

Independent Advisory Panel on non-compliance management (IAPNCM)

27 Aug, 09:00-10:30

Room P136 NE, Peel Building, Floor 1

Teleconference minutes

Present

Akash Chand (AC), David Chinn (DC), Kevin Lockyer (KL), June-Alison Sealy (JAS), Stephen Shaw (SS), Richard Shepherd (RTS), Mandy Simmons (MS).

1. Apologies

Daniel Albert (DA).

2. Minutes

SS queried with the Panel whether the minutes were a true reflection of the meeting of 29th July. DC said that paragraph two of agenda item 4 should read ‘...medical escort would prescribe sedation.’ This has since been amended.

SS asked AC whether the IAPNCM webpage was up to date with minutes and other publications. AC commented that he is still awaiting the publication of some documents. AC said he would query this with the webpage publication team. JAS remarked that the minutes did not appear to be in chronological order and said this should also be raised with the team.

Action 1: AC to contact webpage publication team.

3. Matters arising and action log

SS highlighted action point 10 of the 15th July meeting and confirmed it was still ongoing.

In relation to action point 3 of the 29th July meeting, MS advised that she had a meeting with NOMS that day and can query this. SS commented that there were concerns with the quality of the form and would welcome clarity on its use as part of the package.

SS referred to action point 10 of the 29th July meeting and commented that KL had volunteered to draft the Panel’s final report, having already outlined a draft structure. KL said that a substantive discussion with the Panel was required at the next meeting on 2nd September. AC will circulate this paper ahead of the meeting.

Action 2: AC to circulate draft final report structure.

SS referred to action point 11 of the 29th July meeting and the response from Tony Holyland (Head of Training at the SIA) regarding the new accreditation scheme and the fact that it does not include control and restraint techniques but disengagement skills. SS commented that it would be in the Panel's interest to have sight of the Minister's reply to Lord Ramsbotham's letter regarding SIA accreditation.

Action 3: AC to attain Minister's response re SIA accreditation.

SS highlighted action point 12 of the 29th July meeting and the Panel collectively agreed that they did not wish to further this. This action is now closed.

SS referred to an e-mail from AC in which he said that he had attained contact details for leads of training in aviation security and British Transport Police. AC queried whether the Panel would like to meet with them, or to exchange information, as they too have responsibilities for restraint in confined transport spaces.

RTS commented that the Panel would need to know what other agencies are doing with individuals when using force in confined spaces. DC agreed.

KL said he would hesitate at exploring this as it opens up wider issues, such as other alternatives to that of NOMS package. KL said that if the Panel consider other agencies who use techniques in confined spaces, this may mean that several hundred other techniques should also be considered.

SS remarked that the Panel need to be assured that NOMS package is in line with other major agencies and queried what broad guidance the police give their staff.

DC said that the techniques proposed by NOMS are appropriate, proportionate and medically safe, and it seemed unlikely that anyone had a package dealing with specific actions such as getting an individual in and out of a van.

KL said that we should ask for information to be provided from the other agencies and then forward this to NOMS to gauge their advice. SS agreed and said that the need for continued refinement of the NOMS package should be reflected in the Panel's final report.

JAS commented that rather than testing the techniques of other agencies, the Panel need to be informed that NOMS package is correct.

SS advised AC that the general feeling from the Panel was that a meeting with other agencies was not required, but the Panel would welcome further information.

Action 4: AC to write to agencies regarding use of force in confined spaces.

4. Coroner's Rule 43 report

SS confirmed that the Panel had been sent the Coroner's rule 43 and the Prisons and Probation Ombudsmen's reports by AC.

SS shared an e-mail from DA in which he had outlined his comments in relation to the Coroner's rule 43 report:

1. Racism by DCOs is a real risk that cannot be ignored. This means that training must address attitudes as much as knowledge and techniques.
2. The use of the waist belt proactively on compliant detainees is not supported. This means that there must be a way of applying the belt to a non-compliant detainee on an aeroplane.
3. Maintaining a detainee in rear-stacked handcuffs on board an aeroplane cannot be allowed. This means that if a person is "rear-stacked" as a way to gain immediate control in a dangerous situation, there must be a way of changing to a less dangerous restraint on an aeroplane. Ideally the belt.

SS confirmed that the Panel agreed with point 1, but did not agree with point 2. With regard to point 3, the Panel agreed that rear-stacking should not be used on aircraft, and felt it would not be practicable to change into a waist restraint belt while on an aeroplane during a dangerous situation.

SS said that rear-stacking had particular dangers as it forces an individual to lean forward and is difficult to administer if someone strikes you. SS added that the Panel needed to be certain that the thrust of the training addresses attitudes.

JAS commented that she did not feel there is a section in the package which relates to cultural awareness, or reflecting and reviewing attitudes. KL remarked that he would not expect to see this in a use of force package.

JAS said that tones of voice differ from one culture to another and this can have an impact on communication. KL agreed.

5. Meeting with NOMS medical advisers

SS said that the meeting with NOMS medical advisers had been fruitful and asked if members of the Panel would like to meet with them again. DC said that this would depend upon the content of volume 4.

MS commented that volume 4 is expected by the end of October and SS remarked that this date makes it very difficult for the Panel to meet the Minister's target for completion of the package.

The Panel were concerned about the timetable for future receipt of volumes of the Manual and wanted this clarified.

Action 5: Secretariat to clarify timetable with NOMS.

6. Volumes 2 and 3

SS said that DA had provided e-mail comments regarding volumes 2 and 3, in which he had said that they were of good quality and addressed important issues in a fairly comprehensive way.

Regarding volume 2, the Panel collectively agreed that they did not like the phrase 'pseudo-relationship' and felt that the volume was not suited to its target audience (DCOs) and read like undergraduate psychology course material. The Panel were also concerned as to how Tascor instructors would be able to deliver this volume as much of it was abstruse.

Regarding volume 3, JAS commented that she had initial reservations about the content. KL said that much of it was covered in other volumes and the Panel collectively agreed that certain sections, particularly the human rights section, needed further detail and clarity.

SS asked the Panel to have their comments regarding both volumes ready for the meeting on 2nd September. JAS and DC volunteered to collate and draft the comments on volumes 2 and 3.

Dr Alan Davison is cited as having researched and developed volume 2, and the Panel asked for further information on his background and role.

Action 6: AC to query with NOMS Dr Davison's background and role.

7. AOB

DC queried who will give first aid training and whether this will form part of the package. SS commented that when the Panel receive the medical volume this could be re-visited.

No further business and the meeting was closed.

Next meeting: 2 September 2013.