



Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Independent Custody Visitors' Group Meeting

Minutes

Monday 5th March 2018

1	Welcome and apologies
1.1	<p>Present: JA – Police and Crime Commissioner RB – Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner Insp. AB – Cambridgeshire Constabulary AB – Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner PH – ICV, South JC – ICV, North GW – ICV, North RM – ICV, South BW – ICV, South FC – ICV, North JB – ICV, North JL – ICV, South AS – ICV, South AW – ICV, North JT – ICV, South GR – ICV North PR – ICV North JM – ICV North</p>
1.2	<p>Apologies: AD – ICV North (attempted to join online, technical issues) CM – ICV South JP – ICV South</p>
2	Minutes and actions of previous meeting 11th December 2017
2.1	<p>For item 3.8, AB had circulated the links. For item 3.9, a new Inspector with the Mental Health lead was starting in April. AB will invite to a future meeting when in post.</p>

Contact: Cambs-pcc@cambs.pnn.police.uk FAO: Alasdair Baker

<p>2.2</p> <p>2.3</p> <p>2.4</p>	<p>For item 4.5 Insp. AB had checked certifications required, a wide range were acceptable. Insp AB also confirmed that using volunteer interpreters would likely conflict with the contract in place, and it may not be cost effective to recruit, vet and train volunteers to be used on an infrequent basis. Insp. AB reassured ICVs and the Commissioner that where The Big Word could not provide a service, the Constabulary would make alternative arrangements and charge any costs back to The Big Word.</p> <p>JA also assured ICVs that scrutiny was taking place and the contract was being managed by the procurement team in Cambridgeshire.</p> <p>All present agreed the minutes were a true and accurate record of the meeting with no changes required.</p>
<p>3</p> <p>3.1</p> <p>3.2</p> <p>3.3</p> <p>3.4</p> <p>3.5</p> <p>3.6</p>	<p>HMICFRS / HMIP Joint Inspection of Custody</p> <p>JA and AB spoke about the key findings from August’s unannounced joint inspection of Custody by Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services (HMICFRS), and Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Prisons (HMIP). The Chief Executive of the Independent Custody Visiting Association (ICVA) also shadowed the inspection. The report was circulated ahead of the meeting and the summary of recommendations as well as ICVA’s guidance note were available to ICVs at the meeting.</p> <p>(https://www.justiceinspectors.gov.uk/hmicfrs/publications/cambridgeshire-joint-inspection-of-police-custody/)</p> <p>The report highlighted positive progress since the previous inspection and in particular the Constabulary’s excellent use of force reporting and recording system, and the good care and attention staff showed to the welfare of detainees, particularly vulnerable detainees.</p> <p>The main concerns highlights in the report were complex strategic governance mechanisms and the training of the staff in relation to equality and diversity issues.</p> <p>Some of the recommendations could be looked at by ICVs, while some would involve the PCC holding Senior Officers to account in the Constabulary. JA informed ICVs of progress around improving governance arrangements at the Kings Lynn Police Investigation Centre (PIC). JA had visited and on top of regularly sharing data Norfolk were open to shadow visits. AB is working on a formal governance agreement between OPCCs and has requested an alteration to the national Code of Practice via ICVA to allow Cambs ICVs to jointly visit the PIC with Norfolk ICVs. As this is legislation ICVA have warned this could take a long time.</p> <p>ICVs were asked if there were any specific points they wanted to raise in relation to the inspection, AW started and asked about the signing of the Children’s Concordat (2.14). AB updated that the Concordat has now been signed supported by pressure from JA to achieve this. Additionally the Assistant Chief Constable (ACC) is currently the</p>

Contact: Cambs-pcc@cambs.pnn.police.uk FAO: Alasdair Baker

	Independent Chair of the newly Integrated Youth Justice Management Board, so could work closely with partners to improve processes relating to children and police custody.
3.7	AW highlighted the comment that people are spending longer in custody than HMICFRS / HMIP would normally see (2.26). Insp. AB explained this data could be skewed by exceptional cases where someone has a long hospital stay or detention is extended to all for the passing of ingested substances. There was also the consideration that changes to the Bail Act may have increased times, but it was felt this was minimal.
3.8	AW asked what would constitute as clinically clean for the medical room (2.40) and how would this realistically be achieved. JL added the question of how it could be proved. Insp. AB confirmed there was a log book and now a sheet to record cleaning, but more guidance would be needed on "clinically clean". Insp AB and ICVs agreed that the Health Care Providers (HCPs) has not raised cleanliness in these rooms as an issue.
3.9	FC asked what type of procedures are carried out in the rooms, and asked if this was suitable for the cleanliness. There was consensus that anything serious would result in the detainee going to hospital. It was felt the cleanliness was appropriate for use, and the example of a GPs surgery was raised – where it would not be clinically cleaned between each patient.
3.10	JT asked if HAZMAT suits were available to staff. There were not HAZMAT suits available, but should any risk be identified, suitable emergency procedures would be followed and specialist advice sought.
3.11	AW asked about waiting times for courts. Insp AB stated the use of virtual courts was still in its trial phase and when fully in use should lead to decreased waiting times, but could also lead to more people in custody during the day depending on sentencing. Insp AB gave an example of positive results during the adverse weather, where 5 people were processed using virtual courts, which otherwise would not have happened should transport have been required.
3.12	Custody are now also speaking directly with the Court Clerk and the improved communication has led to more detainees being accepted. Insp AB and Insp DG visited Norfolk in February to see how their system worked as it is well established there.
3.12	JA stated the Constabulary were fully behind the use of virtual courts and it was the direction the MoJ was heading towards.
3.13	AW raised the comment about storage of religious items. Insp AB advised that PACE had very limited guidance, however was able to share electronically guidance from ICVA. AB would also share additional guidance put together by Humberside as ICVA stated this gave additional detail.
3.14	AW asked how Cambridgeshire detainees taken to the PIC who wish to complain could do so easily. Insp AB informed ICVs that since the inspection there had been improved

	<p>communication between Cambridgeshire Constabulary and Norfolk Constabulary with monthly visits by an Inspector and regularly communication between the relevant Chief Inspectors.</p>
3.15	<p>AW pointed out that the report was wrong in its observations about handwashing facilities in Thorpe Wood and also conflicting accounts in relation to Appropriate Adults (AA). This highlighted to the group of the continued local reporting and challenge.</p>
3.16	<p>JA gave further insight around the issue of governance that was highlighted by the HMICFRS / HMIP report. HMICFRS and HMIP did not have a huge amount of experience inspecting collaborated forces. Under the BCH model Hertfordshire took the lead and responsibility for Collaborated Custody. However given the risk faced by an event such as a death in Custody, there is a need for clarity over who would have ultimate responsibility for this. So there is a need to review and be clear on the governance.</p>
3.17	<p>AW asked about the Inspectors review process, particularly if they are being completed over the telephone. Insp AB acknowledged that PACE guidance states Inspectors reviews should always be done in person. However this is not always practical for example where there is only one Inspector covering two custody suites. Insp AB also confirmed that when a detainee is asleep and due for review, it is not always in the best interests of the detainee to be woken, so a note would be left on the front of the custody record to inform the detainee a review has been carried out as soon as possible when they wake up.</p>
4	<p>Matters arising from visits:</p>
4.1	<p>Health Care Provision: AB thanked ICVs for continuing to report on the Health Care Provision. AB noted that there continued to be some gaps in provision, with staff sometimes shared between the two suites. The feedback form ICVs helps to independently verify the force log and supports the contract management being undertaken by the procurement team. Both Custody management and G4S are actively involved in trying to resolve issues with coverage.</p>
4.2	<p>It was noted as positive that no concerns were raised by detainees, staff or ICVs about the quality of the medical care provided, and the right process was being followed to manage the contract.</p>
4.3	<p>JA added that the records will also be used to help inform any future decisions about the healthcare provision in custody, with all options considered to ensure a good quality service.</p>
4.4	<p>The discussion on healthcare lead to discussion about detainees with healthcare issues. One recent visit noted a request for a shower chair after a detainee with mobility issues fell, or raised beds, and braille PACE codes. JT asked if any advice had been sought from an occupational therapist. JL asked how often issues like this occur.</p>

4.5	Insp AB informed ICVs that incidents such as this are rare, and the Constabulary do look for appropriate solutions. One step the Constabulary take is individual risk assessments for detainees, which can lead to medical equipment being brought from the detainee's home for example. It was acknowledged by all that the physical characteristics of custody may make things more difficult however this should not stop reasonable attempts to change. Insp AB also noted that Braille PACE codes were available and all staff now knew where these were kept.
4.6	JA added that when the new custody suite replaces Parkside this will be DDA compliant. AB also noted the positive action to increase the use of voluntary interviews which may reduce the need for vulnerable people to come to police custody.
4.7	Translation Service: Problems with the service have reduced, however there has still been cases recorded by ICVs where difficulty getting a translator has resulted in a longer detention of detainees.
4.8	The Constabulary are managing the contract, and where an interpreter cannot be provided in the agreed timescales, the Constabulary take steps to source an alternative.
4.9	JT noted an anecdotal observation that the perceptions of the translation service changed with experience of the Custody staff. New staff were less satisfied with the service while more experienced staff were more understanding of the issues.
4.10	Special dietary requirements / food certificates: An ICV raised concerns about labelling of ingredients / food allergy at Thorpe Wood. This was raised with the Inspector at the time, who would action up to charts and continue to consider the best approach to meeting the needs of those with special dietary requirements.
4.11	GW noted that the food stock at Thorpe Wood was lower than normal and choice was limited. The order was placed on time but supplier issues lead to a delay. Stocks were adequate for the week and more stock was coming after the deep clean.
4.12	Temperature of Cells at Thorpe Wood GW highlighted a temperature issue at TW again, with 7 cells out of order. The detention officer was really knowledgeable and the situation was being monitored / managed with blankets and moving to cells with comfortable temperature.
4.13	Missing translation card: JL raised that there was a missing French translation card and asked if this could be replaced. JL noted that taking a photocopy of the card and giving it to the detainee helped make the process easier.
4.14	JA put his thanks out to all ICVs.

<p>5</p> <p>5.1</p> <p>5.2</p> <p>5.3</p> <p>5.4</p>	<p>Updates from the OPCC / Constabulary:</p> <p>Tri-force / national reporting form: AB updated that progress was made on the tri-force reporting form and recording spreadsheet. The form was with Hertfordshire OPCC to finalise and it would be brought to the next ICV meeting. The tri-force form was similar in content to the new ICVA national template.</p> <p>ICV Tenure: AB updated that a number of ICVs were approaching the end of their current 3 year tenure period. AB would be in touch with ICVs individually to talk about renewal of tenure and what this would involve.</p> <p>ID Badges: AB update that we would be looking to update all ICVs badges so that they would be able to access the reception area at Police HQ in order to attend evening meetings. ICVs would be contacted about this in due course.</p> <p>June meeting date: Due to apologies given for the planned meeting on the 4th June there was discussion and agreement to move the June panel meeting to Monday 18th June at the normal time.</p>
<p>6</p> <p>6.1</p> <p>6.2</p>	<p>Recruitment & Training</p> <p>Recruitment update: the meeting welcomes several new ICVs to the panel meeting, with the New ICVs having completed their initial training at the end of January and some completed some visits. New ICVs shared their experience of visits with no concerns raised. Positive feedback was received from new and existing ICVs about the initial training day. All ICVs were encouraged to carry out cross-panel visits to help develop their knowledge of the scheme. JB has undertaken one recently and found it helpful.</p> <p>Regional conference: There is a regional ICV conference planned for Saturday 21st April in Bedfordshire. FC asked to attend. Other ICVs were encouraged to consider attending.</p> <p>Athena: AW asked if ICVs could come and look at how Athena works. Insp. AB was happy to take ICVs through the IT training.</p> <p>Virtual Courts: ICVs are also welcome to speak to staff about how virtual courts work. If any ICVs would be interested to learn more then let AB know.</p> <p>Shadow Shifts in Custody: If ICVs would like to undertake a shadow shift in Custody, please let AB know, as Custody would be happy to accommodate.</p>
<p>7</p> <p>7.1</p>	<p>A.O.B</p> <p>Promotion of the ICV scheme: ICVs were keen to do more to promote the ICV scheme to members of the public, so understand what it is and why it is important.</p>

Contact: Cambs-pcc@cambs.pnn.police.uk FAO: Alasdair Baker

7.2	There were discussions about the best way to do this, with suggestions welcome. JA can do more via articles and social media to promote the work of the scheme in the first instance.
7.3	ICVs also asked could a plea be put out on social media for reading material of all types to improve the custody selection.
<p>Date of the next meeting: Monday 18th June</p> <p>Printed copies of the agenda and any papers will be available at the meeting</p>	

Glossary

Appropriate Adult	AA
Assistant Chief Constable	ACC
Accredited Mental Health Practitioner	AMHP
Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire & Hertfordshire (Constabularies)	BCH
Chief Inspector	C/Insp
Disability Discrimination Act	DDA
Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner	DPCC
Detained Person	DP
Detention Officer	DO
Force Medical Expert	FME
Hazardous Material Suits	HAZMAT
Health Care Provider	HCP
Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services	HMICFRS
Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons	HMIP
Independent Custody Visitor	ICV
Independent Custody Visiting Association	ICVA
Inspector	Insp.
Liaison and Diversion Service	LaDS
Mental Health Act	MHA
Ministry of Justice	MoJ
National Appropriate Adults Network	NAAN
Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner	OPCC
Police and Crime Commissioner	PCC
Police Investigation Centre	PIC
Terrorism Act	TACT
Youth Offending Service	YOS

Contact: Cambs-pcc@cambs.pnn.police.uk FAO: Alasdair Baker