



**Annual Report**  
of the  
**Independent Monitoring Board**

at

**HMP Huntercombe**

**January to December 2017**

**Published**  
**(October 2018)**



*Monitoring fairness and respect for people in custody*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

### Introductory Sections

<b>Section</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Page</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Statutory Role</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Description of Establishment</b>	<b>6</b>

### Evidence Sections

<b>4</b>	<b>Safety</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Equality and Fairness</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Segregation/Care and Separation Unit</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Accommodation (including communication)</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>Healthcare (including mental health and social care)</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>Education and Other Activities</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>Work, Vocational Training and Employment</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>11</b>	<b>Resettlement Preparation</b>	<b>16</b>

	<b>The Work of the IMB</b>	<b>19</b>
	<b>Applications to the IMB</b>	<b>20</b>

## **1 STATUTORY ROLE OF THE IMB**

---

The Prison Act 1952 requires every prison to be monitored by an independent Board appointed by the Secretary of State from members of the community in which the prison or centre is situated.

The Board is specifically charged to:

- (1) satisfy itself as to the 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 it has.
- (3) **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 its 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.

### **Main judgements**

---

---

#### **Are prisoners treated fairly?**

- 1) FNOs (Foreign National Offender/s) are not treated fairly in comparison to UK nationals in the provision of resettlement support and preparation for release from prison – see below.
- 2) At Huntercombe prisoners are treated fairly within the prison. They have large amounts of association time and make extensive use of the prison facilities including the gym and library.

#### **Are prisoners treated humanely?**

Overall the Board is content that prisoners are treated humanely. This is borne out by the low number of applications to the Board in general and the number of applications concerning accommodation (A), discipline (B) and equality (C) in particular, a total of thirteen for the reporting period – 10.3% of all applications. The prison opened a total of 42 DIRFs for the year, another indication that, in general, prisoners are content that they are treated humanely.

#### **Are prisoners prepared well for their release?**

- A. No. The prison does not provide resettlement services - section 11.1 details the issues and causes. There is undeniable discrimination in the way that FNOs are prepared for release versus UK national prisoners.
- B. Delays at Home Office Immigration Enforcement (HOIE), Croydon, impact on the processing of deportation decisions which means that those prisoners that are to be released in the UK have received no pre-release preparation.
- C. The prison has no resettlement budget. The Chaplaincy utilises its connections with churches and aid agencies to provide limited support for a few nationalities. Recently the Governor appointed a Resettlement Co-ordinator; whilst welcomed, there is no budget to support the role (section 11.2).

### **Main Areas for Development**

---

#### **TO THE MINISTER**

Provide a budget and resources for Huntercombe to be able to provide resettlement services for prisoners being returned to another country or released in the UK.

#### **TO THE PRISON SERVICE**

- a) Work with HOIE to resolve the issues at Croydon to ensure that all prisoners have a case officer appointed and that all deportation papers are served before a prisoner's CRD (Conditional Release Date) is issued.
- b) Ensure that the translation service is quality controlled and provides translators who understand the terminology that they are required to translate; and that the

translator is located in an appropriate environment to conduct the translation (5.2).

- c) Standardise the rules between publicly run and privately-run prisons relating to prisoners property, and implement a system for accurately recording the location of property held in store for prisoners (Section 7).
- d) Replace the Kitchen with a facility that is fit for purpose and serves the prison population. The existing kitchen was built to serve **half** the number of prisoners currently resident at HMP Huntercombe.

#### **TO THE GOVERNOR**

- i. Continue to provide the Resettlement Co-ordinator role and extend resources, including the Chaplaincy, to support resettlement.
- ii. Work with HOIE Croydon to improve communication and cooperation around appointing case officers.
- iii. Address the shortage of Offender Supervisor staff in OMU (11.1).
- iv. Clear the backlog of prisoners without an OASys assessment and implement a system for ensuring that all prisoners have a current OASys assessment (11.1).

#### **TO THE SECRETARIAT**

Improve the administration of appointing members to boards who transfer from other IMBs; actively manage the process and ensure that appointment letters are issued *before* members transfer (Work of the Board).

#### **Improvements**

---

- a) There were no deaths in custody during the reporting period.
- b) Stoicism courses were introduced
- c) A new textiles workshop was opened.

### **3 DESCRIPTION OF THE ESTABLISHMENT**

---

3.1 HMP Huntercombe is a Category C training prison for foreign national adult males.

3.2 The operational capacity is 480, split between six residential units with a mixture of single and double cells. The prison complex includes education facilities, an indoor gym, an outpatient healthcare facility, workshops, gardens, sports pitch, exercise yards, a visits hall for domestic visits, a cafeteria (run by prisoners) and a multi-faith room. The prison is in a rural location; access by public transport is limited.

3.3 Healthcare is provided by Care UK. Mental health provision is split between Care UK and South Staffordshire & Shropshire Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust, the latter providing in-reach and the Drug & Alcohol Reduction Team (DART) substance misuse services. Dentistry is provided by Time for Teeth through the Care UK contract.

3.4 Education, training, learning and skills is provided by Milton Keynes College.

## 4 SAFETY

---

### 4.1 Safer Prisons

4.1.1 IMB Board members regularly attend the monthly Safer Prisons meeting to ensure all aspects of this part of prison life are monitored effectively. The meetings are generally well attended from senior management through to prisoner participants. Various statistics are presented, scrutinised and explained so their relevance is well understood by attendees.

4.1.2 Board members attend some of the ACCT reviews in order to ascertain their effectiveness and witness at first hand the support extended to vulnerable prisoners placed on this process. Details are available of upcoming reviews via the Daily Sheet, and prison staff, subject to the permission of the prisoner, are always accommodating to IMB members attending the review. It should be noted that our experience generally of attending reviews has been positive and we believe that most prisoners feel supported, despite the highly sensitive nature of the questions.

#### **2017 - ACCTs Opened**

Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total	Avg./M
10	6	12	13	18	18	17	16	12	13	8	12	155	13

ACCT documents are carefully monitored with about 4 - 5 open at any one time. During the reporting period 35% were opened and closed within 24 hours, with an additional 48% open for no longer than 2 weeks. The Board is confident that the close attention and support to prisoners on these documents has helped to keep the prison population at Huntercombe safe.

4.1.3 Despite the spike recorded in last year's report, ACCTs have returned to a more normal level for Huntercombe which, compared to the prison estate generally, remains low. Notwithstanding, the prison does experience serious incidents. In September 2017 a prisoner on an ACCT document caused severe damage to his throat during the evening of the 8<sup>th</sup> September. Due to the strength of the prisoner and his position in his cell immediately after the incident it took several officers, at great risk to themselves, to contain him sufficiently for medical services to attend.

4.1.4 Details of the incident are well-documented and in the public domain, but suffice to say that, if it had not been for the actions of the officers involved, it is almost certain he would not have survived. One of the many lessons learned from the incident concerned the response of the emergency services; these concerns have been dealt with by the Governor. Areas of good practice were identified for which the staff closely involved, the SMT and other services should be commended.

4.1.5 Statistically, the main reason expressed by prisoners for self-harming behaviour is prison regime/practices, particularly for those prisoners spending long periods on basic regime. Whilst the number on basic regime for extended periods remains relatively low overall, it is generally this cohort of prisoners that are more involved in self-harming incidents. Given the relatively small number of prisoners involved, we believe there is an opportunity for wing officers to work with them to reduce the likelihood of continuing their self-harming behaviour.

4.1.6 Huntercombe continues to fulfil its duty of care in keeping prisoners safe; in particular the prison:

- a) supports the SP Team in its effective management of the ACCT process;

- b) continues to improve communication between HOIE staff and prison staff in a visible effort to ensure that concerns around deportation are addressed;
- c) encourages the continued involvement of the Samaritans and the work it does to provide an environment where prisoners are trained effectively as Listeners;
- d) provides on-going SASH training to operational and non-operational staff, providing a support mechanism for everyone with direct interface with prisoners to consider what is required to fulfil the duty of care.

## 4.2 Violence Reduction

4.2.1 Statistically violence is rising at Huntercombe; however, it still remains relatively low, in terms of the prison estate in general, and the Board believes that the majority of prisoners feel safe.

4.2.2 The prison has plans to establish an 'Enhanced Wing' in 2018. The Board is concerned that this may put extra pressure on doubling in other wings and this, together with the introduction of the 'Non-Smoking' policy scheduled for February 2018, may lead to an increase as problems associated with both changes surface.

4.2.3 The prison continues a policy of zero tolerance towards violence. This is particularly evident in proven adjudications and sends a clear message to prisoners that violent behaviour will not be tolerated.

### **2017 - VIOLENT INCIDENTS**

Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total	<b>Avg./M</b>
11	18	16	8	18	17	25	20	27	14	13	11	198	<b>17</b>

## **5 EQUALITY AND FAIRNESS**

---

### **5.1 DIRF**

5.1.1 The number of DIRFs and applications to the IMB suggest that incidents of discrimination remain at a relatively low level. In total, 42 DIRFs were raised during the year; this compares favourably with 89 in 2016. Of those raised, by far the biggest proportion relate to racial discrimination.

5.1.2 Examination of a sample of DIRFs shows no evidence of systematic bias in coming to a judgement on the merits of a DIRF. Eight DIRFs were upheld and these related to either sexual or racial discrimination. During 2018 the Board will implement an exercise to review in-depth a selection of rejected DIRFS.

5.1.3 Only a fraction of the applications to the IMB was related to discrimination and overall the IMB is of the view that actual discrimination within the establishment remains at a very low level.

### **5.2 Translation Service**

5.2.1 2017 was the first full year of use of the Big Word translation service. Overall, direct experience and anecdotal reports indicate that the service has not improved markedly over the previous service, Language Line. The quality of the service is mixed and can depend on a range of factors including the language to be translated and the competence and location of the translator.

There have been instances where background noise at the translator's end has impeded the effectiveness of the service – public announcements (supermarket/train station, etc.), school, road/traffic noise. Sometimes the translator's ability to translate technical language is questionable.

5.2.2 A major concern is that there does not appear to be a quality control process in place to assess, rate and improve the service. In general, the participants accessing the service (other than the prisoner) are not in a position to accurately judge if the service has been effective.

## 6 SEGREGATION/CARE AND SEPARATION UNIT

---

6.1 The Board is satisfied that conditions, facilities, staffing and security in the CSU were all maintained at a humane and satisfactory standard throughout the reporting year, and that processes for segregating prisoners were followed correctly. The unit comprises 5 cells, one of which can be used for constant watch. There is a sixth cell which is used for special accommodation and is not available for prolonged occupation. The unit is kept in a clean and tidy fashion.

6.2 Cellular confinement has not been used, and prisoners being relocated to the unit have very rarely been brought down either handcuffed or with the use of C & R. There were no dirty protests in 2017.

6.3 There has been a grey area between the Board and the segregation staff as regards a successful method of the Board being reliably informed of a new inmate and upcoming segregation reviews (GOoDs), but hopefully this has now been resolved and will prove more reliable in 2018.

6.4 Three prisoners spent over one month in the CSU, but in each case this was on OP (Own Protection) whilst they awaited transfers to a mental health unit or another establishment. Prisoners are only ever kept “behind doors” on the wings if all the cells are occupied in the Unit and after due consideration is given to the fact that it will not be additionally detrimental to the prisoner concerned.

6.5 There have been 858 adjudications, of which 48 were referred to the Independent Adjudicator. 8 Appeals against adjudications were logged of which 7 were upheld and 1 quashed.

6.6 Body worn cameras are now being used.

6.7 In 2017 there was a 45.7% increase in the number of adjudications over the previous year:

<b>Year</b>	<b>Total No. of Adjudications</b>	<b>No. Referred to IA</b>	<b>Change (Total Adjudications)</b>
<b>2017</b>	<b>858</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>↑ 45.7%</b>
2016	589	17	

The reasons for the increase in adjudications are not entirely clear but may be attributed to the increase in the roll, which throughout 2017 was around 480, but for the first 4 months of 2016 had been 430 increasing to 450 by midyear and 480 by the winter of 2016. The significant increase in charges relates largely to both MDT failures and being “in possession of an unauthorised article”. However, some of these adjudications are also outstanding when prisoners arrive from other establishments.

Too frequently adjudication paperwork and conduct reports are arriving late in the CSU for paperwork to be prepared for that day’s scheduled adjudications. Additionally, adjudications have on many occasions had to be dismissed due to the charges/reports being incorrect, thus causing more time to be wasted.

Whilst staff endeavour to maintain the CSU regime, this is frequently disrupted when assigned staff are regularly called away to cover morning healthcare and other parts of the prison due to staff shortages or incidents.

## **7 ACCOMMODATION (including communication)**

---

### **7.1 Property**

7.1.1 Applications regarding prisoners' missing property constitute 25% of all applications made to the Board in 2017. Each month property featured in the top 3 complaints to the prisons, averaging 16.4% of total complaints per month. Despite the issue being raised regularly in IMB reports and via various other channels the MoJ and prison service appears reluctant to act. At Huntercombe, the main issue relates to property lost/mislaid/left behind at another prison that the prisoner has transferred from. When a prisoner is transferred, PER (Prisoner Escort Record) documentation should be prepared by the transferring prison. The PER should include the prison property card and a Prison Property Transfer Certificate; the PER is given to the escort driver. Not all prisons are meticulous in completing and providing the necessary documentation.

The following changes to policy, process and practice would stop many property complaints arising and introduce fairness and consistency:

- a) standardise the number of bags of property that a prisoner may have in all prisons – privately run and publicly run. Currently, prisoners in privately run prisons are generally allowed more bags of property than those in publicly run prisons. This is an unnecessary and unjustifiable inconsistency that is unfair to prisoners and causes particular problems when prisoners are transferred between prisons;
- b) when prisoners transfer between prisons ensure that they are given a copy of their property card (signed by the prisoner and the reception officer from the prison they are leaving) detailing the property that is being transferred with them;
- c) provide the prisoner with a copy of the property card detailing all property that is not being transferred with them (signed by the prisoner and the reception officer from the prison they are leaving), a reference number and location where the property is to be stored until able to be reunited with the prisoner;
- d) ensure that a prisoner's property (that allowed under the rules) always travels with the prisoner. GeoAmey frequently send vans without sufficient space available on them to carry the three bags of property each prisoner is entitled to move with, despite having it in their contract: e.g. a 6-cell van due to transport 4, 5 or 6 prisoners is unlikely to be able to fit the requisite number of bags into spare cell/s.

7.1.2 Property is of paramount importance to all prisoners but particularly to those such as the inmates at HMP Huntercombe, who are preparing for deportation or repatriation and will need to have all their possessions with them when they leave the country. This issue, apart from the frustration it causes prisoners, ends up costing the Government or the local prison significant amounts in compensation claims.

### **7.2 Kitchen**

7.2.1 Since the publication of our 2016 report, in which many items of concern were raised with relation to the maintenance and infrastructure of the kitchen and its equipment, the IMB have become increasingly aware of the fact that the kitchen at HMP Huntercombe is no longer fit for purpose.

7.2.2 When the kitchen was originally built the roll at the prison was around 240. It is now 480 – double the number. The kitchen is cramped and cannot be laid out, organised and

equipped to efficiently operate. Additionally, there have been a number of equipment failures during the reporting period that have further impacted effective operation.

7.2.3 Major areas of concern are:

- a) The flooring laid in July 2015 has reached a parlous state with seams and joints having split open in many places. Not only does this present trip hazards but has allowed water to penetrate below the flooring (see item b), thus causing bubbling of both the underlying screed and the rubber flooring itself which presents a hygiene risk;
- b) repeated issues with blocked drains throughout the year; there is no sluice in the kitchen to dispose of waste water;
- c) the ceiling requires work as do the lighting and the extractor system. This equipment has not been updated to cope with extra/new equipment introduced since the kitchen was built.

7.2.4 The management process for ordering equipment, repairs and maintenance is unwieldy and has not provided an improved service to the prison.

### **7.3 Residential Units**

7.3.1 There have been repeated issues throughout the reporting period with hot water for showers and heating breaking down due to leaks in the external pipework. Breakdowns of tumble dryers, washing machines and dishwashers and their subsequent repairs have been greatly protracted due to the time required to go through the system of reporting the fault, and having it costed for approval before a call could be made to the repair team to actually complete the job.

### **7.4 General Cleanliness**

7.4.1 The prison is kept in a high state of cleanliness which is a credit to the prison staff and management.

## **8 HEALTHCARE (including mental health and social care)**

---

8.1 Healthcare is provided by Care UK; there is a positive working relationship between Care UK and the prison. Services provided include:

- a) GP - access is well managed and has absorbed the increase in prison roll; urgent cases are triaged by healthcare staff. The protocols in place are widely advertised to prison staff to ensure an efficient service. Two GPs were attending the prison weekly with no apparent gaps in service.
- b) Dentistry - As reported last year, many of the FNP population have not had access to dentistry and have poor dental hygiene regimes resulting in often many hours work needed per prisoner. There was a backlog for dentistry services; the dentist attends for 1.5 days per week and extra days were being provided to clear the backlog.
- c) Podiatry, physiotherapy, hepatology, audiology and sexual health services.

8.2 A number of health promotion events were held during the year including infection control and under 25s' health. Additionally, Healthcare prepared for the introduction of the smoking ban at the prison from February 2018, including the development of distraction packs, identifying health 'champions' to support prisoners and smoking cessation techniques.

8.3 Procedures for dispensing medication to prisoners were strengthened, with the stationing of a prison officer at the dispensing station to maintain discipline and ensure that medications are consumed and not reserved for future trading by prisoners.

8.4 Prisoners suspected of substance misuse are checked over by healthcare staff. During the reporting period there was an average of four to five SMS (Substance Misuse) clinical patients each month.

8.5 Blood-borne viruses (BBV) were a particular issue as many foreign nationals did not have childhood vaccinations. A rigorous screening system was implemented to check the health status of incoming men, particularly around BBV and TB. The number of clinics was increased to tackle the incidence of TB.

8.6 Prisoners about to leave the prison are seen in a discharge clinic the day before their move.

8.7 The healthcare staff and prison staff are to be commended for the care and treatment of a terminally ill prisoner and the efforts made by both the prison and HOIE to return him to his family overseas for his final days were ultimately successful.

### **8.8 Mental Health**

8.8.1 The Board is aware of the increasing need for mental health support and resource. During the reporting year there were two incidents, both requiring transfer to a secure mental health unit, that gave cause for concern. In one instance it took six months to secure a transfer and in the second 9 weeks. These matters have been commented on by HMIP; however, the Board is aware of its obligation to raise the matter because of the impact on the individual prisoners concerned and the effect on the rest of the prisoners and staff. Huntercombe is not equipped to manage and support mentally ill prisoners.

Notwithstanding, the healthcare staff and prison staff performed exceptionally in supporting and managing the two prisoners that required transfer to mental health units.

## 9 EDUCATION AND OTHER ACTIVITIES

---

9.1 Our last two reports have highlighted the endeavour with which the prison and its education partner (Milton Keynes College) have approached the areas of education, learning and purposeful activity. 2017 has been an especially challenging year as the prison roll has increased and the difficulties of attracting and retaining staff have continued.

9.2 Notable highlights of the reporting year:

- a) The introduction of Stoicism courses for prisoners, giving them the chance to re-examine their behaviour and present them with opportunities to improve their understanding of how they can take control of their own behaviour when confronted by frustrations with both other prisoners and the prison regime;
- b) new staff in the library has resulted in increased use of the resources available and the introduction of initiatives to promote engagement from the prisoners, for example a well-supported poetry competition;
- c) there were only five occasions in the year where the whole of Education and Industries was closed due to regime restriction.

9.3 The year did not pass without difficulties:

- a) The Virtual Campus was out of action for over half the year caused by issues with the support contract. This was resolved and by the end of the year an enhanced facility became available and is in use;
- b) the Gym was closed on a number of occasions resulting in almost 9,500 lost prisoner hours in the second half of the year alone;
- c) the reduced staffing levels in Education and Industries caused by unfilled posts resulted in around 60 days-worth of meaningful activity places lost.

## **10 WORK, VOCATIONAL TRAINING and EMPLOYMENT**

---

10.1 The prison attempts to provide appropriate qualifications for prisoners. However, given the large number of nationalities housed in Huntercombe and the fact that the majority of prisoners will be returning to their country of origin at the end of their sentence, it is difficult for the prison to source and develop training and work that will assist prisoners in assimilating into their home society. Keeping pace with economic and other developments in each of the countries represented in the prison is a major task. The introduction of a dedicated resettlement resource and careers advisor in late 2017 should improve this position.

10.2 Notable highlights of the reporting year:

- a) The introduction of a new textiles workshop, providing new skills and work opportunities for prisoners and an additional income stream for the prison from external supply contracts;
- b) only five occasions of complete close down caused by prison regime restriction (per 9.2. c).

10.3 Difficulties encountered during the year:

- a) Finding new outlets for the recycling workshop;
- b) the reduced staffing levels in Industries caused by unfilled posts resulted in around 40 days-worth of meaningful activity places lost;
- c) finding additional meaningful activity places to cope with the increased roll.

## **11 RESETTLEMENT PREPARATION**

---

### **11.1 OMU (Offender Management Unit)**

11.1.1 The OMU has been working with restricted prison staffing; the effective number of OS (Offender Supervisor) staff was reduced to 1 from 3 as a result of staff being seconded to other duties (late 2016/early 2017). Additionally, the Probation OS complement - 4.5 FTE – was effectively 2. A result of the staff shortage was that some prisoners did not receive an OASys assessment. For illustration, at the time of writing there are 148 prisoners without an OASys assessment and 15 prisoners with an assessment that relates to a previous sentence.

11.1.2 Huntercombe does not run any offending behaviour programmes, e.g. Thinking Skills or Healthy Relationships; some prisoners who arrive at Huntercombe have not had the benefit of these at other prisons. To achieve appropriate access to such programmes entails transferring prisoners; this has proved difficult.

11.1.3 Relations with HOIE locally are good. However, delays in appointing case officers at HOIE Croydon has a knock-on effect in processing deportation decisions. Some prisoners are not served their deportation papers before their CRD (Conditional Release Date). The consequence of this is to impact on the pre-release risk assessment actions of the OMU and Community Offender Management teams; thus, they must plan for the prisoner being released at the last minute in the UK. The implications of release in the UK are immense and entail identifying approved accommodation (note: this is difficult, as immigration policy prevents foreign nationals from having “recourse to public funds” which are used to pay for such placements) and liaison with various agencies including the police and social services to ensure that the offender is supported and managed in the community.

11.1.4 Improving the process to ensure that deportation decisions are taken and communicated quickly would free resources to be targeted at those to be released in the UK. A further refinement would be to prioritise those for deportation that pose the highest risk to the public, including those subject to MAPPA (Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements) – those convicted of sexual and/or violent offences.

### **11.2 Resettlement**

11.2.1 Shortly after Huntercombe became a prison for foreign national offenders (FNO) in 2012, the resettlement provision (amounting to a six-figure sum) was withdrawn on the grounds that such provision was not necessary for a prison deporting the vast majority of its population. In our annual reports since 2014, the Board has expressed its concerns that foreign nationals are being unfairly treated with respect to UK nationals in this regard. In 2016 we observed that:

"This is a major area of concern for the Board.....There is little support for prisoners when returning to their home countries.....This is a major area of unfairness between the way UK national prisoners are treated and FNOs are treated".

In addition, HM Chief Inspector of Prisons reported after an inspection of Huntercombe in April 2017:

"The key challenge the prison faced was how it was able to assist prisoners prior to their departure and release.....There should be a coordinated assessment of prisoners for release and resettlement needs....Action should be taken to meet these needs before release or transfer."

11.3 Little has changed since our 2014 Report. The prison continues to be severely handicapped by lack of financial provision in preparing prisoners for return to their home countries (or release in the UK for a minority). That said, we commend the prison for some progress it has been able to make in 2017:

- a) Towards the end of the year, the Governor found the resource to appoint an officer as Resettlement Co-ordinator. He is actively working up plans to assist prisoners in confronting life in their home countries, to which many FNOs will be going back for the first time in many years after working and possibly raising a family in the UK. He is energetically pursuing contacts in the charitable sector and elsewhere that may be able to help;
- b) alongside the Resettlement Co-ordinator, the Chaplaincy continues valuable work to help departing prisoners. As the year closed, the appointment of a Polish-speaking administrator was in hand, who would focus on establishing contacts in Poland that prisoners could use on return there. It is hoped that this can be followed up by a similar arrangement for Romania. In addition, the Chaplaincy works with bodies such as the Salvation Army, the Anglican Church in Nigeria and other aid agencies that may be able to support returning prisoners;
- c) the outcomes from education classes (in terms of attendance and qualifications) have been consistently higher than the average for the region, enabling Huntercombe to draw down a greater share of the regional provision for education than its numbers would normally allow;
- d) funding has been provided to allow family visits to be restored. These now occur on a monthly basis, are much appreciated, and take place in a commendably calm and positive atmosphere. Enabling family links to be maintained by prisoners is crucial for their well-being when they leave prison;
- e) after many years during which ROTL (Release on Temporary Licence) was unavailable for FNOs, a very modest programme was being embarked on as the year ended. There is no immediate prospect of prisoners being able to work out in the community, as is the case for UK nationals. But at least the blanket ban is being challenged; at year-end one prisoner was being allowed outside the secure perimeter and he spent Christmas at home. We understand that the risk of absconding for those resisting deportation is a real inhibition on ROTL; but we hope the scheme can cautiously be extended for FNOs who are happy to be returned to their home country, and therefore less likely to abscond.

11.4 The foregoing examples are being pursued on a piece-meal basis; a co-ordinated approach to resettlement is desirable. We are in no doubt that the prison would be ready to do more if resources were available. One example is that there are charities that, for a relatively modest fee, will come in for one-on-one sessions with prisoners to help them build up dossiers on their home countries with helpful contacts and information to ease the transition from prison in the UK to life in a country that may be unfamiliar to them.

11.5 Apart from prisoners returned to another country some, albeit few in number, are released into the UK:

Year	Removed from UK	Released in UK	Total
<b>2017</b>	<b>411</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>444</b>
2016	378	18	396

Even though the proportion being released in the UK is small, it is still of concern that they are going out into the community with minimal resettlement provision having been made for them. Moreover, the figure for prisoners being removed includes those going to Immigration Removal Centres as well as those being deported directly. The prison does not know how many of these are ultimately released into the community; thus, the number of FNOs going back into the community without proper preparation for resettlement could be higher than the bare figures suggest.

11.6 We do not accept the apparent view of the Government that FNOs have no need of a funded resettlement programme. We believe that it is neither humane nor just that they are differentiated from UK nationals in this way.

11.7 In his reply to our Annual Report for 2016, the then Minister for Prisons said that the Ministry “is looking again at the resettlement activity currently offered by FNO-only prisons”. We very much hope that the reply to this report can give a time-scale for the completion of that work.

## Work of Board

---

<b>BOARD STATISTICS</b>	
Recommended Complement of Board Members	15
Number of Board members at the start of the reporting period	10
Number of Board members at the end of the reporting period *	8
Total number of visits to the Establishment	284
Total number of segregation reviews attended	<b>104</b>

\* A member transferred from IRC Campsfield at the end of August. This was agreed with the Secretariat, and he fully participated in the work of the Huntercombe Board from September 2017. However, his formal appointment letter from the Commissioning Directorate was dated 8<sup>th</sup> February 2018. This was queried with the Secretariat who advised that the official date stood.

This is an unsatisfactory situation and, in reality, meant that the individual was not officially a member of the IMB despite being privy to its meetings, files, etc. and performing the full duties of an IMB member. He was included onto the Board in good faith and is included in the number of Board members at the end of the reporting period.

**B APPLICATIONS**

<b>Code</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Current reporting year</b>	<b>Previous reporting year (2016)</b>
A	Accommodation including laundry, clothing, ablutions	4	7
B	Discipline including adjudications, IEP, sanctions	9	7
C	Equality	2	4
D	Purposeful Activity including education, work, training, library, regime, time out of cell	7	15
E 1	Letters, visits, phones, public protection restrictions	3	9
E 2	Finance including pay, private monies, spends	3	7
F	Food and kitchens	2	3
G	Health including physical, mental, social care	16	18
H 1	Property within this establishment	11	11
H 2	Property during transfer or in another establishment or location	26	27
H 3	Canteen, facility list, catalogue(s)	3	9
I	Sentence management including HDC, ROTL, parole, release dates, re-categorisation	21	24
J	Staff/prisoner concerns including bullying	10	11
K	Transfers	5	6
L	Miscellaneous	12	28
	<b>Total number of IMB applications</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>186</b>

↓ 52 (28%)