute* with so many prisoners using “Spice” with the subsequent consequences. As previously mentioned as a new measure to combat the situation the Governor *decided* that prisoners who *got* themselves into debt through the use of illegal highs, indeed any illegal drug, *would not be* provided with “Protection” as they *were* the creators of their own predicament. There *had* been a surfeit of prescribed medication available in the prison. It *was being* redirected by the prisoners for whom it *was* prescribed to other prisoners. This *was* either for payment or again under intimidation. Improved delivery of the medication *was brought in* to resolve or at least improve the situation. The surfeit came from the prescribing protocols, so the IMB *were* told, of the previous General Practitioners providing medical cover. *A different GP was employed at the prison and worked* to control and situation and *reduced* the prescribing levels and also *provided* less attractive alternatives for prisoners. It *was the reduction* in the availability of these illicit but prescribed drugs *which led* to this increased demand for illegal substances. *All this demonstrated and still does, as the situation is not peculiar to HMP Blundeston*, the dependence that many prisoners have on some sort of drug to get them through their sentences. Reduction in staff over the years *had* led to more and more time being spent by prisoners behind their cell door with the inevitable pressure and frustration that brings. Most *were* young males and in a small compact prison like Blundeston there *were* few outlets for all their energy and trying to cope with it all leads to drug taking and so on. *The Government talks much about rehabilitating prisoners and yet the policy which leads to a*

*reduction in funding and therefore prison staff leads, and led at Blundeston, to situations as above and works against any prospect of meaningful rehabilitation. All the good work perhaps done on courses and 36 hour weeks' working etc. is undermined by the long periods of "Bang up". **IMBs up and down the country have been expressing grave concern about the cuts in annual reports for some years and their comments seem to be ignored. In this final report by Blundeston IMB we continue to make the same comments and point out what we believe to be false long term economies and fulfil our duties and responsibilities.***

6.

**10. Other areas to report.** These are very much reduced this year to keep down the length of the report.

## **"D Cats", ROTL, HDC, Town Visits and Sentence Plans**

*This section highlighted the lack of resources in providing timely reports for all these areas which are so relevant and important to prisoners as they progress through the system towards release. Some criticisms are no longer relevant.*

## **Resolving Reoffending**

*This section was about the increasing difficulties being found by NACRO in finding suitable accommodation for prisoners on release especially when there is a need for them not to go back to the area of their offending and become involved again with their peers and "Partners in crime".*

## **RAPt**

*\*Suffolk Drug and Alcohol Treatment Service" had provided an increase in funding for drug and alcohol treatment services within the prison and this is run by RAPt. There were up to 14 RAPt staff in the prison working hard to assist prisoners with their substance abuse issues. The IMB recently received an excellent presentation on the work which was very much needed. We are aware that recently a RAPt worker, for just a volunteer, came many miles to meet a prisoner at the gate, even stayed overnight in the area, to be available for this prisoner on release. \*This was all a new and recent initiative to help prisoners with their drug problems and took a while to set up and almost as soon as the scheme was fully operational the prison is closed\*.*

## **Staffing.**

*Of course staffing issues are no longer a matter of concern.*

## Facilities and Property

*This section bemoaned to continuing failure of NOMS to grasp the issue of the loss of so much prisoner property and mentioned the large amount of time and effort put in by the IMB looking for that property. No doubt with the closure of the prison some property will never be found.*

## The Closing Ceremony

The closing ceremony was moving for those involved in the prison for many years, particularly seeing the officers all marching, and it was good to be part of it all and praise the current and former staff for all they had achieved over so many years; that can never be taken away.

## The Board

The IMB ceased to function operationally once the prison was closed and this report is part of “tying up a few loose ends” but making sure that we finish the job in hand. The unhappiness over the 15 year tenure still remains, partly due to the difficulty in recruiting new members and the loss of invaluable experience when members depart after their 15 years. There was an understanding that every application for an extension was initially turned down by the designated person in the Ministry of Justice. This was all reviewed and at least some extension was granted, so that long term Blundeston members could be there at the closure of the prison. The whole process is totally unsatisfactory and shows scant regard for those who have served the BOV/IMB well for so many years.

We would like to thank all those former and current members of the IMB and what was the Board of Visitors for their part in monitoring the prison over the past 50 years. Blundeston IMB/BOV has always been a happy Board, working together as a unit for the benefit of the whole prison, prisoners and staff alike. Some members have been on the Board for a short time and others much longer but all have played their part in contributing to the respect with which the Board was held by prisoners, Governors, uniformed officers, admin staff, medical staff and instructors for the quality and the fairness of its work, and the integrity with which it behaved and carried out its duties.

Our longstanding clerk had been moved to another post within the prison and we had a new IMB clerk who was doing well. His “hub manager” has also been extremely supportive in all the changes and meant everything took place as smoothly as possible. We are grateful to our all former clerks, some recent and some from many years ago, who have helped and supported the Board in their work.

Thank you

## The Board's Statistics for the year July 2012 to June 2013

<b>BOARD STATISTICS</b>	
Recommended Compliment of Board members	13
Number of Board members at the start of the reporting period	13
Number of Members at the end of the reporting period	9 (one is a dual member)
Number of new members joining in reporting period	0
Number of members leaving in reporting period	4
Number of Board meetings in reporting period	12
Average attendance	7.41
Attendance at other meetings apart from Board meetings	309
Total Number visits including all meetings	398
Total Number of applications received	298
Total Number of Segregation Reviews held  <i>(This is a considerable increase on last year demonstrating how busy the segregation unit has been and the increased unrest in the prison particularly in the spring of 2013)</i>	252  98 : 14 day reviews  154 : 72 hour reviews
Total Number of Segregation reviews attended.  <i>All 14 day reviews are held on Monday afternoons when the duty IMB member will usually attend. 72 hour reviews by their very nature are held when needed and may not be attended by the IMB but if they are carried out on Mondays with the 14 day reviews then the IMB are in attendance.</i>  <i>All segregated prisoners are checked each week by a duty member whether or not they are due for review, also any new arrivals in the unit are seem during their first week in the segregation unit..</i>	90 :14 day reviews and  26 : 72 hour reviews

## Applications

Code	Subject	07/08	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12	12/13
A	Accommodation	0	4	3	13	8	9
B	Adjudications	0	2	7	4	4	6
C	Diversity Related	2	6	7	1	4	1
D	Education/Employment/Training Unemployment Pay	3	7	18	6	12	10
E	Family/Visits	15	10	11	6	10	5
F	Food/Kitchen/Canteen	3	0	7	2	4	7
G	Health/Healthcare/Medication	28	15	16	14	35	40
H	Property, including money, Clothing and property loss	56	78	63	87	80	56 (only 41 re property)
I	Sentence Related, including I.E.P, D Cat, Remission days, Parole, Probation and Re-categorisation Sentence Calculation	34	53	56	64	50	55
J	Staff/Prisoners  Includes Security, IEP, Violence Reduction, Added Days, R&Cs etc	0	19	10	15	38	8
K	Transfers/Repatriation/TELS	42	19	29	34	53	52
L	Miscellaneous, Phone calls, Human Rights and Private Matters/Post	28	41	40	45	59	48
	<b>Total Applications</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>220</b>	<b>254</b>	<b>305</b>	<b>357</b>	<b>298</b>