



CAYMAN ISLANDS

Prisons Inspection Board

General Report 2007-2009

Chief Secretary's Office

INDEX

Preface by the Honourable Chief Secretary	3
Introduction by the Chairperson	5
History of the Prisons Inspection Board	7
Why we need a Prisons Inspection Board	9
How the Prisons Inspection Board Works	10
Membership of the Prisons Inspection Board	11
Accomplishments of the 2007-2009 Prisons Inspection Board	13
Moving Forward	14
Summary	16
Inspection Standards for Prisons, Places of Detention and Immigration Detention Centres in the Cayman Islands	17

Preface by the Honourable Chief Secretary

Sir Raymond Lygo, an Admiral in the British Royal Navy, was once tasked with carrying out an official analysis of prisons in the UK. At the conclusion of his work he described the prison service as “the most complex organization...and the most difficult management task I have encountered.”

Most of us like to air “armchair opinions” about prisons from time to time, and the topic of prisons is one that will always evoke public discussion. Yet the truth is that prisons are complex and ever changing. We have to be ready to meet society’s ongoing requirements for prisons while at the same time ensuring that the conditions of those kept in custody are humane as well as secure.

This report is the first of its kind. Its publication is designed to help the general public understand the importance of inspecting places of custody, and to assure the public that inspections are being carried out regularly, consistently and to the best international standards. In a community the size of Cayman, many of us know someone who is in prison or has been in prison, or we know their families. In addition to the basic obligation to treat those detained with human dignity, we have a particular interest in the fair treatment of prisoners.

Custody, and its use, is governed in the Cayman Islands by national legislation. The primary legislation is the Prison Act 1975 while the secondary legislation is contained in the Prison Rules 1999. There are additional laws regulating custody including the Penal Code and the Prisons and Places of Detention Regulations (2000 Revision). Local legislation regarding prisons and parole is currently being reviewed, modernised, and aligned with other recent legislation, such as the Alternative Sentencing Law, 2006. The Cayman Islands have ratified the European Convention on Human Rights and are legally bound to observe all of the Articles - a fact that has clear implications for prison standards.

From this body of international, European, and Cayman legislation, it is possible to develop firm and fair standards for the treatment of those detained in the Cayman Islands. The purpose of this report is to introduce these standards to the public. Collectively these standards express the ideal

expressed in Article 10 of the United International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights: “*All persons deprived of their liberty shall be treated with humanity and with respect for the inherent dignity of the human person.*”

How we treat prisoners says a lot about us as a society, and for this reason the work of the Prison Inspection Board forms a vital part of our modern way of life in the Cayman Islands. Much of the inspectors’ work goes on behind the scenes and is not something that the public encounters. Yet their work is an integral part and an expression of the democratic and humane values we espouse. .

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Chairperson and members of the Prisons Inspection Board, as well as the Secretary, for their hard work, dedication and practical humanity in carrying out their duties over the past two years. I look forward to the development of the Board as it goes from strength to strength in the future.

Donovan Ebanks

Introduction by the Chairperson

Since the appointment of the new Prisons Inspection Board in September 2007 by Cabinet, its six members representing each district of the Cayman Islands have been busy attending trainings and completing monthly inspections.

The Board members attended a two day training course in September 2007 facilitated by Professor McManus and Roger Houchin of the Scotland Prisons System. This training allowed the members to gain a thorough understanding of modern prison standards as well as a range of skills for conducting sound inspections.

For its work the Board is divided into three two-member teams. The teams have made significant progress in their goal of ensuring that the Cayman Islands are compliant with prison standards accepted by the European Union. I would like to take this opportunity to publicly thank the members of the Board for their hard work and dedication over the past two years.

I trust that in the future the Prisons Inspection Board will continue to work with the prison system to ensure that the Cayman Islands are at the forefront of international practice in this area.

It is our sincere hope that appropriate educational and counselling programmes will increasingly be available in order to rehabilitate prisoners to prepare them for reintegration into our community.

On behalf of the Prisons Inspection Board I would like to thank the Honourable Chief Secretary and his staff for their commitment and support for the Board. I particularly wish to thank our dedicated Secretary, Deborah Boddin, for her professional advice and her efficiency. She has made my work load considerably lighter and has ensured that all aspects of the Board's work have moved along smoothly.

Finally, I would like to thank the men and women of The Cayman Islands Prison Services, The Royal Cayman Islands Police Services, and the Immigration Department for their assistance each month, which enabled us to carry out our duties in such a professional and efficient manner.

To the incoming members of the Prisons Inspection Board I wish every success as they advance the work of the Board for the good of prisoners and the benefit of the whole community.

Georgette Myrie, MBE, JP

The History of the Prisons Inspection Board

The Prisons Inspection Board has been operational in the Cayman Islands for at least fifteen years and is underpinned by a requirement for prisons inspection in the Prisons Law (section 42). Boards or committees of this kind can be found in many different jurisdictions. In the UK the body has traditionally been referred to as a “Visiting Committee” or a “Visiting Inspection Board,” though recent changes emphasize the importance of its “monitoring” function.

Until two years ago, prison inspection was carried out by a large number of appointed Justices of the Peace and private citizens. These volunteer members worked diligently to monitor general ethics standards in the treatment of detainees, based on their experience as JPs. They were instrumental in bringing to light a number of issues and concerns to prison authorities.

In 2007 it became evident that there was a need for a more modern approach using professional and internationally recognized standards of inspection. In September 2007 the Prisons Inspection Board was significantly changed. The number of members was reduced to seven persons, each representing different districts, including the Sister Islands, and a Chairperson.

Following their appointment, the Board underwent intensive training. The Portfolio was fortunate to secure the services of two widely recognized experts, Professor Jim McManus and Mr. Roger Houchin, to undertake this training. Professor McManus is currently a Professor of Criminal Justice at the Glasgow Caledonian University in Scotland and has vast experience of prison systems throughout the world both as an inspector and as an academic. He has drafted Prisons Laws and worked with various Councils of Prisoner and Human Rights. Mr. Houchin also works at Glasgow Caledonian University where he co-directs the Glasgow Centre for the Study of Violence. He worked as a Prison Governor for almost three decades and has expert knowledge in the area of human rights in prisons and the public supervision of prisons.

Using resources provided by these trainers, the Prisons Inspection Board is now able to work from a set of internationally recognized standards. These standards are comparable to the best found in jurisdictions that look either to the European Convention on Human Rights or to United Nations documents in order to monitor custodial establishments.

The standards used in the Cayman Islands are at the heart of the PIB's work. A copy of them can be found at the end of this report, and readers are invited to sample them to get a flavour of how the Board goes about its work.

Why We Need a Prisons Inspection Board

The purpose of the Prison Inspection Board is to provide an independent perspective, on behalf of the public and the Cabinet Member responsible, regarding the conditions in each correctional facility and the ways in which that facility is achieving the two main goals of a prison:

- to provide secure and humane custody for those sentenced to prison by the courts;
- to promote the rehabilitation of inmates so that they live law-abiding and useful lives in custody and after release.

The Prisons Inspection Board has a very important job of making sure that prisoners are being treated humanely, especially in relation to the way detainees are deprived of various basic liberties.

Inspection of custodial establishments is an important part of demonstrating compliance with international standards of human rights. The international human rights conventions to which Cayman is party require that a system of independent monitoring of all places of custody should be established. The local legislation that corresponds to these conventions is the Prison Act 1975.

It is vital that a body not under the same administrative authority as the custodial system should inspect the conditions of custody, assess whether there is ill-treatment, and make reports to a part of government that has the power to act on their findings. The global standards for this work are enshrined in the UN Body of Principles for the Protection of All Persons under Any Form of Detention or Imprisonment (Principle 29) and in the UN Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners (Rule 55)

There are several additional reasons for independent inspection. Custodial establishments are by definition closed institutions, often far from the public eye, where one group of people has considerable power over another group. However well custodial establishments are run, the potential for abuse is always present. The strong possibility that abuses will eventually be uncovered is also a protection for custodial staff who want to resist a culture of ill-treatment and inhumanity.

How the Prisons Inspection Board Works

The members of the Prisons Inspection Board meet either monthly or every other month depending on the business at hand. HMP Northward, Fairbanks, and Eagle House are each inspected monthly, while the lock ups at the Central Police Station, the West Bay Police Station and the Immigration Detention Centre are inspected once per quarter. Other lock ups that are rarely or no longer used for these purposes are also inspected on “as needed” basis (generally once per year).

Each monthly inspection is carried out by a team of two members. Members therefore rotate the responsibility so that each inspector conducts a series of inspections once per quarter. Given the number of places to inspect, inspectors can spend up to two days each quarter completing their inspections, with additional time taken on report writing.

The monthly reports are forwarded as appropriate to the Director of the Prisons, Commissioner of Police, and/or Deputy Chief Immigration Officer (Enforcement). The Honourable Chief Secretary also receives monthly reports of the Board. This protocol was set up to ensure that consistency is attained and that any significant issues which the Board members raise are dealt with expeditiously.

As provided by the Terms of Reference the Inspectors may inspect any prison records with the exception of:-

- (a) staff personnel records;
- (b) personal records of prisoners (sentence plans, however, can and should be examined as part of inspecting the rehabilitation process);
- (c) security manuals or other documents whose examination may compromise security.

Inspectors may visit any part of any facility or may request to speak with any prisoner or any member of the prison staff unless security or personal safety considerations demand otherwise.

Membership of the Prisons Inspection Board

The Prison Inspection Board is composed of seven members who are chosen by Cabinet. One member is drawn from each of the six electoral districts in the Cayman Islands. The Chairperson is appointed by the Portfolio of Internal and External Affairs.

The members come from all walks of life but they share some important qualities. They do not have to have any prior training or experience but they must be persons who find this work to be both essential and rewarding. Membership in the PIB is done on a voluntary basis, though members do receive a small stipend for their time.

Members must be prepared to set aside at least two to three full days per month for board business to conduct and discuss inspections, to prepare inspection reports, and to prepare for future inspections. They should be able and willing to undergo training, to learn about the complexities of prison life, the prison law and rules, and to fully understand the inspection standards, including how prison inspection standards promote a well-run prison.

Although members serve in one sense as representatives of their district, their perspective and concerns cannot be limited to prisoners from their own district but should feed into a broader, national understanding of correctional work in the Cayman Islands. Members are expected to exercise considerable discernment, judgment, tact and diplomacy. In the course of their work they will be exposed to sensitive information about prisoners and prison life, which must be held in the strictest confidence.

The PIB Members for the 2007-2009 term were:

- Mrs. Georgette Myrie, MBE, JP who served as the Chairperson. Mrs. Myrie is a retired civil servant who completed 35 years of service in various Government departments including serving as Clerk of the Legislative Assembly from 1987-2001.
- Mrs. Jenny Manderson, MBE, JP who represented the district of West Bay who is a retired civil servant. She is the Chairperson of the National Youth Commission, a past President and current member of the Justices of the Peace Association, and a member of the Board of the CAYS Foundation.

- Mrs. Debbie McTaggart who represented the district of George Town. Mrs. McTaggart is a founding member of Cayman Against Substance Abuse. Mrs. McTaggart has previously served as a member of the Immigration Board and treasurer of the Inner Wheel Club of Grand Cayman. She was also a member of Vision 2008.
- Mr. Dwayne Seymour, who represented the district of Bodden Town, is a noted businessman. He was recently elected as a member of the Legislative Assembly.
- Mrs. Yvonne A. Miller, JP who represented the district of East End. She retired from the Civil Service after twenty nine years, as Supervisor of Medical Records with the Cayman Islands Health Services.
- Ms. Patricia (Pat) Ebanks, JP who represented the district North Side. Pat worked for the Cayman Islands Health Services for ten years before joining Appleby in 1981. She was awarded the Distinguished Woman of the Year Award in 2000.
- Mr. Christopher (Chris) Randall who represented the Sister Islands. Chris is company secretary of the Sister Islands Community Care Association and a member of the Shelter Assessment, Transportation and Communications hurricane sub-committee.

How does it feel to be involved in this unique work? Member of the Board Chris Randall had this to say: “Contrary to popular opinion, Northward Prison is not a hotel, and most people would find the conditions there to be quite unpleasant. The Board’s job is to ensure that those conditions do, at least, meet certain minimum internationally recognised standards”.

Mrs. Georgette Myrie summed up her feelings about the work of the last two years this way: “Applying the European Standards of prison inspection has been a challenge, but Inspectors are now in a better position to delve more deeply into and understand more fully the various aspects of Prison Administration and its programmes. They are in a very sound position to identify whether or not standards are met both at our local prison and in the police lock-ups.” She went on to say that “there have been concerns raised by the members that the Board was not able to make recommendations regarding concerns that it may have had and that there were no provisions which allowed the Inspectors to conduct unannounced inspections.”

Accomplishments of the 2007-2009 Prisons Inspection Board

Over the past two years this Board is proud to have played a role in seeing some important changes take place in Cayman's detention facilities. The willingness of agencies to strive to improve their facilities and conform to internationally recognized standards, as advanced by the work of the PIB, has been key to these improvements.

Major changes which have occurred in the past two years and which the PIB's work has encouraged include:-

- The Health block;
- The Education block;
- The Vocational block;
- Construction of a visitors waiting area;
- Heightened security;
- The new library at HMP Northward;
- Recent improvement to 'B' block;
- City and Guilds courses offering certification for prisoners;
- Introduction of Prison Advisor Programme;
- Core risk and needs assessment being implemented at all detention centres;
- Food warmers for all detention centres;
- Formal training in proper food handling completed at all facilities;
- The inclusion of local cultural books at the library;
- External shutters/awnings over windows at Fairbanks; and
- Painted/decorated and lighting repaired at West Bay Lock Up.

Moving Forward

In the future it is hoped that the incoming members of the PIB will be able to build on the work of the board in the past two years. Some areas of concern which the present board recognized and which the new board will hopefully be able to address include:

- Reconfiguring the standards to be more suitable for the lockup facilities;
- Standardization of privileges across all lock up facilities i.e. access to phones;
- A full work programme for female prisoners;
- Shortening the remand period at HMP Northward – especially for less serious offences;
- Addressing mental health needs better;
- Addressing the needs of juveniles and young offenders better;
- Full use of the facilities at Fairbanks to prepare food on site;
- The development & implementation of a comprehensive rehabilitation programme for all detainees;
- Increase in educational opportunities and programmes;
- Improved communication between all the Detention Centres;
- A review of the activities, rehabilitation and educational programs for Eagle House & Fairbanks;
- Name tags for all prison staff;
- Access to legal publications for those in Eagle House and Fairbanks (Northward already has a fair collection);
- Separation of adult prisoners currently being housed at Eagle House;
- Strengthening of programmes for those being released;
- Fire precautions, procedures and evacuations; drills at all facilities;
- Nursing staff visiting the prisons more frequently; and
- Counselling opportunities for all prisoners offered by qualified Counselors.

The Board understands that it will always be a challenge for prisons and lock-ups to meet all internationally recognized standards - mainly because of ongoing structural problems and the simple need to rebuild facilities. We hope that the Government will place an emphasis on building a new prison structure and improving police lock-up cells in the future. However, we feel that the immediate focus should be on rehabilitative programming - particularly for young persons.

The Board has grave concerns with the mixing of adult prisoners with juveniles at the Eagle House Facility and it is our hope that this situation will be resolved very shortly. Equally, the Board has concerns regarding the lack of rehabilitative programming for prisoners such as the lack of access to qualified counselors and education programmes which span the diverse needs of the prison population.

The Board would also like to make the recommendation that the Terms of Reference for the Prisons Inspection Board are modified to allow the Inspectors to:

- 1) make recommendations for the issues/concerns that are raised; and
- 2) make unannounced inspections to the facilities.

Summary

The Prisons Inspection Board has at no time ever experienced any resistance from any of the facilities or personnel with whom they have worked. The PIB has always encountered an open and willing attitude and we wish to commend the prison authorities and staff for their open and transparent approach which has made our task easier. The Board has felt at times, however, that the Director of Prisons did not seriously take all of the concerns raised in the monthly inspection reports into consideration.

As previously stated the purpose of the Prison Inspection Board is to provide an independent perspective, on behalf of the public and the Cabinet Member responsible, regarding the conditions in each correctional facility and the ways in which that facility is achieving the two main goals of a prison:

- to provide secure and humane custody for those sentenced to prison by the courts;
- to promote the rehabilitation of inmates so that they live law-abiding and useful lives in custody and after release.

It is the belief of the 2007-2009 Prisons Inspection Board that Her Majesty's Prison Service has met the first of its main goals stated above but that the second goal has yet to be reached.

It has been an exciting two years. As we look to the future, we anticipate further positive changes and improvements, and we wish the new PIB every success in this rewarding work.

Inspection Standards

The inspection standards set out below lie at the heart of the work of the Board. They cover inspections of Prisons and all other Places of Detention, which are referred to throughout as ‘custodial establishments’. They include prisons, juvenile centres, immigration detention centres, court cells, or legalised police cells. The term “detainee” is used throughout to describe any person held in a custodial establishment.

Applying these standards to prison inspection in Cayman represents a significant step towards compliance with the European Convention on Human Rights.

It is vital that inspection standards are not a matter of subjective opinion but are objective and based in law. The PIB is not concerned primarily by the processes through which things are done. They do not inspect the day-to-day management decisions of the prison, nor is their job to second guess how the prison is run. Instead, they examine specific areas of prison life to ensure that basic norms of humanity and dignity are reflected in the way prisoners are treated.

The standards are presented in three separate sections, which reflect three basic principles. These principles are: *Safety* (security, good order, protection of detainees from harm); *Decency*, (humanity and respect for legal rights), and *Opportunity* (activities provided for rehabilitation, self-improvement and preparation for release and social reintegration). This division is not watertight. For example, healthcare is a matter which has great importance in all three sections and could be located in any of them.

The standards that will lead to the required outcomes are listed below. “Sample indicators” are included to show how the inspectors actually measure the delivery of standards. Such indicators will naturally vary over time as the inspectors seek to fine tune their measurement of standards.

It is important to realize that there is variation in the way different standards and indicators can be applied to different places of custody. Indicators appropriate for the prison, for example, may not be suitable for an Immigration Detention Centre. The “sample indicators” included illustrate how the inspectors go about their work in one or other of these institutions.

**Inspection Standards for Prisons, Places of Detention and Immigration
Detention Centres in the Cayman Islands**

SECTION ONE: SAFETY

OUTCOME 1

APPROPRIATE STEPS ARE TAKEN TO ENSURE THAT INDIVIDUAL DETAINEES ARE PROTECTED FROM HARM BY THEMSELVES AND OTHERS.

Standard 1.1	
Detainees are safe at all times; while being escorted to and from custody, in custody and while under escort in any location.	
Indicators	Inspected
a) On Admission	
Sample Indicator: Measures are in place to assess all arriving detainees, based on the premise that all of them may be vulnerable and might need detoxification from drugs or alcohol	
Sample Indicator: New arrivals are given an explanation of what will happen to them and the routines of the custodial establishment in a language they understand	

b) In Emergencies	
Sample Indicator: Procedures are in place to deal with all foreseeable emergencies and all staff have been trained in what to do in such instances	
Sample Indicator: At least one staff member qualified in first aid is available at all times	

Standard 1.2	
Force is only used as a last resort and then strictly according to law and procedures	
Indicators	Inspected
Sample Indicator: Special cells and mechanical restraints are used as a last resort	
Sample Indicator: Complaints of illegitimate force on the part of custody staff are dealt with speedily and in a way that ensures detainees are not victimised	

Standard 1.3	
Detainees are protected from violence and harm by other detainees.	
Indicators	Inspected
Sample Indicator: A clear management plan is in place to prevent inter-detainee violence including verbal abuse	
Sample Indicator: Enough staff are properly deployed and able to interact with detainees to ensure good order, protect weaker detainees and prevent fights	

Standard 1.4	
Security levels for individuals are no higher than is necessary to meet the risk presented by the detainee.	
Indicators	Inspected
Sample Indicator: Decisions about security levels are taken on the basis of an objective assessment process	

Standard 1.5 Procedures for deciding security levels are as transparent as is compatible with the sensitivities of the decision.	
Indicators	Inspected
Sample Indicator: Detainees are told about the security level decision and the reasons are given, as far as possible.	
Sample Indicator: The detainee is given an indication of how he or she can contribute to reducing the level of security applied	

**SECTION TWO: DECENCY,
HUMANITY, AND RESPECT FOR LEGAL RIGHTS**

OUTCOME 2

DETAINEES ARE TREATED WITH RESPECT FOR THEIR DIGNITY WHILE BEING ESCORTED TO AND FROM CUSTODY, IN CUSTODY AND WHILE UNDER ESCORT IN ANY LOCATION.

Standard 2.1 The standards that apply to the treatment of detainees in custody extend to all other places where they are held.	
Indicators	Inspected
a) Measuring treatment when in transit	
Sample Indicator: Detainees are told where they are going, how long the journey will take and why they are going there	
Sample Indicator: Vehicles are cleaned between journeys and vehicle temperatures are kept at an adequate level	
Sample Indicator: Men and women are kept separately	

OUTCOME 3

DETAINEES ARE HELD IN CONDITIONS THAT PROVIDE THE BASIC NECESSITIES OF LIFE AND HEALTH, INCLUDING ADEQUATE AIR, LIGHT, WATER, EXERCISE IN THE FRESH AIR, FOOD, BEDDING AND CLOTHING.

Standard 3.1 The accommodation is clean and provides a reasonable amount of space for each detainee, with space for personal belongings, ventilation, a reasonable temperature, natural light.	
Indicators	Inspected
Sample Indicator: Cells are clean and materials are available to enable detainees to keep cells clean	
Sample Indicator: The window permits the entrance of air and natural light	
Sample Indicator: Drinking water is available at all times	

Standard 3.2 Detainees are allowed into the open air for at least one hour a day every day.	
Indicators	Inspected
Sample Indicator: The custodial establishment provides at least one hour in the open air per day for every detainee	
Sample Indicator: The space in which this is taken is large enough for meaningful exercise	

Standard 3.3 Personal clothing is in decent condition, washed frequently and fits.	
Indicators	Inspected
Sample Indicator: Appropriate personal clothing is issued by the custodial establishment or detainees may wear their own clothing where approved	
Sample Indicator: Arrangements are made for regular cleaning of clothing provided by the custodial establishment	

Standard 3.4 Bedding is supplied and laundered at frequent intervals.	
Indicators	Inspected
Sample Indicator: Clean bedding is issued to detainees on arrival	
Sample Indicator: Bed linen is changed weekly and other bedding regularly	

Standard 3.5 Sanitary arrangements take account of health, hygiene and human dignity.	
Indicators	Inspected
Sample Indicator: There is access to a lavatory and wash hand basin at all times	
Sample Indicator: If detainees have to call for the cell door to be opened to access the lavatory, staff respond within a stated period of time that is reasonable	

Standard 3.6 Food is adequate for health, varied and religiously and culturally appropriate.	
Indicators	Inspected
Sample Indicator: The kitchens are clean and those preparing and serving food are appropriately trained	
Sample Indicator: Detainees are not required to eat in cells where the lavatories are not enclosed	

OUTCOME 4

DETAINEES ARE TREATED WITH RESPECT BY CUSTODIAL STAFF.

Standard 4.1 Respect is the underlying basis of all interactions between staff and detainees.	
Indicators	Inspected
Sample Indicator: <input type="checkbox"/> Staff never use insulting nicknames, racial epithets or impersonal terms when addressing detainees	
Sample Indicator: When detainees have to be given news that is sensitive or likely to be unwelcome, this is done in privacy and with compassion	
Sample Indicator: Detainees’ families are informed rapidly and sensitively of all incidents affecting their family member	

Standard 4.2 Security measures such as searching are carried out with regard to the protection of human dignity.	
Indicators	Inspected
Sample Indicator: Detainees are only given body searches by officers of the same gender	
Sample Indicator: Searching is not done in a humiliating way	

OUTCOME 5

GOOD CONTACT WITH FAMILY AND FRIENDS IS MAINTAINED

Standard 5.1 Family visits are given a high priority in terms of frequency, length and quality and are not restricted as part of any disciplinary or control process.	
Indicators	Inspected
Sample Indicator: Family members have contact details for a named member of staff whom they can contact if they have any concerns about the family member who is in custody	
Sample Indicator: Arrangements for booking visits are transparent, easily understood and inexpensive	

Standard 5.2 Visitors are well treated.	
Indicators	Inspected
Sample Indicator: Visitors are politely received	
Sample Indicator: The searching procedures are thorough but compatible with human dignity	

Standard 5.3 Visits take place in the most relaxed environment compatible with security.	
Indicators	Inspected
Sample Indicator: <input type="checkbox"/> The visits room is large enough for the numbers it has to cater for	

Standard 5.4 Telephone contact is made as easy as possible.	
Indicators	Inspected
Sample Indicator Telephones are not in a noisy place where detainees cannot hear properly	

Standard 5.5 Letter contact is made as easy as possible.	
Indicators	Inspected
Sample Indicator: There is no limit to the number of letters which a detainees can receive	

OUTCOME 6

DETAINEES' ENTITLEMENTS ARE ACCORDED THEM IN ALL CIRCUMSTANCES WITHOUT THEIR FACING DIFFICULTY

Standard 6.1 Staff are aware of their duty to give detainees their legal rights. They know what these rights are. They accept the legitimacy of that duty and meet their obligations under it promptly.	
Indicators	Inspected
Sample Indicator: On arrival detainees are given information about rules, punishments and how to make a request or complaint in a form they can understand. They are informed about the workings of the Prison Inspection Board and its inspection standards.	
Sample Indicator: Detainees are helped if they so wish to contact lawyers, the PIB, their MLA, the Courts and the Complaints Commissioner	

Standard 6.2 Staff are aware of their duty to observe the human rights of detainees. They know what these rights are. They accept the legitimacy of that duty and meet their obligations under it promptly.	
Indicators	Inspected
Sample Indicator: Measures are in place to prevent racial and/or national discrimination and where it does occur it is rapidly dealt with	

Standard 6.3 Staff are aware of their duty to treat detainees in accordance with fairness and natural justice. They know what this involves. They accept the legitimacy of that duty and meet their obligations under it promptly.	
Indicators	Inspected
Sample Indicator: Detainees are able to attend court hearings clean and properly dressed	
Sample Indicator: Attempts are made to resolve complaints by mediation before resort to the formal process	

Standard 6.4 Segregation is used sparingly and in accordance with procedures.	
Indicators	Inspected
Sample Indicator: Putting detainees into segregation is governed by a clear set of procedures	

SECTION THREE:
OPPORTUNITIES FOR SELF-IMPROVEMENT AND ACCESS TO SERVICES AND
ACTIVITIES
OUTCOME 7

DETAINEES TAKE PART IN ACTIVITIES THAT EDUCATE, DEVELOP SKILLS AND
PERSONAL QUALITIES AND
PREPARE THEM FOR LIFE OUTSIDE CUSTODY

Standard 7.1 The regime of the custody encourages detainees to make the most of their time there and to exercise responsibility.	
Indicators	Inspected
Sample Indicator: All detainees attend an induction programme soon after admission	
Sample Indicator: Within two weeks of admission, each convicted detainee has an individual “sentence plan” which describes the programme and activities for the duration of their particular sentence. The plan is monitored by their officer adviser, and every effort is made to ensure that it is being used to lower the detainee’s risk to the community and to encourage their full rehabilitation	

Standard 7.2 A full day’s out of cell activities, such as work, education, leisure and cultural pursuits, is available for seven days of the week.	
Indicators	Inspected
Sample Indicator: The period each day during which detainees are locked in their cells is kept to the minimum	

Standard 7.3 The programme of work and related training focuses on equipping detainees for employment on release.	
Indicators	Inspected
Sample Indicator: The programme of work and training helps to develop the existing skills of detainees and to provide them with new ones	

Standard 7.4 A broad and relevant education programme including vocational training is available.	
Indicators	Inspected
Sample Indicator: Detainees will have regular access to education	
Sample Indicator: Education classes are rarely cancelled and when they are the detainees are given a reason	

Standard 7.5 A range of interventions is in place to encourage detainees to address those behaviours which may contribute to their offending.	
Indicators	Inspected
Sample Indicator: Assessment processes appropriate to needs and risks are in place	
Sample Indicator: Clear processes to encourage individuals to address identified risks and record progress are in place	

Standard 7.6 There is a programme of cultural and voluntary activities.	
Indicators	Inspected
Sample Indicator: Detainees can have access to news media (print, radio and television) every day	
Sample Indicator: There are opportunities for detainees to do voluntary work for the benefit of others	

Standard 7.7 Opportunities to practise their religion are available to all detainees.	
Indicators	Inspected
Sample Indicator: <input type="checkbox"/> Representatives of all religious faiths represented in custody are afforded the opportunity to visit regularly	

Standard 7.8 Suitable arrangements to enable detainees to buy a range of personal and other items that meet detainees' needs are in place and available and accessible as necessary.	
Indicators	Inspected
Sample Indicator: The establishment has items available that help detainees with their family links, such as cards marking family, religious and cultural events	

OUTCOME 8

HEALTHCARE IS PROVIDED TO THE SAME STANDARD AS IN THE COMMUNITY OUTSIDE CUSTODY, AVAILABLE IN RESPONSE TO NEED, WITH A FULL RANGE OF PREVENTIVE SERVICES, PROMOTING CONTINUITY WITH HEALTH SERVICES OUTSIDE CUSTODY.

Standard 8.1 Health services of a high quality are available to all who need them.	
Indicators	Inspected
Sample Indicator: Appropriate medical services are provided without undue delay	
Sample Indicator: Medical records are treated as confidential except for a very limited "need to know" disclosure	

Standard 8.2 Addictions are dealt with the way most likely to be effective, and when they conflict treatment takes priority over security measures as far as possible.	
Indicators	Inspected
Sample Indicator: Interventions aimed at reducing or stabilising individual drug abuse are in place and available to all who need them	

OUTCOME 9

APPROPRIATE STEPS ARE TAKEN TO ENSURE THAT DETAINEES ARE INTEGRATED SAFELY INTO THE COMMUNITY AND WHERE POSSIBLE INTO A SITUATION LESS LIKELY TO LEAD TO FURTHER CRIME.

Standard 9.1 The custodial establishment has a policy on links with families and with the local community and allocates staff time to implement it.	
Indicators	Inspected
Sample Indicator: Local community organisations are invited to the custodial establishment	
Sample Indicator: Where security and other factors make it appropriate and possible, detainees are involved in work of benefit to the local community	

Standard 9.2 Arrangements are made for detainees to leave with somewhere appropriate to live, healthcare continuity assured, a chance to find work and build social links.	
Indicators	Inspected
Sample Indicator: Appropriate risk assessments are in place prior to release and they are shared with appropriate groups and individuals (both official and voluntary) who have responsibility for assisting detainees in resettlement after their release.	