

Harris Review Meeting 1
13:00 – 16:00, 10 April 2014, 9.29A
102 Petty France, London, SW1H 9AJ

Present

Chair: Lord Toby Harris (TH)

Panel Members: Stephen Cragg (SC), Richard Shepherd (RS), Graham Towl (GT), Philip Leach (PL), Dinesh Maganty (DM), Deborah Coles (DC), Matilda MacAttram (MM),

The Harris Review Secretariat: Deborah Browne (DB), Tom Shaw (TS), Robyn Malan de Merindol (RM)

Apologies

Panel Member: Meng Aw Yong

Item 1: Welcome and Introductions

1. TH asked each person present to introduce themselves and provide detail of what they hoped to bring to the Review and what they were hoping to learn from it.

Item 2: Scope and Context of Terms of Reference and exchange of letters with the Minister

2. TH provided new panel members with a general overview of the background to the review, including the recommendations in the 'Fatally Flawed' report. He also set out his interpretation of the Terms of Reference (ToR), which he feels are sufficiently broad to take the self-inflicted deaths of the four children that died during the review period into account. He explained that Jeremy Wright had acknowledged his interpretation of the ToR.
3. TH clarified that the report would need to be presented by 31 March 2015, but explained that they would not expect to see it published or responded to until after the general election next May.
4. TH said there were high expectations for this Review and that it is seen as a 'once in a generation' opportunity to look at how we can improve how we learn from the findings of the deaths that have occurred.
5. TH felt that the minutes should reflect a short summary of the meeting and would be published on the IAP website.
6. TH explained that he proposed, for this first meeting, to roll agenda items together because they were all linked to agreeing a process and the scope of the review.

7. DC discussed *Fatally Flawed* and noted that the Joint Committee for Human Rights and Justice Select Committee both supported INQUEST's call for an independent review.
8. There was discussion on including some deaths outside of the scope of the ToR, including the four deaths of the children and deaths in the two weeks following release. GT suggested that it might be appropriate to look at recommendations from cases prior to 2007 to see if there was learning that was relevant.

Action 1: Secretariat to provide a list of all deaths in scope for the Review, which will then be discussed by the panel.

Action 2: Secretariat to provide a summary of each death from the information available.

Action 3: Secretariat to examine the feasibility of including post release deaths in scope for the Review.

Action 4: Secretariat to seek advice on whether self-inflicted deaths at UKBA and IRCs facilities are in scope for the Review.

Item 3: Call for Evidence and Process of Review

(Secretary's note, 14:30 Matilda MacAttram joined the meeting)

9. A number of suggestions were made about what external organisations could add value in terms of written submissions. The secretariat noted these to add to stakeholder engagement planning. It was felt important to set up early meetings with key organisations and individuals.
10. Suggestions were also made about the potential of using existing relevant databases to look at particular questions and get additional insight.
11. Innovative ways of engaging the public, offenders and key stakeholders were discussed, including examining mechanisms used by the Corston report, Prison radio, particular magazines, organising focus groups etc. These will all be explored by the secretariat.
12. It was also felt that there was scope to engage with staff and with offenders to look into staff-prisoner relationships, cultural issues within the prisons and prison performance.
13. TH directed a discussion on the themes of the draft Call for Evidence, inviting further exploration of additional material and themes. Discussion included a range of issues, including the importance of examining the impact of ACCT, information sharing, the importance of family input into assessments of vulnerability, and whether there is learning to be had from 'near deaths'. In addition it was felt that the Incentives and Earned Privileges (IEP) level of a prisoner, and recent changes to the IEP scheme, could impact on how prisoners feel and reflections on this should be encouraged in submissions.

14. In discussion it was agreed that the deadline for formal written submissions to the Review will be Mid July, with reasonable flexibility given if the deadline is missed by contributors.

Action 5: Secretariat to organise early meetings with key stakeholders such as PPO, YJB, Inspectorate etc.

Action 6: Secretariat to organise an initial listening opportunity with families.

Action 7: Secretariat to redraft the 'Call for Submissions'. This will include a foreword by TH, to be agreed by panel members and go out by the end of the month.

Item 4: AOB

15. Panel agreed that they would like to have fuller summaries of particularly key cases and noted that cases are accompanied with differing levels of evidence.
16. DM offered the services of two Specialist Registrars to analyse the confidential medical information held on each of the people who took their lives and provide a summary of anything relevant.
17. The next meeting will be on 1 May 2014 and will include a discussion by MoJ analysts on the potential of a research commission, and a presentation by MoJ Communications on how young adults might potentially be engaged in the review.
18. Future meetings will be held on Thursdays, generally, and these are likely to be a mixture of meetings to hear the evidence of key stakeholders, to discuss review findings and regular review panel meetings. When longer, full day, meetings are held, sufficient 'email break' time will be built into the schedule. Meetings will begin around 10.30 to facilitate travel by all members. Teleconference facilities will be provided when possible.

Action 8: Secretariat to look into issues around what documents can be disclosed, what can be circulated to the review panel and what can be published.

Action 9: ALL – consider which institutions should be visited and additional stakeholders to engage and send suggestions to secretariat.

Action 10: Secretariat to set up a Functional Mailbox for the Review