

**Harris Review Meeting 2**  
**12:00 – 16:00, 1 May 2014, Room 4.29A**  
**102 Petty France, London SW1H 9AJ**

**Present**

**Chair:** Lord Toby Harris (TH)

**Panel Members:** Stephen Cragg (SC), Graham Towl (GT), Philip Leach (PL), Deborah Coles (DC), Matilda MacAttram (MM), Meng Aw Yong (MAY),

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

**By telephone:** Dinesh Maganty (DM)

**For item 3:** Jorgen Lovbakke (JL) and Rachel Tsang (RT)

**For item 7:** Alex Gaze (AG)

**Apologies:** Richard Shepherd (RS)

---

1. The meeting began with introductions and welcome to MAY who had not been able to attend the last meeting.

**Item 1: Review previous minutes**

2. The minutes were agreed as a true record.

3. Re paragraph 8, DC offered to provide a list of deaths and summaries of deaths pre 2007 that may be of particular interest to the Review, this was welcomed.

**Action 1: DC to provide secretariat with summaries of deaths pre 2007 that may be of interest for the Review and a list of deaths for the secretariat to follow up on.**

4. Re paragraph 17, DM raised his offer of Specialist Registrar support to the Review and clarified for the panel their professional experience and seniority. The panel discussed the benefits of having a summary of the clinical evidence, particularly by professionals with experience in the most relevant areas and to include child as well as adult mental health and additional options were raised.

5. TH advised that this and other professional resources being offered to the Review were welcome and should be used to maximum effect, particularly where no cost is involved.

**Action 2: DM and DC to discuss arrangements for the Specialist Registrars outside the meeting ASAP. Taking this on board, DM to advise the panel on an appropriate means of using the SR support that takes the concerns of the panel on board by the end of May.**

6. DB clarified for the panel that independent legal advice for the review and the secretariat would be provided by Treasury Solicitors and that there would be no conflict of interest with any legal advice being provided to the Ministry of Justice (MoJ). TH told the meeting that legal indemnity was also being sought for review panel members.

### **Item 2: Action Log**

7. Actions were updated. It was explained that only live actions would be brought to the meeting and a closed action log would be kept and form part of the published records of the Review.

### **Item 3: Research Overview and Item 4: Panel discussion on potential research commission**

8. JL described his role in potentially supporting the panel on the Review. The panel sought further clarification on the capacity of the research team to carry out work themselves and the time frames of this and contracted out work. It was agreed that it would be challenging to complete research within a time frame that could benefit the panel. The panel asked for a review of the recommendations and findings of key reports and reviews that relate to this topic (including the Fatally Flawed report and relevant HIMP reports etc).

**Action 3: JL will confirm for the panel whether the research team can provide a review of key papers and reports to the panel within approximately three weeks.**

9. GT was keen to have the last approximately 20 years of empirical data on self-inflicted deaths in custody available to the Review. He was keen to look at the data with the researchers and offered to help assess it.

**Action 4: The Secretariat will work with analysts to see if this can be facilitated and liaise with GT outside the meeting.**

**Action 5: JL to provide a similar version of the key statistics paper showing around 20 years of data i.e. to the point from which the data is consistent.**

10. The meeting discussed their interest in having qualitative information about vulnerability from young adults and particularly staff.

**Action 6: JL to provide details of scope for possible research that would capture staff understanding of vulnerability this should include the perceptions of minority groups for next meeting on 15 May.**

*(Secretary's note JL and RT left the meeting.)*

**Item 5: Call for submissions and key stakeholders**

11. The meeting went through the draft 'Call for Submissions' document and agreed some further amendments.

**Action 7: Secretariat to update the Call for submissions and arrange publication on 1 May.**

**Item 6: Review the draft summary template for each death**

12. The meeting agreed some additional information to be included in the summaries where it is available. TH said that when the Review was published it should include some of the detail that is available.

**Action 8: Secretariat to update the summary sheet.**

*(Secretary's note meeting order changed)*

**Item 8: AOB**

13. The meeting discussed dates for future meetings, stakeholders who will attend and visits to prisons. These issues will all be followed up at later meetings.

14. The meeting discussed that a 'List of Questions' should be compiled and would be open to additions from panel members at any time; this would not just concern commissioning research but would be a resource for meetings with stakeholders.

**Action 9: Secretariat to set up a 'Questions List'.**

*(Secretary's note Alex Gaze joined the meeting)*

**Item 7: Communications approach and recommendations**

15. AG shared the logo design with the panel and a version was agreed.

16. The panel discussed the range of communications and strategies offered by AG in the paper he presented.

17. It was agreed to look at various communications tools (including for example Facebook and Twitter) in more detail to facilitate dissemination of information, including the call for submissions.

18. In addition to the IAP website, Citizen Space was agreed for a survey type response, Connect will be used to contact the stakeholders, approximately 800 on the list.

19. The IAP stakeholder list will also be contacted in the call for submissions.

20. In developing the media handling plan AG agreed to:

- Circulate the communication list of around 800 stakeholders, for any additions;
- Review the level of activity two weeks on from the launch of the call for submissions;
- Ask key stakeholders to consider a link to the call for submissions from their own websites;
- Work with the Secretariat and Press Office to provide appropriate guidance on pushing messages and pro-active communication.
- AG will circulate the presentation and a communications plan for sign off at a later meeting.

21. AG is to provide further information on handling press enquiries to the secretariat.

22. It was agreed that in addition to the final report there should be an accessible summary of the key messages.

*(Secretary's note AG left the meeting)*

**Action 10: Secretariat to follow up on identifying the best ways of communicating with prisoners and using prisoner publications**

**Action 11: Secretariat to follow up on biographies of the new members of the IAP being published on the IAP website.**