

**VISITING FOREIGN NATIONAL PRISONERS:
FINDINGS FROM A SCOPING STUDY**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank all of those who shared their time and expertise with me in this project. I would also like to thank AVID, and particularly Mrs Sally Tarshish for hiring me to conduct this work.

AVID is grateful to the Sigrid Rausing trust for funding this project.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Mary Bosworth is Reader in Criminology and Fellow of St Cross College at the University of Oxford. Her major research interests are in punishment, incarceration and immigration detention with a particular focus on how matters of race, gender and citizenship shape the experience and nature of confinement. She has published widely on these issues as well as on qualitative research methods. Her books include *Engendering Resistance: Agency and Power in Women's Prisons* (1999, Ashgate Press), *The US Federal Prison System* (2002, Sage) and *Explaining U.S. Imprisonment* (2009, Sage). She is a member of the editorial board of the *British Journal of Criminology* and, with Simon Cole, Co-editor of *Theoretical Criminology*. At Oxford, Mary teaches courses on race and gender, prisons, the sociology of punishment, and qualitative research methods to Masters and undergraduate students studying law and criminology. She is the Director of Graduate Studies for Research at the Centre for Criminology.

FOREWORD

In 2007 AVID was approached by the Independent Monitoring Board National Council and Prison Chaplains with a request to help support foreign national prisoners with spent sentences being held in main stream prisons under Immigration Act powers (detainees). This Report charts the progress of the project, the outcomes, and the questions potential and existing visitors must consider before undertaking what might be a long-term commitment.

The project raised some serious issues about setting boundaries, confidentiality, respect for the privacy of both visitors as well as detainees, and the duty of care towards volunteers. In the workshops AVID held at the beginning of the project and at the end, these same issues triggered lively and searching discussions from different professional angles.

At the end of this project, AVID realized that what had begun as a narrowly defined remit, actually revealed a much wider area of work for which further funding would be needed in the very near future. The announcement from Her Majesty's Prison Service about their Hubs and Spokes Policy for Foreign Nationals came in the middle of this project. How that will affect the foreign national population in prisons is not yet entirely clear. What the project did highlight was that in general the

Foreign National Coordinators in prisons would welcome and value the special involvement of visitors, nationwide.

The AVID Board of Trustees are especially grateful for the significant work of Dr. Mary Bosworth in this project. She managed to open doors for us and worked very hard to facilitate the sometimes quite difficult discussions around sensitive areas.

Sally Tarshish, Chairman AVID
October 17, 2009. Oxford.

AVID is very appreciative of the time given by all those who contributed to this work.

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In September 2009, foreign national prisoners made up 14% of the prison population of England and Wales, a proportion that has risen dramatically over the past decade. Since 2006, the British government has sought to deport a greater number of foreign offenders and has also restricted access for serving foreign prisoners to open conditions and parole. Changes to immigration policy mean that many face mandatory deportation at the end of their sentence, while the rest may be considered for deportation. Former prisoners now make up around 50% of those detained in Immigration Removal Centres (IRCs).

Despite a number of recent initiatives to improve the treatment of foreign nationals in prison, evidence suggests that as a group, many remain isolated. Uncertainty about their immigration status is often compounded by cultural, religious, and linguistic differences with the mainstream population. Though some foreign nationals are long-term UK residents and, therefore, may be visited by their family and friends, many others, particularly in the male estate, receive no visits at all. This project, which developed in response to discussions with members of the Independent monitoring board (IMB), prison chaplains and the British Red Cross, sought to explore how AVID might fill this gap in service provision to coordinate voluntary group visitors to foreign nationals in prison. It was animated by three primary objectives, that, in turn generated three research questions:

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

1. To devise and implement a strategy for setting up or supporting volunteer visitor group to support time-served Foreign national prisoners,
2. To provide training and support for visitors, working in partnership with relevant organizations; and
3. To set out proposals on how AVID should take forward the work supporting detained ex-foreign national prisoners

RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

1. What are the needs and characteristics of foreign national prisoners?
2. What services could visitor groups offer foreign national prisoners?
3. More generally, what should AVID do to promote visitor groups to offer their services in prisons?

1. Needs and characteristics of foreign national prisoners

In 2004, the Prison Reform Trust (Bhui, 2004) identified six broad areas of concern for foreign national prisoners:

- (a) lack of information
- (b) immigration-related problems
- (c) language barriers
- (d) isolation
- (e) lack of preparation for release, and;
- (f) racist and disrespectful staff attitudes.

Since this time, HM Prison Service and the private prison contractors have made the treatment of foreign national prisoners and matters of race equality more of a priority. However, subsequent publications by the Prison Inspectorate (2007) as well as some of the research conducted for this report suggest that many of the problems outlined in 2004 remain, at least in some establishments.

2. Services Visitor groups could offer

There are a number of groups associated with AVID around the country currently visiting immigration detainees in removal centres. Some, like the London Detainee Support Group (LDSG) and the Liverpool Prisons Visiting Group, also visit detainees in prison. All of the organizations have considerable expertise to draw on in establishing groups to visit serving, un-sentenced and post-sentence foreign nationals in prison. In addition to those organisations, AVID can also benefit from working with existing prisoner visiting groups like New Bridge, Vamos Juntas and Hibiscus.

3. Recommendations for AVID

This report makes a number of recommendations for AVID:

1. That AVID should expand its current remit to include visiting serving, remand as well as post-sentence foreign nationals in prison.
2. That, in consultation with the relevant HM Prison Service Area Manager and with the relevant Foreign National Coordinators, AVID should initiate a more systematic visiting and befriending scheme within a small number of Local Prisons in one region as a pilot scheme.

3. That while AVID should draw on existing expertise in visiting detainees, it must also be careful to recognise the specific nature of the prison environment.
4. That AVID should initiate and continue contact with Foreign National Coordinators and Community and Visitor Coordinators in a select number of Local prisons to gauge their need for volunteers.
5. That AVID should look into training opportunities offered by HM Prison Service and the Voluntary Sector, particularly CLINKS, Hibiscus and New Bridge.
6. That, where prison visitor groups already exist, such as at HMP The Verne (New Bridge) and in the female prison estate (Hibiscus) that AVID should partner with these groups to pool resources.
7. That, initially, prison visitors should be trained by AVID, and that AVID should help visitor groups design local training strategies.
8. That a major pilot scheme should be re-evaluated after an agreed period of time in order to establish the feasibility of offering visits to foreign national prisoners on a national scale.
9. That this pilot scheme should be well funded to secure the services.
10. That, if funding allows, AVID considers appointing its own foreign national prisoner coordinator, further to develop this new line of service provision.

If the recommendations of this report are followed and AVID succeeds in offering its services to foreign national prisoners, a longer-term goal would have to be to secure funding to help groups roll out a national strategy. Given the numbers behind bars, this is an ambitious program and one that will require further assessment and development. However, this initial scoping study suggests both that prisons are receptive to the voluntary sector, and also, that there is a recognised and palpable need for befriending and visiting non-UK nationals behind bars, whatever their immigration status.

2. INTRODUCTION

The request for AVID to visit ex-Foreign national prisoners originally came from members of the IMB, the Red Cross and Prison Chaplaincy. Individual foreign national coordinators in prisons also contacted AVID for support and advice in regard to their foreign prison population. Such requests reflect the rapidly growing numbers of non-UK citizens behind bars, and the current interest in this group within the criminal justice system more broadly.

For some time now, non-citizens from outside Europe sentenced to more than 12 months custody, and the European Economic Area (EEA) nationals sentenced to more than 24 months, could be deported at the end of their sentence. Yet, until recently, the immigration and prison systems operated largely independently from one another. Since 2006, however, the Home Office has made the deportation of time-served foreign national prisoners, along with the removal of failed asylum seekers, a priority. All non-citizens sentenced to prison should now be automatically considered for deportation, with plans afoot to extend this policy to those sentenced to community penalties as well.

Whereas in the past, the immigration status of an individual was reported to the immigration authorities somewhat haphazardly, new regulations require the prison service and private prison companies to determine and record each inmate's citizenship upon arrival. These regulations are further supported by a new computer system, introduced across the penal estate in Summer 2009, called P-NOMIS in which, for the first time, there is specific prompt for nationality. The prison service and private contractors must fax the details of those who are not British citizens to the UK Border Agency (UKBA) so they can be entered into the UKBA data base, CIDS, and considered for deportation.

Though, ideally, non-citizens subject to deportation orders would be removed seamlessly at the end of their criminal sentence, or indeed during their prison term under Repatriation Agreements or through projects like the Facilitated Returns Scheme (FRS) or the Early Returns Scheme (ERS), this does not always happen. Instead, many are moved to facilities in the immigration removal estate where, recent estimates claim they constitute around 50% of the population (NAO, 2009).

In addition to the former foreign national prisoner population in IRCs, at any one time, around 500 individuals remain incarcerated in prison post-sentence, indefinitely detained under Immigration Act powers. Over the course of 2008, statistics from the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) show that this figure translated into 3500 people held beyond the terms of their sentence in prisons in England and Wales. Reflecting a widespread desire to reduce this number, a 2009 service level agreement (SLA) between NOMS and UKBA

introduced a target figure of no more than 250 post-sentence detainees in prison.

Although post-sentence detainees were the original target group of this scoping study, it rapidly became clear that concentrating on them alone would not be feasible, due to their small numbers and erratic turnover in the prison system. In any case, many foreign citizens serving sentences or on remand face immigration detention or deportation, and so will, at some point, be held under Immigration Act powers.

This report outlines the needs and characteristics of the general foreign national prison population. Despite considerable effort on behalf of the prison service, and notwithstanding reports of improved services from UKBA, it seems that many non-British citizens in prison continue to experience the difficulties identified in 2004 by the Prison Reform Trust, particularly in terms of lack of information, immigration-related problems, language barriers, and isolation.

While a voluntary visitors scheme could not solve all of these problems, experience in the immigration estate suggests that social visits help people cope with their incarceration. Contact with a visitor, whether by mail or in person reduces a person's isolation. Visitors also can sign post prisoners to services in the prison and beyond, providing a welcome source of information and referral during what can be a confusing and distressing period.

The prison service and private sector companies welcome a range of volunteers into all their establishments, and recognise their many and varied contributions. Hibiscus already runs a comprehensive befriending scheme for foreign national women in prison, while Vamos Juntas offers some outreach services for male prisoners from Latin America. No single voluntary sector group, however, currently offers social visits to foreign national men on anything other than a small scale. In pulling information together from a range of stakeholders and publications, this report maps a way forward for AVID to facilitate groups to visit to foreign nationals in prison, whether they are on remand, serving a criminal sentence, or post-sentence.

3. PROJECT DESIGN: AN OVERVIEW OF THE METHODOLOGY

This project took a case study approach based on four prisons in three geographical areas: HMP Woodhill (Category A Local) and HMP Bullingdon (Category B Local and Category C Training Prison), HMP Canterbury (Foreign national prison) and HMP Bronzefield (Private Sector, Women's Local, mother and baby unit). The prisons selected covered a range of institutions: male, female, public sector, private sector, local, high security and foreign national specialists. They are all near to existing detainee visitor groups, yet are not yet visited by any of the groups in question. I met with the foreign national coordinators in three of these prisons (Bullingdon, Woodhill and Bronzefield), plus the head of diversity in two (Woodhill and Bronzefield) and with the community and visitors coordinator in one (Canterbury). At HMP Bullingdon I also spoke to two members of the local Independent Monitoring Board (IMB) and to civilian clerks dealing with UKBA paperwork.

In addition to those working in the prisons, I consulted with members of HM Inspector of Prisons (HMIP) as well as with the IMB Secretariat. I also spoke to individuals from the UKBA Removals Enforcement & Detention Statistics Section, the Offender Management & Sentencing - Analytical Services in the Ministry of Justice and the NOMS Foreign National Policy group.

To gauge the experiences and concerns of the detainee groups, I met with the coordinators of Asylum Welcome, the London Detainee Support Group (LDSG), the Liverpool Prisons Visiting Group and the Dover Detainee Visitor Group (DDVG). I also spoke to members of the board of trustees from DDVG and AVID. All of the groups shared information with me about their visitor training and their interest in and concerns about visiting foreign national prisoners.

Finally, to round out the picture, I consulted with a range of other charities and organisations that offer services to immigration detainees and prisoners. These included Bail for Immigration Detainees (BID), Medical Justice, Detainee Advice Services (DAS), ILPA, the Immigration Advisory Services (IAS), Doughty Street Chambers, Hibiscus, the Prison Reform Trust, the Poppy Project and New Bridge. I also spoke to a series of academic researchers in the UK and abroad with expertise in immigration and asylum issues, and imprisonment.

Discussions with all of the participants usually lasted between one to two hours, during which time I took detailed notes. In addition to these consultations I drew on written material the groups made available to me along with relevant academic research, and official Home Office and Ministry of Justice publications. On August 10, 2009, I held a workshop at the University of Oxford, drawing together staff from the four prisons, with representatives from the visitor groups and some of the NGOs. The following report is based on evidence culled from all of these sources.

4. STATISTICS AND POLICY BACKGROUND

There are currently 136 prisons in England and Wales. Most are run by the public sector (HM Prison Service), with 11 prisons managed by private contractors (Kalyx, G4S Justice Services, Serco). The Prison Service – including public and private sector establishments -- is part of the National Offender Management System (NOMS), which itself, is located in the Ministry of Justice. Immigration Removal Centres and the UK Border Agency are part of the Home Office and do not fall within the purview of NOMS.

The Prison Service is, like any government department, a hierarchical organisation. At its head, is the Director General, a post currently held by Mr Phil Wheatley. A number of positions fall directly underneath him, including the 'Chief Operating Officer' and the 'Director of High Security'. The chief operating officer oversees the vast majority of prisons, via nine area managers, who split England and Wales between them. The Director of High Security, not unexpectedly, has responsibility for the 8 male high security prisons.

The Prison Service is currently undergoing a 'rationalisation' program, involving significant cost cutting and a redistribution of tasks. In a recent address to the 2009 Annual General Meeting of Clinks, the Prison Service Director General, Mr Phil Wheatley talked of having to cut £171 million from prisons and probation. Unless there is a dramatic policy change, such cuts, he claimed, would necessarily increase the role of the voluntary sector behind bars, in order to fill some of the gaps in service.

At the time of writing (October, 2009), around 85,000 men, women and young offenders are held in prisons in England and Wales, of whom approximately 12,000 (or 14%) are foreign nationals and 5% are women. About 13,500 of the total population are on remand. These people are either un-convicted, or have been convicted, but are awaiting the terms of their sentence. Of the remand population, approximately 2400 or 18% are foreign nationals, part of the target group.

Within the foreign national population, the largest individual groups in 2008 were Jamaican nationals with a population of 1,099 followed by Nigeria (855), Republic of Ireland (620), Poland (492) Somalia (447), China (445) and Vietnam (442). (Ministry of Justice, 2009b: 3). Evidently, the national origin of a foreigner will have some bearing on his or her experience of incarceration; EEA nationals are far less likely to face deportation for instance. So, too, given historic patterns of immigration, those from Jamaica are more likely to have longer-standing ties with the UK than those from China. Nonetheless, evidence from groups like Hibiscus as well as from HMIP reports, suggest that most foreign nationals will have some needs and characteristics that differ from the UK citizen-prisoners.

Foreign nationals are distributed unevenly throughout the penal estate (see Appendix II). While two prisons -- HMP Canterbury and HMP Bullwood Hall -- have been designated as 'foreign national prisons' and designed exclusively to house foreigners, others hold anywhere from 1 (HM Lancaster Castle) to 500 or so (HMP Wandsworth, HMP Wormwood Scrubs). Amongst those establishments with a high number of serving foreign national prisoners, there is a high concentration in the London prisons, and, more generally in the South East.

In early 2009, HM Prison Service announced a new plan to distribute foreign nationals based on 'hubs' and 'spokes'. This arrangement has designated 6 'hub' prisons each of which will have on-site UKBA personnel and services tailored to the foreign population. These hubs will be attached to 'spoke' prisons in their geographical area, which will direct their foreign national population to them where possible. The 6 hubs are: HMP The Verne (Dorset), HMP The Mount (Hemel Hempstead), HMP Wormwood Scrubs (London), HMP Risley (Cheshire), HMP Hewell (Worcestershire) and, for women, HMP Morton Hall (Lincoln). There are also two foreign national-only prisons for men, HMP Bullwood Hall (Essex), and HMP Canterbury.

The majority of foreign nationals in prison are serving a criminal sentence. Around 20% of those serving a sentence in 2008 had been convicted of violence against the person, as compared to 29% of the UK national prisoner population. Around 11% of both groups were convicted of sexual offences, whereas proportionally, foreign nationals were twice as likely to be sentenced to drug offences than UK nationals (29% vs. 14%). (Ministry of Justice, 2009c: 119)

Some foreign prisoners will be removed during their sentence. Depending on international agreements, prisoners may be eligible to serve out their sentence in their country of origin via Repatriation Agreements. The Prison Service also administers two 'returns schemes', known as the 'Early Release Scheme' (ERS) and the 'Facilitated Release Scheme' (FRS). While ERS can shave up to 270 days of a person's sentence, the FRS run in conjunction with the International Office of Migration (IOM), also offers foreign nationals financial aid towards business and education opportunities in their country of origin.

While considerable effort is spent in trying to siphon off as many foreign nationals as possible during their sentence via these schemes, not everyone is removed or removable in this way. Many non-British nationals have longstanding ties to Britain, with indefinite leave to remain, and do not want to leave. Others do not have travel documents. They may be from countries with governments that either refuse to issue travel documents, or simply take a long time to do so. Still others hail from states that have no functioning government and/or human rights abuses that prevent their removal, while finally, some have asylum claims pending or may have been previously given refugee status. In any case, non-EEA nationals serving sentences of less

than 12 months, or whose previous convictions over the past five years do not add up to this figure, are not subject to *mandatory* deportation, even though they can be considered for it. EEA nationals are difficult to deport in any case, while Irish citizens are almost entirely exempt from removal in this way.

Notwithstanding such complications, since 2006, the British government has sought to deport a greater number of foreign offenders. This has led to an increase in the deportation orders handed out at sentencing as well as in the number of deportation orders signed by the Secretary of State to be 'conducive to the public good'. Evidence suggests that such orders continue to be given to individuals even when there is little likelihood that deportation can occur any time soon, leading, in some cases, to lengthy periods of detention following the completion of their criminal sentence (Phelps, 2009). While the majority of former prisoners under deportation orders are housed in immigration removal centres, at any one time around 500 or so remain in prison. Regrettably neither the precise number of individuals, nor any further details about them, such as their original sentence, their national origin, nor the amount of time they have been detained, is readily available. All we know for sure, from recently published figures from the National Offender Management Services (NOMS), is that over the course of 2008, 3500 individuals had been detained in prison under Immigration Act powers (NOMS, 2009).

Relative to the total population behind bars, as well as to the numbers of foreign nationals serving sentences or on remand, the number of immigration detainees is fairly small. A recent service level agreement (SLA) between NOMs and UKBA indicates that both organisations are determined to shrink the number further, with a target of no more than 250 detainees in prison at any one time by 2010. While this population remains one of grave concern to AVID and to detainee visitor groups, it would be logistically very difficult only to offer visits to the detained population; no readily available statistics will identify the location of detainees, such figures are held locally in individual prisons and centrally by the Population Management Unit (PMU) in the Ministry of Justice, which does not publish them. Although this project was initially motivated by concerns about this group, it soon became apparent, that a larger need existed.

Recommendation 1:

That AVID should expand its current remit to include visiting serving, remand as well as post-sentence foreign nationals in prison.

Recommendation 2:

That, in consultation with the relevant HM Prison Service Area Manager and with the relevant Foreign National Coordinators, AVID should initiate a more systematic visiting and befriending scheme within a small number of Local Prisons in one region as a pilot scheme.

5. UNDERSTANDING THE PRISON SERVICE

Though, in many respects, prisons may look like immigration removal centres, and vice versa, it is important to recognise the specificity of each set of institutions. Visiting and gaining access to prisons is quite different to visiting immigration centres. On the one hand, prisons have far more restrictions on communication. Serving prisoners, as distinct from un-convicted ones or detainees, are only entitled to limited number of visits, usually two a month. They do not have (legal) access to mobile phones or to the internet, but rather rely on pin-based pay phones. On the other hand, the prison service explicitly welcomes the contributions of the voluntary sector, and during the course of this project, it was made clear that individual prisons were already extremely keen to host volunteers interested in visiting foreign nationals. This section of the report will briefly outline some of the key aspects of prison service policy and organisation to help visitor groups understand how prisons work.

Over the past two decades, prisons in England and Wales have undergone significant changes, starting, in 1992, with the opening of the first private prison for those on remand at HMP Wolds. The following year, Wolds was re-designated to hold sentenced prisoners and the prison service itself was reorganised as a semi-autonomous agency within the Home Office. These days, 11% of the total prison population live in private prisons, and the Prison Service, both public and private sector, is part of the National Offender Management Service, within the Ministry of Justice. It has embraced the language and practices of managerialism, constantly measuring itself against a set of Key Performance Indicators and strategic initiatives.

HM Prison Service, according to its mission statement,

“ serves the public by keeping in custody those committed by the courts. Our duty is to look after them with humanity and help them lead law abiding and useful lives in custody and after release.”

Underpinning all prisons, in other words, are two primary goals of security and reform. In the men's estate, prisons and inmates are classified in declining levels of security from A to D. Women's prisons instead are classified as Open, Semi-Open or Closed, with an additional security classification for prisoners of 'restricted status' corresponding to men's Category A level. Local prisons, which hold the majority of foreign national prisoners are usually Category B, although some, like HMP Woodhill, have a Category A rating. Typically Male highest security (Cat A) prisoners are mixed with category B prisoners in one of 8 high security prisons. Others may be held in Close Supervision Centres (est. 1998; previously control centres, or 'special

units') within high security establishments. The handful of women with 'restricted status' are housed in HMP Bronzefield or HMP Holloway.

In recent years, under the stewardship of its Director General, Mr Phil Wheatley, the prison service has championed a 'decency agenda,' seeking, with some success, to transform penal policy and culture. Decent prisons are ones in which staff and prisoners are treated with respect. They are also, according to the Director General, ones where staff members themselves would not be concerned if their family members were incarcerated. While much of the Decency Agenda is important for its direct engagement with more philosophical issues of legitimacy and humanity, there is also an instrumental aspect to it. The Prison Service believes that

- "by treating people with decency, they will be more likely to go on to live useful and law-abiding lives that will benefit them as individuals and society as a whole.
- We are committed to ensuring that staff, prisoners and all those visiting prisons or having dealings with the Prison Service are treated fairly and lawfully irrespective of their race, colour, religion, sex or sexual orientation."

Alongside, and some cases predating the Decency Agenda, the prison service oversees a raft of policies and practices to monitor and regulate life behind bars. Of particular note, is the Incentives and Earned Privileges (IEP) Scheme, which determines such matters as the provision of in-cell television and the number of visits to which a prisoner is entitled. There are three levels of service in the IEP, basic, standard and enhanced. While all prisoners start at standard, and most remain on that level, they can be moved up or down, depending on their behaviour in prison. Those on enhanced regimes are entitled to more visits.

Every two years prisons conduct a 'Measurement of the Quality of Prison Life' (MQPL) Survey to capture inmate views on a range of matters including prison safety, programs and relationships. This survey is meant to help prison's monitor and improve their service provision. The Prison Service also "benchmarks" all establishments on a scale of 1 – 4, in order to measure their performance relative to one another and in relation to a basic threshold of acceptability.

In response to a series of racist events, culminating in the killing of Zahid Mubarek by his cellmate at HMP/YOI Feltham¹ in March 2000, the prison service was formally investigated by the Centre for Racial Equality (CRE). The recommendations of CRE's critical report, published in July 2003 were officially accepted by the prison service, leading to

¹ HMP/YOI Feltham is both a prison and Young Offender Institution. It holds teenage boys aged 15 – 18 as well as young adult men from 18 – 21 placed in custody by the courts. Young Adults and Young people are held in separate residential units.

significant changes in practice, many of which are relevant to foreign nationals. All prisons must now have race equality and diversity officers; these senior management posts usually work closely with Foreign National Coordinators.

More broadly speaking, the prison service has devised a detailed statement about race equality that is displayed prominently in every establishment:

“The Prison Service is committed to racial equality. Improper discrimination on the basis of colour, race, nationality, ethnic or national origins, or religion is unacceptable, as is any racially abusive or insulting language or behaviour on the part of any member of staff, prisoner or visitor, and neither will be tolerated”

They must also operate a formal process for assessing each prisoner's risk of violence if sharing a cell; this may be relevant for Foreign nationals who tell visitors they want to share a cell with someone who speaks their own language, but are not allowed to do so because they have been rated as high/raised risk of violence to others. While finally, racist incidents are constantly measured and monitored.

Since July 2006, administrative issues pertaining to foreign national prisoners and immigration detainees in prison have been set out in Prison Service Order (PSO)4630. All prisons now should have Foreign National Coordinators (FNCs). This is meant to be a senior management post working alongside the diversity officer. FNCs should appoint foreign national prisoner representatives from the inmate community, while local IMB members also focus on the foreign population. There is an administrative lead on foreign national prisoner policy in the Prison Service and a designated policy group with NOMS more generally. In all respects other than in matters pertaining to deportation orders, foreign national prisons and immigration detainees in prison should be treated the same as UK nationals.

Recommendation 3.

That while AVID should draw on existing expertise in visiting detainees, it must also be careful to recognise the specific nature of the prison environment.

6. COMMON ISSUES FACING FOREIGN NATIONAL PRISONERS

There are a number of common issues facing foreign national prisoners, most of which remain fairly constant over time and all of which will be important for visitors to understand. As such, these issues will need to be covered in some detail in training. Many will be familiar to those already visiting immigration removal centres. The primary issues identified in the literature and in this project are:

- Isolation and Family contact
- Language
- Religion
- Gender
- Health needs
- Remand
- Immigration status
- Deportation
- Detention Post-sentence

Isolation and Family Contact

Foreign national prisoners are less likely than UK nationals to receive visits and are also less likely to know their entitlement to visits. If most or all of their family and friends live abroad, they may find it particularly difficult to stay in touch. Currently, if a foreign national prisoner does not receive domestic or social visits, he or she should receive a 5-minute international phone call once a month. Foreign National prisoners are also entitled to one free airmail letter a month.

At the moment, there appears to be some inconsistency in practice, at least in terms of the availability of free phone calls. Some prisons (like HMP Bronzefield) allow foreign nationals a free 5-minute call to children or family members abroad, even if the prisoner receives some visits in the UK. Others (like HMP Bullingdon) do not. A draft new prison service order (PSO) that is due to come into force later this year, will require all prisons to offer the 5-minute phone call home, even when foreign national prisoners receive some visits.

Language

Individuals in prisons in England and Wales come from over 172 different countries and speak over 100 foreign languages. Most prison information is produced primarily in English, though certain items, like the foreign national prisoner handbook are translated into 23 different languages (HM Prison Service, 2004). Some prisons are also gradually introducing picture based instructions for prison menus.

Poor English language skills make it difficult for foreign prisoners to access prison healthcare, work, education or training. As a result, foreign national prisoners are less likely than their British counterparts to engage in prison labour while incarcerated. They also continue to miss out on a number of programs designed to reduce offending behaviour and to tackle drug and alcohol addiction.

Prisons, like Immigration Removal Centres, have access to services like the Big Word, and also to laptops that can translate documents. As in IRCs, however, many prefer to use inmates or officers as translators to keep costs down. This practice can lead some establishments to use prisoners as translators in adjudications for offences of good order and discipline in prison, though other prisons eschew this practice.

Some foreign national coordinators expressed concerns that prisoners did not always understand documentation issued by UKBA, all of which was produced only in English. Poor language skills, they reported, sometimes meant that individuals did not fully understand that they were facing mandatory deportation. Widespread confusion over immigration status, the prison staff reported, meant that foreign national prisoners were often surprised and upset when they were not released into the community at the end of their sentence.

Religion

As with language, there is enormous diversity of religious belief among the foreign national prisoner population. The Prison Chaplaincy team is charged with meeting the religious needs of all prisoners and all prisons should have a multi-faith room available. Many establishments employ part-time chaplains in a range of faith groups. If the prisoner's faith group is not represented, it may be possible to arrange a visit from a community representative.

Prisons should cater for religious diet and festivals. However unlike IRCs or the foreign national specialist prisons like HMP Canterbury and HMP Bullwood Hall, mainstream prisons must also cater for a much larger British population too. While most foreign national coordinators reported that their establishment marked the primary religious and cultural festivals of the major ethnic groups, they pointed out that their capacity to do so was limited. With a budget of around £1.70 per prisoner per day, one staff member asserted, there was little that they

could do.

Gender

Women in prison typically serve shorter sentences than men, and generally for less serious offences. However, some foreign national women will be serving long sentences for drug-related offences. Such individuals may have imported drugs into the country (drug 'mules'), or may have been brought illegally into the country (trafficked) to work in drug production (e.g. marijuana). Studies show that around 2/3rds of women in prison have children under the age of 18 in the community, and that half of the women in prison also have been victims of sexual and other violence.

Many of these women will already be receiving advice and visits from Hibiscus which currently works in most women's prison, offering case work and befriending services. Hibiscus also has offices in some of the main non-EEA countries from which foreign national women originate such as Jamaica and Nigeria. In these places Hibiscus works to educate the local population about the dangers inherent in and potential consequences of drug trafficking.

Some foreign national women may have been trafficked into the country for sex work. The Poppy Project, based in London, has an assessment protocol for anyone suspected to be a victim of sex trafficking. As a signatory to the Council of Europe's Convention on Action Against Trafficking in Human Beings the UK government has agreed not to imprison trafficking victims.

Women are far more likely than men to have been the primary caregiver to a child or children, and so the visitor should be aware that women may be quite concerned about their child's welfare. Foreign national women in prison may not have told anyone about the whereabouts of their children in the community for fear of them being deported. Under certain circumstances babies and infants remain with their mothers in prison until they are 18 months old. In those prisons like HM Bronzefield, that have mother and baby units, staff reported a high number of foreign national prisoners.

Health needs

Unlike most facilities in the Immigration estate, healthcare in prison is provided by NHS doctors and nurses and is funded by the local Primary Care trust. Prisoners, as a group, have poorer than average health. Many arrive in prison addicted to drugs and alcohol, and exhibit high rates of mental illness. The rate of suicide and self-harm in prisons is far above the national average.

Compounding such matters, non-UK citizens, particularly asylum seekers who have been convicted of immigration-related offences, may have experienced torture in their home countries. Such

individuals as in the immigration removal centres may suffer from post-traumatic stress disorder. At present, however, groups like Medical Justice and the Medical Foundation who work with survivors of torture have little presence in prisons, and foreign national coordinators and other prison staff may be unaware of their services.

Foreign national prisoners are also slightly more likely than UK nationals to be HIV+ and to have health concerns relating to diet. Prisoners should be able to access high quality medical care in every establishment. They should also be seen by a dentist, an optometrist, or a psychiatrist as needed. As in any system, however, medical services vary across the penal estate, and health care remains a concern for many prisoners.

Remand

At any one time, around 15% of the total prison population is held on remand. Within this population, foreign nationals are slightly more over-represented than they are within the sentenced prison population. About two thirds of this population have been accused of non-violent offences. Less than half (around 40%) of all remanded prisoners go on to receive a prison sentence at the end of their trial. About one in five are acquitted of all charges against them, while the rest are either sentenced to time served or the case against them does not proceed (because, for example, of insufficient evidence).

In addition to the usual issues of uncertainty that all remand prisoners will face regarding their criminal trial, foreign nationals will have the extra burden of uncertainty about their immigration status. At the moment, UKBA cannot finalise a deportation, or holding order until a person's criminal matter has been resolved. In practical terms, this causes delays in determining what to do with individuals who have been sentenced to time served, found innocent, or whose cases have not gone ahead. Without sufficient lead time to process them, foreigners on remand who are 'of interest' to UKBA may be detained in prison after their criminal matter is resolved.

Immigration status

Since UKBA does not have to furnish an individual with a deportation order until the criminal sentence is spent, foreign prisoners, whether sentenced or on remand, may spend considerable time unsure of what will happen. Such lack of information may make it difficult for them to decide whether to pursue ERS or FRS.

A crucial issue for many foreign prisoners remains the communication barriers between the prison service and UKBA. Immigration clerks spoke of having call UKBA "ten times a day" to try to move cases along. There were also reports of paperwork arriving from UKBA on the afternoon of the day an individual was due for release.

Prisons with large foreign national populations can struggle to keep up with the paperwork. The new system of hubs and spokes is meant to address such problems.

There was some variety in how often UKBA visited the prisons in this study. While they were onsite all the time at HMP Canterbury, at both HMP Woodhill and HMP Bullingdon they came far less often. Without much access to immigration solicitors or the voluntary sector, considerable work fell to the foreign national coordinators. Not only do such staff members have to provide information, referral and interpersonal support to prisoners, they must also often deliver deportation orders from UKBA. Such a range of duties could, at times, be complicated.

Deportation

A deportation order requires an individual to leave the UK, authorizing his or her detention until he or she is removed, even though not everybody with a deportation order is detained. A deportation order prohibits the person from re-entering the country for as long as it is in force and invalidates any leave to enter or remain in the United Kingdom given before the Order is made or while it is in force. According to the Immigration Rules, a person is liable to deportation:

- (i) where the Secretary of State deems the person's deportation to be conducive to the public good;
- (ii) where the person is the spouse or civil partner or child under 18 of a person ordered to be deported; and
- (iii) where a court recommends deportation in the case of a person over the age of 17 who has been convicted of an offence punishable with imprisonment.

However, the rules also state unequivocally that,

- A deportation order will not be made against any person if his removal in pursuance of the order would be contrary to the United Kingdom's obligations under the Convention and Protocol relating to the Status of Refugees or the Human Rights Convention. (para 380)"

In the case of offenders, deportation can be recommended by the courts. Since the passage of the UK Borders Act 2007, all non-EEA nationals sentenced to more than 12 months imprisonment face mandatory deportation as do EEA nationals sentenced to 24 months. In 2008, the British government deported or removed 5,395 foreign national prisoners.

Serving prisoners can appeal their deportation order or, if it was a recommendation of a court, they can appeal their sentence. They may not be removed while their appeal is pending. Prisoners will usually need legal advice from an immigration solicitor to lodge any such appeal. Since April 2001 it has been illegal for unauthorised people to give advice on immigration law. Prisons outside of London, however, are poorly serviced by immigration solicitors due to restrictions on legal aid funding. So, too, they have little access to third sector groups like Detention Advice Services (DAS), Bail for Immigration Detainees (BID) or Immigration Advice Services (IAS), many of whom simply do not have the staff or funds to cover a wider geographical area.

Detention Post-Sentence

While not everyone under a deportation order will, or must be detained, those who have served prison sentences are more likely to be detained than those who have not. For the most part, former prisoners are housed in Immigration Removal Centres. At any one time, however, there are between 400 – 550 immigration detainees held in prisons in England Wales. Current targets aim to reduce this number to no more than 250 by 2010.

The criteria that determine where a detainee is housed after the expiry of their custodial sentence are set out in paragraph 5.1 of Prison Service Order (PSO) 4630:

- 5.1 In general terms, Immigration Detainees will only normally be held in prison accommodation in the following circumstances:
- National Security – where there is specific (verified) information that a person is a member of a terrorist group or has been engaged in terrorist activities.
 - Criminality – those detainees who have been involved in the importation of Class A drugs, committed serious offences involving violence, or committed a serious sexual offence requiring registration on the sex offenders' register.
 - Security – where the detainee has escaped prison or immigration custody, or planned or assisted others to do so.
 - Control – engagement in serious disorder, arson, violence or damage, or planning or assisting others to so engage.

Such categories are only a guide, the PSO makes clear, and there may be occasions where individuals who may have been convicted of

quite serious offences, are suitable for an IRC. Specifically, the PSO states,

It must be recognised that the behaviour of ex-FNP detainees will be the key factor as some who would be excluded by the above criteria may be sufficiently well behaved to merit transfer.

So, too,

It must be assumed that regardless of the guidelines any ex-prisoner who had been deemed suitable as a Cat. D will be acceptable for the IRC estate.

What happens to those detainees who do remain in prison? Here the PSO is, at least, initially, unequivocal: detainees must be treated as though they are un-convicted prisoners (PSO 4630, para. 3.9). Immigration detainees in prison should be treated as 'un-convicted' prisoners. As such, they fall under Prison Rule 7(2), according to which, un-convicted prisoners:

(a) shall be kept out of contact with convicted prisoners as far as the governor considers it can reasonably be done, unless and to the extent that they have consented to share residential accommodation or participate in any activity with convicted prisoners; and

(b) shall under no circumstances be required to share a cell with a convicted prisoner.

In practical terms, this should mean they are housed in local prisons since training prisons and Category A prisons do not typically hold prisoners on remand. Being treated as an un-convicted prisoner draws some benefits: the un-convicted are entitled to more visits – as many as one a day --, greater telephone contact and more time out of cell. They also can wear their own clothes. Yet, there are also many drawbacks: un-convicted prisoners are less likely to be employed in paid employment in a prison, or to be enrolled in education and drug treatment. Similarly, remand prisoners are usually housed in wings that can be more chaotic, due to the rapid turnover of inmates. Remand wings usually house a higher proportion of individuals undergoing drug and alcohol withdrawal as people dry out in arrival. They also have a greater proportion of prisoners suffering from mental health disorders. In any case, prisons may simply not be able to offer ex-foreign nationals the additional time out of cell or telephone privileges, due to staffing and housing constraints. In those circumstances, detainees will be

asked to sign a form stating their understanding that they “cannot be held in unconvicted conditions” (Annex C, PSO 4630).

Whereas PSO 4630 might suggest that former foreign national prisoners held in prison have been judged as somehow unsuitable for IRCs, in practical terms, individuals can remain in prison for more mundane reasons, either because of incomplete paperwork from UKBA or, due to space issues in the immigration estate. There was a sense from some staff members that even ex-prisoners who do not fall into the risk categories identified above, are viewed with some suspicion by the removal centre. As one FNC put it, ‘if a removal centre is offered 10 non-criminals, they will take them over ten former prisoners’.

Not unexpectedly, members of the IMB, FNCs and others reported that foreign nationals articulated high levels of anxiety and frustration post-sentence as they sought to be moved to an IRC or released into the community. Plenty of academic research from the medical sciences suggests that the negative impact of detention far outlasts the period of incarceration. It was not just detainees who were adversely affected by post-sentence detention however. A number of staff members were also quite concerned over the practice of holding people in prison once their criminal sentence was spent. They worried that this practice was counter to the decency agenda; as one officer put it, ‘it is not decent, and it’s not right.’

Even as everyone reported an improvement in the timeliness of UKBA decisions, and a growing understanding from within UKBA about foreign national prisoners, considerable concerns remained. An ongoing lack of clarity over immigration decisions and, in particular uncertainty about detention was difficult for many prisoners to bear, with a predictable outcome: self-harm and other forms of violence. In a sad irony, such factors themselves contributed to detainees remaining in prison since could act as grounds for an IRC to refuse to take them.

Recommendation 3.

That while AVID should draw on existing expertise in visiting detainees, it must also be careful to recognise the specific nature of the prison environment.

7. VOLUNTEERING IN PRISON

There is a long history of visiting and volunteering in English prisons that dates back to the first prison reformers of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Volunteers offer either/both practical assistance to prisons and prisoners, as well as a friendly critique and oversight. Organisations like the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)—formerly known as the ‘Board of Visitors’ – and the Official Prison Visitors (OPVs) combine these roles in an official capacity; visiting prisoners on the wing and keeping tabs on their treatment. Other, smaller organisations like Hibiscus and New Bridge also combine social visits with various kinds of practical assistance, from the Hibiscus case workers employed in most women’s prisons, to New Bridge’s weekly information surgery at HMP The Verne. Still others, like local churches, artists, musicians and concerned citizens offer the prison their time and commitment for free.

All told, hundreds of voluntary sector groups are working in prisons throughout England and Wales. Since 2002, the prison service has coordinated these groups according to the PSO 4190 *Strategy for Working with the Voluntary and Community Sector*. All prisons should have a member of their Senior Management team with responsibility for liaising with the voluntary and community sector. Rather like the foreign national coordinators, this role is often an add-on to a senior management post and so there is some variability in how much time individuals are able to give to this job.

According to the PSO, however, the involvement of the voluntary and community sector is an important part of the prison service’s commitment to resettlement and reducing reoffending. Third sector groups are also thought to contribute positively to the performance standard on constructive regimes. Voluntary and community groups, the PSO asserts, can offer improved support for prisoners and their families.

In order to integrate the third sector into prisons, the prison service commits to train “staff from voluntary groups alongside prison staff in areas such as security, health and safety, suicide prevention, etc.” The prison service also agrees to “provide an induction pack for all new organisations and volunteers” as well as “to use opportunities such as secondments, mentoring, job shadowing, and attending management committee meetings to enhance interaction and understanding between staff and voluntary and community groups”. In practical terms, governors must “make sure that every group/volunteer coming into the establishment is linked to a nominated member of staff.”

Like most aspects of the prison regime, the London prisons appear to be particularly well serviced by volunteers. On at least one occasion in this project, prison staff members expressed concern at the number of community groups wishing to help; the prison felt overwhelmed. Elsewhere, however, prisons may depend almost

exclusively on official prison visitors, the IMB and representatives from local churches.

The prison service's commitment to the voluntary sector is good news for groups interested in visiting foreign national prisoners. It suggests that pathways already exist to host such organisations. While the Foreign National Coordinator would be the logical nominated staff member in most places, the Volunteer Coordinator may be another person to consider. A third option is the Chaplain, although this person usually coordinates the institution's Official Prison Visitor Programme.

Recommendation 4.

That AVID should initiate contact with Foreign National Coordinators and Community and Visitor Coordinators in a select number of Local prisons to gauge their need for volunteers.

Recommendation 5.

That AVID should look into training opportunities offered by HM Prison Service and the Voluntary Sector, particularly CLINKS, Hibiscus and New Bridge.

8. VISITING AND TRAINING

Even as many of the aspects of visiting foreign national prisoners may be similar to visiting immigration detainees, there are some important general differences as well as plenty of internal local variation in both the prison population and in penal policy. Most obviously, in comparison to visiting immigration detainees, groups may find the restrictions on communications and visits in prison initially rather difficult. Similarly, while most foreign national prisoners are serving relatively short prison sentences, others, particularly those sentenced for drug importation related offences or violence will be behind bars for many years. Long-term incarceration poses particular challenges for visitor groups. Finally, there are some groups already visiting foreign national prisoners, raising the possibility of new forms of partnership.

In terms of penal policy, visitor groups must expect some variation and inconsistency. Although prisons must follow national guidelines as articulated in the various Prison Service Orders and codified in the Prison Rules, establishments are also meant to produce local policy documents. For instance, while there is a national information handbook for foreign national prisoners, each prison also produces a local edition as well. Similarly, while some prisons may be prepared to welcome visitor groups as special visits, others may wish to include them under the prisoner's social visiting entitlement.

In devising training for visitors, and in supporting visitor groups, AVID will have to strike a balance between the general and the particular in penal practice. This is likely to be done best, both in partnership with existing groups and in local initiatives. While this report and its accompanying training pack are intended as the building block for visitor groups, they should both be supplemented at the local level.

Differences with Removal Centres

According to page 10 of the Immigration Removal Centre's *Operating Standards Manual*,

The [Removal] Centre must provide the opportunity for detainees to receive daily visits throughout the year, but not including Christmas Day and Boxing Day. Visiting hours must be at least five hours per day and may take place during the mornings, afternoons or evenings. With regard to weekday evenings, there must be at least 1 1/2 hours visiting time available.

Furthermore, in page 21, it states quite clearly that,

The [Removal] Centre must maintain up-to-date lists of local befriending groups and contact details of the Association of Visitors to Immigration Detainees (AVID) and ensure that detainees are aware of their services.

Even those who have been removed from association are entitled to visits.

These requirements make it relatively straightforward to visit those detainees held in removal centres. So, too, AVID and the visitor groups already have existing profiles in the immigration estate. Detainees are entitled to mobile phones and have access to faxes and the internet. Under such circumstances, visitor groups can maintain daily contact if necessary and can refer to other organizations with ease.

For those in prison, however, whatever their legal status, matters are not nearly as simple. Instead of the *Detention Centre Rules* and *The Operating Standards*, detainees in prison, as well as those on remand or serving a sentence are subject to the *Prison Rules*. While visits are recognized as an important part of reducing re-offending through strengthening ties with the community, population management issues and security drastically limit the access of prisoners to the outside world.

Visits and communication

Regulations governing visits are set nationally according to a number of Prison Service Orders. Individual establishments also will have some versions of local practice. Certain prisons, for instance, offer all day visits to family members, while others do not. Some offer evening and weekend visits, while others do not.

Officially, there are two main kinds of prison visits: an 'official' prison visit, usually denoting a visit from a lawyer, or a 'social' or 'domestic' visit. To receive a social visit, a prisoner must lodge a visiting order (VO), with the prison. Only approved names from the individual prisoner's list of visitors can be issued with a VO, and prisoners on most 'standard' level regimes typically are only allowed 2 VOs per month. In some instances, voluntary groups can be given an intermediary status, where their visits do not count as a social visit and so do not 'use up' a VO. Everyone consulted in this project agreed that it would be counterproductive if voluntary visits prevented a foreign national prisoner from obtaining the free phone call that is offered in lieu of visits.

Prison visits must be booked ahead. Any visitor, whether official or social, will be searched on each and every occasion. The nature of the search varies somewhat according to the security level of the prison. High security prisons like HMP Woodhill require visitors to pass through metal detector, and submit to a pat down search. Any items they bring in will be x-rayed. Visitors are extremely limited in what they are permitted to bring in with them. They cannot bring in any food, or

items to pass over to the prisoner. Most prisons also use dogs to search visitors for drugs. Once in the visiting room, in most cases, prisoners must stay in an allocated seat for the duration of the visit. Visits are fairly short, often no more than one hour.

Such strictures can, undoubtedly, make it difficult to strike up much rapport, particularly when there is no pre-existing relationship. To overcome this barrier, New Bridge initiates contact by mail with those who want to be visited. Their volunteers only go into the prison once they feel that a connection exists.

In terms of communication, letter writing remains the primary route open to anyone wishing to befriend someone in prison. Given the high levels of illiteracy among the entire population, not to mention language skills among the foreign national group, letter writing can be difficult. Nonetheless, letters enable people to maintain lengthy contact with prisoners even when the prisoner is relocated to an institution far away.

At the Oxford workshop, some indication was given that certain prisons, like HMP Bronzefield, were trying to explore the possibility of more web-based services, including a secure video-conferencing mechanism. Many prisons already partner with www.emailprisoner.com. This service enables friends and families to email a prisoner. The prison prints the email and delivers it with the mail. Prisoners, however, are unable to email back.

Security

A concern with security was a common theme that arose in many of the consultations with visitor groups. Currently, it seems to be fairly common practice among the immigration detention visitor groups to ask detainees for information about their previous conviction. While at the Oxford conference, this strategy was deeply criticized by all the prison staff and by other voluntary sector groups, coordinators feel that this information is necessary in order to allocate an appropriate visitor. They have a duty of care to their visitor, and wish to avoid putting any individual at risk. New Bridge also requires any prisoner who wishes to be visited to disclose his or her offence. New Bridge then checks the prisoner's claim with the individual's probation officer in the prison and determine whether there are any particular security issues relevant to the prisoner.

Whereas the participants at the conference were united in their view that it was not necessary to know an individual's conviction, they were equally sure that security would be a real issue for volunteers. In particular, they urged volunteers to avoid handing out their phone numbers and addresses. New Bridge, once again, offers an interesting example of how to manage the privacy of its volunteers. Once someone is trained they are asked to choose a pseudonym which is the name to be shared with the prisoner. Volunteers are strongly advised by New Bridge never to furnish prisoners with their home

addresses or personal telephone numbers. Instead, all communication comes through New Bridge's London office, where letters are re-addressed and re-routed. While this strategy creates a lot of labour in the head office, it protects the anonymity of the befrienders.

Training and Recruiting Volunteers

In training its volunteers, AVID can draw on the considerable experience of detainee visitor groups, particularly on those who currently visit detainees in prison. It can also supplement them with resources from the prison service and, where possible, partner with organizations like CLINKS, New Bridge and Hibiscus that have years of experience in volunteering in prison. For a fee, Clinks, New Bridge and Hibiscus offer training sessions with the voluntary sector. The Prison Service could also provide basic ACCT training to help visitors identify potential suicide risks. Any training scheme, however, will also need to respond to local characteristics of the prison and of the visitor group. It will also, eventually, have to be owned by them as well.

To that end, this report and the accompanying training pack could provide a basic template of training, which can be adapted for use at the local level. The template could include basic prison policy, as well as information about the population in question. In the early stages of the pilot visiting scheme, AVID could run a training workshop in partnership with CLINKS or the prison service.

While AVID and its constituent groups have many years of experience in recruiting volunteers, it might be worth considering whether there will be any impediments to recruiting visitors specific to prisons. Some people, no doubt, will be fearful of offenders, while others may find the prison environment disturbing. One group, who were mentioned both by existing visitor groups and by some of the prison staff, were students. Recently, the Howard League for Penal Reform has created a network of student groups. These are modeled on similar groups that Amnesty International has long facilitated. AVID might wish to consider either partnering with these kinds of organizations to recruit volunteers, or even, in the longer term, to setting up their own student network.

Recruiting Prisoners

From the consultation process, it became apparent that there are three main sites where AVID needs to consult further in order to further develop a visitor scheme. On the one hand, they need to liaise with the foreign national or visitor and community coordinator of the prisons they would like to visit. In order to secure the scheme, however, AVID is also advised to seek out approval from NOMS and from HM Prison Service Headquarters. Finally, if the scheme is to be a success, it will need the interest and approval of the prisoners themselves. The easiest way to access this group may be through foreign national prisoner

reps. AVID also should produce posters in multiple languages for display. If funds were to allow, it could set up a free phone number, like that of the Prison Reform Trust, for information.

Recommendation 6.

That, where prison visitor groups already exist, such as at HMP The Verne (New Bridge) and in the female prison estate (Hibiscus) that AVID should partner with these groups to pool resources.

Recommendation 7.

That, initially, prison visitors should be trained by AVID, and that AVID should help visitor groups design local training strategies.

9. CONCLUSION: IMPLICATIONS OF THE SCOPING STUDY

At the start of this project, one of the stakeholders asserted that the study could conclude that, for any particular prison:

- i. There is no need for a visitor group, the existing provision being adequate
- ii. There could be provision made by organic growth of an existing visitor group of a given prison,
- iii. There could be a need for a new visitor group, or
- iv. The study was too limited and that there is a need for further research before a more definite recommendation could be made in respect of an individual prison, or for all prisons studied.

Over the course of the project, it became clear that these four options are not mutually exclusive. There are, indeed, some prisons like HMP The Verne, and a number of the women's prisons, which have active visitor groups already working with the foreign national community. In such places, it would make little sense for new groups to be established. Instead, AVID could either partner with the existing organizations to bolster their number of volunteers, or could simply deploy their resources elsewhere.

Similarly, all detainee visitor groups are near to prisons and thus could expand their activities to visit foreign national prisoners. Not all groups will, however, wish to take on this new commitment, and so, in consultation with them, AVID may work to foster new groups, whose sole purpose is to visit foreign national prisoners. Finally, while this study can conclude with some certainty that there is a need and opportunity for visitor groups to offer their services to foreign national prisoners, further research would be beneficial.

On the one hand, a primary recommendation, flowing from the Oxford Workshop and from the consultations, is that AVID should pilot visitor groups in a limited number of prisons in one region. After the groups have settled into a routine of visiting, their activities and experiences could be evaluated, to help roll out a more ambitious programme. In this evaluation, AVID should ascertain the views of the prisoners and prison staff about the impact, utility and limitations of visitor groups. Such views would help determine the future shape of a visiting programme.

On the other hand, questions remain over which section of the foreign prison population would be best served by a new visitor's scheme. While the project began with a primary interest in immigration

detainees in prison, their low numbers rapidly ruled them out as the sole focus. In turn, foreign national coordinators suggested that volunteers target those on remand. Unlike serving prisoners, who can be moved at any moment around the penal estate, those on remand usually stay in one establishment. They are also entitled to daily visits. Both of these factors would make visiting in prison more like visiting a removal centre.

What happens, however, to those foreigners on remand sentenced to further time in prison? Would a volunteer simply cut off contact? Or, conversely, would volunteers wish to maintain their relationships? Once a prisoner moves off the remand wing, he or she will only be entitled to an average of two visiting orders a month. At this point, 'visiting' could transform into a letter-based 'befriending' scheme.

Decisions over these kinds of practical questions must be taken at the local level, by AVID in consultation with its volunteers and existing groups. Whatever format is chosen, this scoping study demonstrates an urgent need for targeted voluntary sector work, in particular, with male foreign national prisoners.

Recommendation 8.

That a major pilot visiting scheme should be re-evaluated after an agreed period of time in order to establish the feasibility of offering visits to foreign national prisoners on a national scale.

Recommendation 9.

That this pilot scheme should be well funded to secure the services.

Recommendation 10.

That, if funding allows, AVID considers appointing a foreign national prisoner coordinator, further to develop this new line of service provision.

APPENDIX I

CONSULTATIONS

Matt Holman, Coordinator, Asylum Welcome
Francesca Cooney, Prison Reform Trust (PRT)
Jerome Phelps, Coordinator, London Detainee Support Group (LDSG)
Peter Day, Volunteer, LDSG
Vebi Kosumi, Coordinator Dover detention visitors group (DDVG)
Robin Saunders, Chair of Board of Trustees, DDVG
Victor Fiorini, Detainee-visitor Manager, DDVG
Miriam Wood, Board of Trustees, DDVG
Julie Pitkin, FNC, HMP Woodhill
Tina Heath, Detention Statistics, UKBA, Home Office
Adam Spriggs, Prison Statistics, Ministry of Justice
Andy Layard, FNC, HMP Bullingdon
Paul Marsh, Visitor Coordinator, HMP Canterbury
Yvonne Shah, Foreign National Coordinator, HMP Bronzefield
Ann Thomson, Interventions & Diversity Manager, HMP Bronzefield
Sally Tarshish, Chair of Board of Trustees, AVID
Tony Oteh, Board of Trustees, AVID
Ali McGinley, Director, AVID
Steve Symmonds, ILPA
Frances Webber, Garden Street Chambers
Laura Dubinski, Doughty Street Chambers
Steve Mason, Detention Advisory Services (DAS)
Amanda Shah, Communications Director, Bail for Immigration
Detainees (BID)
Sue Simkin, Independent Monitoring Board, Foreign National Lead (IMB)
Peter Selby, IMB Secretariat
Tony Cudlip (IMB)
David Carpenter, IMB, HMP Bullingdon
Jill Flitter, IMB, HMP Bullingdon
Olga Heaven, Director, Hibiscus
Sally Mentier, The Poppy Project
Chris Thomas, Chief Executive, New Bridge
Ao Ajemole, New Bridge visitor group at HMP The Verne
Frank Arnold, Medical Justice
Hindpal Singh Bhui, HM Inspectorate of Prisons
Martin Lomas, HM Inspectorate of Prisons
Helen Ireland, former Coordinator AVID
Liz Cox, Trustee, AVID
Dr Jo Borrill, University of Westminster
Dr Emma Plugge, University of Oxford
John Townley, Deputy Head of Policy on Foreign National Prisoners,
NOMS.

APPENDIX II

Foreign National Prison Population by Establishment on 30 June 2009²

Men

Establishment	Total Population	Foreign Nationals	UK Nationals	Nationality unrecorded
Acklington	940	25	915	0
Albany	554	62	483	9
Altcourse	1314	114	1186	13
Ashfield	338	18	313	7
Ashwell	200	19	181	0
Bedford	461	105	352	4
Belmarsh	897	176	702	19
Birmingham	1444	196	1224	24
Blantyre House	118	2	115	1
Blundeston	514	77	434	3
Brinsford	521	37	483	1
Bristol	607	58	541	7
Brixton	792	285	490	16
Buckley Hall	377	21	356	0
Bullingdon	1081	141	936	4
Bullwood Hall	229	221	5	2
Camp Hill	566	79	450	37
Canterbury	295	281	10	3
Cardiff	819	60	746	13
Castington	371	10	359	2
Channings Wood	722	18	704	0
Chelmsford	692	90	583	19
Coldingley	506	20	486	0
Cookham Wood	86	6	79	1
Dartmoor	620	68	552	0
Deebold	431	10	420	1
Doncaster	1103	80	970	53
Dorchester	226	14	206	6
Dovegate	848	97	750	1
Dover	310	307	0	3
Durham	958	94	857	6
Edmunds Hill	369	90	276	3
Elmley	954	145	794	14

² Figures from Ministry of Justice, (2009b) *Population in Custody Monthly Tables, June 2009, England and Wales*. Ministry of Justice Statistics Bulletin. Available at: <http://www.justice.gov.uk/publications/docs/population-in-custody-06-2009.pdf>

Erlestoke	468	11	457	0
Everthorpe	674	9	665	0
Exeter	531	27	498	7
Featherstone	682	67	614	1
Feltham	680	180	471	29
Ford	529	62	467	0
Forest Bank	1144	88	1032	24
Frankland	734	47	687	0
Full Sutton	577	45	532	0
Garth	817	54	763	0
Gartree	678	62	613	3
Glen Parva	793	55	736	2
Glouceseter	287	21	254	13
Grendon/Spring Hill	516	24	492	0
Guys Marsh	575	89	486	0
Haslar	151	149	0	2
Haverigg	629	17	612	0
Hewell (1)	1344	170	1170	3
High Down	1073	223	822	29
Highpoint	930	177	750	3
Hindley	289	12	273	4
Hollesley Bay	334	8	326	0
Holme House	948	27	918	3
Hull	1018	75	939	4
Huntercombe	260	39	215	5
Kennet	336	6	330	0
Kingston (Portsmouth)	175	18	157	0
Kirkham	568	77	561	0
Kirklevington Grange	270	44	266	0
Lancaster Castle	228	1	227	0
Lancaster Farms	493	18	463	13
Latchmere House	193	5	188	0
Leeds	1157	113	1022	22
Leicester	357	71	280	7
Lewes	664	60	593	10
Leyhill	492	22	470	0
Lincoln	670	85	576	9
Lindholme	1114	254	860	0
Littlehey	711	110	601	0

Liverpool	1337	144	1191	2
Long Lartin	537	82	455	0
Lowdham Grange	685	105	577	3
Maidstone	590	242	347	1
Manchester	1226	163	1023	40
Moorland Open	241	3	238	0
Moorland Closed	771	36	735	0
North Sea Camp	303	4	299	0
Northallerton	232	3	229	0
Norwich	502	59	437	6
Nottingham	545	77	457	11
Onley	692	38	654	0
Parc	1175	43	1126	6
Parkhurst	491	75	410	6
Pentonville	1105	332	741	33
Peterborough	603	114	466	23
Portland	553	68	482	3
Preston	746	37	704	5
Ranby	1054	105	948	1
Reading	242	25	213	4
Risley	1080	123	957	0
Rochester	647	95	551	1
Rye Hill	654	134	519	1
Shepton Mallet	188	6	182	0
Shrewsbury	290	30	257	3
Stafford	735	63	671	0
Standford Hill	450	38	412	0
Stocken	807	47	760	0
Stoke Heath	580	27	550	3
Sudbury	570	16	554	0
Swaleside	826	163	661	2
Swansea	398	26	370	2
Swinfen Hall	616	47	569	0
The Mount	763	207	556	0
The Verne	589	336	249	3
The Wolds	388	12	376	0
Thorn Cross	301	2	298	1
Usk/Prescoed	426	23	403	0
Wakefield	735	69	666	0
Wandsworth	1675	555	1049	71
Warren Hill	188	14	161	13

Wayland	1000	119	878	2
Wealstun	517	22	495	0
Wellingborough	628	110	518	0
Werrington	130	4	120	6
Wetherby	360	8	344	8
Whatton	840	62	778	0
Whitemoor	444	73	369	2
Winchester	689	58	627	4
Woodhill	809	148	640	21
Wormwood Scrubs	1293	465	796	32
Wymott	1127	59	1068	0
TOTAL	79158	10512	67856	791

Women

Establishment	Total Population	Foreign Nationals	UK Nationals	Nationality Unrecorded
Askham Grange	122	2	119	1
Bronzefield	439	98	295	46
Downview	340	79	261	0
Drake Hall	261	44	217	0
East Sutton Park	88	5	83	0
Eastwood Park	317	45	269	3
Foston Hall	217	8	207	2
Holloway	428	133	284	10
Low Newton	311	15	295	0
Morton Hall	328	228	101	0
New Hall	370	29	334	7
Peterborough	347	61	279	7
Send	278	36	241	1
Styal	450	55	391	4
Total Women	4296	838	3375	83
TOTAL	83454	11350	71231	874

APPENDIX III

USEFUL WEBSITES AND ORGANISATIONS

Care for Overseas Prisoners (COP)

COP is a Christian charity that provides help, support and campaigns for the welfare of male foreign prisoners both nationally and internationally.

P O Box 54277
London W14 8WU
Tel: 0773 8371 036
Email: info@careforoverseasprisoners.org
<http://www.careforoverseasprisoners.org>

Clinks

Clinks was established in 1998 to strengthen and develop the partnerships between voluntary and community-based organisations and the Prison and Probation Services in England and Wales. It offers extensive training to voluntary sector groups wishing to volunteer in prisons.

25 Micklegate
York
YO1 6JH
Tel: 01904-673970
Fax: 01904-613756
www.clinks.org

Hibiscus

Hibiscus was set up in 1990 to cater specifically for the special needs of Foreign National and British based Black and Minority Ethnic women in prison. These days it offers case work in nearly all women's prisons in England and Wales as well as a befriending service.

FPWP/ Hibiscus
12 Angel Gate 320 City Road
London EC1V 2PT
Tel: 020 7278 7116
Fax: 020 7837 3339
Email: fpwphibiscus@aol.com
<http://www.hibiscuslondon.org.uk/>

HM Inspectorate of Prisons (HMIP)

HMIP conducts announced and unannounced inspections of all prisons and Young Offender Institutions in England and Wales. It also produces

thematic reports on specific populations and issues. All of its reports are available on its website.

HM Inspectorate of Prisons
First Floor Ashley House
2 Monck Street
London SW1P 2BQ
Tel: 020 7035 2136
Fax: 020 7035 2141
<http://www.justice.gov.uk/inspectors/hmi-prisons/>

HM Prison Service

Website lists all the prison service orders, locations of prison and regulations about visiting and other matters. It is also possible to download copies of the foreign national prisoner handbook.

<http://www.hmprisonservice.gov.uk/>

Howard League for Penal Reform

The Howard League for Penal Reform is a penal reform lobby group. It runs a small legal aid service and produces research on a variety of issues pertaining to prisons.

1 Ardleigh Rd
London
N1 4HS.
Tel: 020 72497373
Fax: 020 7249 7788
Email: info@howardleague.org
www.howardleague.org

Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)

Each Prison and Young Offender Institution (YOI) in England and Wales must have an Independent Monitoring Board (IMB). Board members are appointed by the Home Secretary and are charged with monitoring the rights and well-being of all prisoners within the prison or YOI to which they are appointed. Members of the IMB focus on foreign national prisoners.

2nd Floor Ashley House
2 Monck Street
London SW1P 2BQ
Fax: 020 7035 2250
<http://www.imb.gov.uk/>

Ministry of Justice

Prisons are part of the National Offender Management System (NOMS) which is an arm of the Ministry of Justice. The Ministry of Justice website links to publications on prison statistics.

<http://www.justice.gov.uk/>

The National Association of Official Prison Visitors (NAOPV)

The Association of National Prison Visitors was formed in 1924. It is administered in prisons by the Chaplain's office, though visitors are non-denominational. All prisons should have an official prison visitor and any prisoner may apply for an Official Visitor, whether he/she has visits from family members or friends or not.

Email: info@naopv.com
<http://www.naopv.com/>

New Bridge

New Bridge was founded in 1956 to create links between the offender and the community. It offers a wide range of programmes to help prisoners keep in touch with the outside world and prepare themselves to rejoin it. At The Verne prison New Bridge has, for many years, run a weekly information surgery for foreign national prisoners. There and elsewhere it runs a befriending service, where volunteers write to and visit prisoners over the course of their sentence.

New Bridge Foundation
27A Medway Street
London SW1P 2BD
020 7976 0779
Email: info@newbridgefoundation.org.uk
<http://www.newbridgefoundation.org.uk/>

Prison Advice & Care Trust (PACT)

PACT provides support to prisoners and their families. They run a number of visitor centres based outside prison gates where families and others can find information, advice and support.

Suite C5 , City Cloisters
196 Old Street
London EC1V 9F

Tel:: 020 7490 3139
Fax: 020 7490 0755
Email: info@prisonadvice.org.uk
<http://www.prisonadvice.org.uk/>

Prison Reform Trust

The Prison Reform Trust is a lobby group that offers an information and support service to serving prisoners. Twice a year PRT produces the Bromley briefings that summarise criminal justice statistics.

15 Northburgh Street
London
EC1V 0JR
Tel: 020 7251 5070
Fax: 020 7251 5076
Email: prt@prisonreformtrust.org.uk
www.prisonreformtrust.org.uk

The Poppy Project

The POPPY Project was set up in 2003. It is funded by the Office for Criminal Justice Reform (reporting to the Ministry of Justice) to provide accommodation and support to women who have been trafficked into prostitution. It has 35 bed spaces in houses throughout London. POPPY also provides education, training and lobbying to raise awareness about trafficking and exiting prostitution. This area of POPPY's work is funded by London Councils.

Unit 2.03,
Canterbury Court
1-3 Brixton Road
London SW9 6DE

Tel: 020 7735 2062
<http://www.eaves4women.co.uk/>

Vamos Juntos

Part of Praxis, Vamos Juntos visits and corresponds with Latin American migrants held in UK prisons, making contact with their families and liaising with the prison welfare services on their behalf.

Praxis Community Projects
Pott Street,
London E2 0EF
Tel: 020 7729 7985
Fax: 020 7729 0134
Email: admin@praxis.org.uk,
www.praxis.org.uk

WOMEN IN PRISON

Set up by former prisoner Chris Tchaikovsky in 1983, Women in Prison concentrates on the needs of women in prison. WIP also provides training to criminal justice sector professionals and others working

with women offenders and ex-offenders. Their training course aims to improve agency responses to meeting the needs of women offenders and ex-offenders by providing those working with women offenders and ex-offenders with awareness, knowledge and an understanding of the impact of imprisonment upon women.

347-349 City Road

London

EC1V 1LR

Tel: 020 7841 4760

Fax: 020 7837 0653

<http://www.womeninprison.org.uk/>

REFERENCES

- Bhui, Hindpal Singh. (2004). *Going the Distance: Developing Effective Policy and Practice with Foreign National Prisoners*. London: Prison Reform Trust.
- HMIP (2006). *Foreign National Prisoners: A Thematic Review*. London: HMIP.
- HMIP (2007) *Foreign nationals in prison: A follow-up report*. London: HMCIP.
- HM Prison Service. (2004). *Information and Advice for Foreign National Prisoners*. London: HM Prison Service. Available at: <http://www.hmprisons.gov.uk/resourcecentre/publicationsdocuments/index.asp?cat=127>
- Ministry of Justice, (2009a) *Population in Custody Monthly Tables, March 2009, England and Wales*. Ministry of Justice Statistics Bulletin.
- Ministry of Justice. (2009b). *Population in Custody Monthly Tables, June 2009, England and Wales*. London: HMSO.
- Ministry of Justice. (2009c). *Offender Management Caseload Statistics 2008*. London: HMSO.
- NAO (2009). *The Home Office: Management of Asylum Applications*. London: National Audit Office.
- Phelps, Jerome. (2009). *Detained Lives*. London: LDSG.
- PSO 4410 Visit Booking Guidelines
- PSO 4450 Assisted Prison Visits
- Prison Service Order (PSO) 4630 Immigration and Foreign Nationals in Prison
- PSO 6000 'Foreign National Prisoners liable to removal from the UK: Parole Board responsibility for release decisions' June 21, 2009

PRISON	ADDRESS	TELEPHONE	FAX & EMAIL	CATEGORY
HMP ACKLINGTON	MORPETH, Northumberland NE65 9XF	(01670) 762300	(01670) 762301	M CL C
HMP ALTCOURSE * www.hmpaltcourse.co.uk	Higher Lane, Fazakerley, LIVERPOOL L9 7LH	(0151) 522 2000	(0151) 522 2121	M L
HMP/YOI ASHFIELD* http://www.serco.com/markets/homeaffairs/offendermanagement/juvenilecustody/ashfield/index.asp	Shortwood Road, Pucklechurch BRISTOL BS16 9QJ	(0117) 303 8000	(0117) 303 8001	CL YOI RC J
HMP ASHWELL	OAKHAM, Rutland LE15 7LF	(01572) 884100	(01572) 884101	M CL C
HMP/YOI ASKHAM GRANGE	Askham Richard, YORK YO23 3FT	(01904) 772000	(01904) 772001	F O
HMYOI AYLESBURY	Bierton Road, AYLESBURY, Buckinghamshire HP20 1EH	(01296) 444000	(01296) 444001	YOI(M) CL A RES
HMP BEDFORD	St. Loyes Street, BEDFORD MK40 1HG	(01234) 373000	(01234) 273568	M L
HMP BELMARSH	Western Way, Thamesmead, LONDON SE28 0EB	(020) 8331 4400	(020) 8331 4401	M CL A
HMP BIRMINGHAM	Winson Green Road, BIRMINGHAM B18 4AS	(0121) 345 2500	(0121) 345 2501	M L
HMP BLANTYRE HOUSE	Goudhurst, CRANBROOK, Kent TN17 2NH	(01580) 213200	(01580) 213201	M S-O C
HMP BLUNDESTON	LOWESTOFT, Suffolk NR32 5BG	(01502) 734500	(01502) 734501	M CL C
HMP/YOI BRINSFORD	New Road, Featherstone, WOLVERHAMPTON WV10 7PY	(01902) 533450	(01902) 533451	YOI CL RC J
HMP BRISTOL	19 Cambridge Road, Horfield, BRISTOL BS7 8PS	(0117) 372 3100	(0117) 372 3013	M L
HMP BRIXTON	P O Box 369, Jebb Avenue, LONDON SW2 5XF	(020) 8588 6000	(020) 8588 6191	M L B
HMP BRONZEFIELD * http://www.kalyxservices.com/locations/hmp_bronzefield.aspx	Woodthorpe Road, Ashford, Middlesex TW15 3JZ	(01784) 425690	(01784) 425691	F
HMP BUCKLEY HALL	Buckley Road, ROCHDALE, Lancashire OL12 9DP	(01706) 514300	(01706) 514399	M C
HMP BULLINGDON	P O Box 50, BICESTER, Oxfordshire OX25 1PZ	(01869) 353100	(01869) 353101	M CL C L

PRISON	ADDRESS	TELEPHONE	FAX & EMAIL	CATEGORY
HMP/YOI BULLWOOD HALL	High Road, HOCKLEY, Essex SS5 4TE	(01702) 562800	(01702) 562801	M C
HMP CANTERBURY	46 Longport, CANTERBURY, Kent CT1 1PJ	(01227) 862800	(01227) 862801	M L
HMP/RC CARDIFF	Knox Road, CARDIFF CF24 0UG	(02920) 923100	(02920) 923318	M L RC
HMP/YOI CASTINGTON	MORPETH, Northumberland NE65 9XG	(01670) 382100	(01670) 382101	YOI CL J
HMP CHANNINGS WOOD	Denbury, NEWTON ABBOTT, Devon TQ12 6DW	(01803) 814600	(01803) 814601	M CL C
HMP/YOI CHELMSFORD	200 Springfield Road, CHELMSFORD Essex CM2 6LQ	(01245) 552000	(01245) 552001	M L RC
HMP COLDINGLEY	Bisley, WOKING, Surrey GU24 9EX	(01483) 804300	(01483) 804427	M CL C
HMP COOKHAM WOOD	ROCHESTER, Kent ME1 3LU	(01634) 202500	(01634) 202501	F CL
HMP DARTMOOR	Princetown, YELVERTON, Devon PL20 6RR	(01822) 322000	(01822) 322001	M CL C
HMYOI DEERBOLT	Bowes Road, BARNARD CASTLE, County Durham DL12 9BG	(01833) 633200	(01833) 633201	CL YOI
HMP/YOI DONCASTER * http://www.serco.com/markets/homeaffairs/offendermanagement/adultcustody/doncaster/index.asp	Off North Bridge, Marshgate, DONCASTER, South Yorkshire DN5 8UX	(01302) 760870	(01302) 760851	M L
HMP DORCHESTER	North Square, DORCHESTER, Dorset DT1 1JD	(01305) 714500	(01305) 714501	M L RC
HMP DOVEGATE* http://www.serco.com/markets/homeaffairs/offendermanagement/adultcustody/dovegate/index.asp	Uttoxeter, Staffordshire ST14 8XR	(01283) 829400	(01283) 820066	M CL B
IRC DOVER	The Citadel, Western Heights, DOVER, Kent CT17 9DR	(01304) 246400	(01304) 246401	CL IR C
HMP DOWNVIEW	Sutton Lane, SUTTON, Surrey SM2 5PD	(020) 8196 6300	(020) 8196 6301	F CL C
HMP/YOI DRAKE HALL	ECCLESHALL, Staffordshire ST21 6LQ	(01785) 774100	(01785) 774010	F S-O YOI
HMP DURHAM	Old Elvet, DURHAM DH1 3HU	(0191) 332 3400	(0191) 332 3401	M RES

PRISON	ADDRESS	TELEPHONE	FAX & EMAIL	CATEGORY
HMP/YOI EAST SUTTON PARK	Sutton Valence, MAIDSTONE, Kent ME17 3DF	(01622) 845000	(01622) 845001	F O
HMP/YOI EASTWOOD PARK	Falfield, WOTTON-UNDER-EDGE, Gloucestershire GL12 8DB	(01454) 382100	(01454) 382101	F L
HMP EDMUNDS HILL	Stradishall, Newmarket, Suffolk CB8 9YN	(01440) 743500	(01440) 743560	M C
HMP ELMLEY (Sheppey Cluster)	Church Road, EASTCHURCH, Sheerness, Kent ME12 4DZ	(01795) 882000	(01795) 882001	M C L B L
HMP ERLESTOKE	DEVIZES, Wiltshire SN10 5TU	(01380) 814250	(01380) 814273	M C L C
HMP EVERTHORPE	BROUGH, East Yorkshire, HU15 1RB	(01430) 426500	(01430) 426501	M C L C
HMP/YOI EXETER	New North Road, EXETER, Devon EX4 4EX	(01392) 415650	(01392) 415691	M L R C
HMP FEATHERSTONE	New Road, Wolverhampton, Staffordshire WV10 7PU	(01902) 703000	(01902) 703001	M C L C
HMP/YOI FELTHAM	Bedfont Road, FELTHAM, Middlesex TW13 4ND	(020) 8844 5000	(020) 8844 5001	RC CL M YOI J
HMP FORD	ARUNDEL, West Sussex BN18 0BX	(01903) 663000	(01903) 663001	M O D
HMP/YOI FOREST BANK* http://www.kalyxservices.com/locations/hmp_forest_bank.aspx	Agecroft Road, Pendlebury, MANCHESTER M27 8FB	(0161) 925 7000	(0161) 925 7001	M L YOI
HMP FOSTON HALL	Foston, DERBY, Derbyshire DE65 5DN	(01283) 584300	(01283) 584301	F C L
HMP FRANKLAND	Brasside, DURHAM DH1 5YD	(0191) 332 3000	(0191) 332 3001	M C L A
HMP FULL SUTTON	Full Sutton, YORK YO41 1PS	(01759) 475100	(01759) 371206	M C L A
HMP GARTH	Ulnes Walton Lane, Leyland, PRESTON, Lancashire PR26 8NE	(01772) 443300	(01772) 443301	M C L B
HMP GARTREE	Gallow Field Road, MARKET HARBOROUGH, Leicestershire LE16 7RP	(01858) 426600	(01858) 426601	M C L B
HMYOI/RC GLEN PARVA	Tigers Road, Wigston, LEICESTER LE8 4TN	(0116) 228 4100	(0116) 228 4000	RC CL YOI
HMP/YOI GLOUCESTER	Barrack Square, GLOUCESTER GL1 2JN	(01452) 453000	(01452) 453001	M L R C B
HMP GRENDON	Grendon Underwood, AYLESBURY, Buckinghamshire HP18 0TL	(01296) 443000	(01296) 443001	M C L B

PRISON	ADDRESS	TELEPHONE	FAX & EMAIL	CATEGORY
HMP/YOI GUYS MARSH	SHAFTESBURY, Dorset SP7 0AH	(01747) 856400	(01747) 856401	M CL C YOI
IRC HASLAR (Immigration Removal Centre)	2 Dolphin Way, GOSPORT, Hampshire PO12 2AW	(02392) 604000	(02392) 604001	HC
HMP HAVERIGG	MILLOM, Cumbria LA18 4NA	(01229) 713000	(01229) 713001	M CL C
HMP HEWELL	Hewell Lane, REDDITCH, Worcestershire, B97 6QQ	(01527) 785000	(01527) 785001	M B C D (varied sites)
HMP HIGH DOWN	Sutton Lane, SUTTON, Surrey SM2 5PJ	(020) 7147 6300	(020) 7147 6301	M L
HMP HIGHPOINT	Stradishall, NEWMARKET, Suffolk, CB8 9YG	(01440) 743100	(01440) 743092	M CL C
<i>HMYOI HINDLEY</i>	Gibson Street, Bickershaw, WIGAN, Lancashire WN2 5TH	(01942) 663100	(01942) 663101	RC CL YOI
HMP HOLLESLEY BAY	WOODBIDGE, Suffolk IP12 3JW	(01394) 412400	(01394) 410115	M O D YOI(CL)
HMP/YOI HOLLOWAY	Parkhurst Road, LONDON N7 0NU	(020) 7979 4400	(020) 7979 4401	FL
HMP HOLME HOUSE	Holme House Road, STOCKTON-ON-TEES, Cleveland TS18 2QU	(01642) 744000	(01642) 744001	M CL L B
HMP HULL	Hedon Road, HULL HU9 5LS	(01482) 282200	(01482) 282400	M L YOI(CL)
HMYOI HUNTERCOMBE	Huntercombe Place, Nuffield, HENLEY-ON-THAMES, Oxfordshire RG9 5SB	(01491) 643100	(01491) 643101	CL YOI J
HMP ISLE OF WIGHT	Clissold Road Newport Isle of Wight PO30 5RS	(01983) 556 300		M B C
HMP KENNET	HM Prison Kennet Parkbourn, Maghull LIVERPOOL, Merseyside L31 1HX	(0151) 2133000	(0151) 2133103	M C
HMP KINGSTON	122 Milton Road Portsmouth PO3 6AS	023 9295 3100	023 9295 3181	M B C
HMP KIRKHAM	Freckleton Road, PRESTON, Lancashire PR4 2RN	(01772) 675400	(01772) 675401	M O D
HMP KIRKLEVINGTON GRANGE	YARM, Cleveland TS15 9PA	(01642) 792600	(01642) 792601	M RES C D

PRISON	ADDRESS	TELEPHONE	FAX & EMAIL	CATEGORY
HMP LANCASTER CASTLE	The Castle, LANCASTER, Lancashire LA1 1YL	(01524) 565100	(01524) 565022	M CL C
HMP/YOI LANCASTER FARMS	Far Moor Lane, Stone Row Head, Quernmore Road, LANCASTER LA1 3QZ	(01524) 563450	(01524) 563451	RC CL J YOI
HMP LATCHMERE HOUSE	Church Road, Ham Common, RICHMOND, Surrey TW10 5HH	(020) 8588 6650	(020) 8588 6698	M RES D
HMP LEEDS	Armley, LEEDS, West Yorkshire LS12 2TJ	(0113) 203 2600	(0113) 203 2601	M L
HMP LEICESTER	Welford Road, LEICESTER LE2 7AJ	(0116) 2283000	(0116) 2283001	M L
HMP/YOI LEWES	Brighton Road, LEWES, East Sussex BN7 1EA	(01273) 785100	(01273) 785101	M L YOI(CL)
HMP LEYHILL	WOTTON-UNDER-EDGE, Gloucestershire GL12 8BT	(01454) 264000	(01454) 264001	M O D
HMP LINCOLN	Greetwell Road, LINCOLN LN2 4BD	(01522) 663000	(01522) 663001	M L
HMP IRC LINDHOLME	Bawtry Road, Hatfield Woodhouse, DONCASTER DN7 6EE	(01302) 524700	(01302) 524750	M CL C O IRC
HMP LITTLEHEY	Perry, HUNTINGDON, Cambridgeshire PE28 0SR	(01480) 333000	(01480) 333070	M CL C
HMP LIVERPOOL	68 Hornby Road, LIVERPOOL L9 3DF	(0151) 530 4000	(0151) 530 4001	M L
HMP LONG LARTIN	South Littleton, EVESHAM, Worcestershire WR11 8TZ	(01386) 295100	(01386) 295101	M CL A
HMP LOWDHAM GRANGE* http://www.serco.com/markets/homeaffairs/offendermanagement/adultcustody/lowdham/index.asp	LOWDHAM Nottinghamshire NG14 7DA	(0115) 966 9200	(0115) 966 9220	M CL B
HMYOI LOW NEWTON	Brasside, DURHAM DH1 5YA	(0191) 376 4000	(0191) 376 4001	F L CL
HMP MAIDSTONE	36 County Road, MAIDSTONE, Kent ME14 1UZ	(01622) 775300	(01622) 775301	M CL C
HMP MANCHESTER	Southall Street, MANCHESTER M60 9AH	(0161) 8175600	(0161) 8175601	M CL A
HMP/YOI MOORLAND OPEN	Thorne Road, Hatfield, DONCASTER, South Yorkshire DN7 6EL	(01405) 746500	(01405) 746501	M O D YOI
HMP/YOI MOORLAND CLOSED	Bawtry Road, Hatfield Woodhouse, DONCASTER, South Yorkshire DN7 6BW	(01302) 523000	(01302) 523001	M CL C YOI

PRISON	ADDRESS	TELEPHONE	FAX & EMAIL	CATEGORY
HMP MORTON HALL	Swinderby, LINCOLN LN6 9PT	(01522) 666700	(01522) 666750	F O
HMP THE MOUNT	Molyneaux Avenue, Bovingdon, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, Hertfordshire HP3 0NZ	(01442) 836300	(01442) 836301	M CL C
HMP/YOI NEW HALL	Dial Wood, Flockton, WAKEFIELD, West Yorkshire WF4 4XX	(01924) 803000	(01924) 803001	F CL YOI(CL)
HMYOI NORTHALLERTON	15A East Road, NORTHALLERTON, North Yorkshire DL6 1NW	(01609) 785100	(01609) 785101	YOI CL
HMP NORTH SEA CAMP	Freiston, BOSTON, Lincolnshire PE22 0QX	(01205) 769300	(01205) 769301	M O D
HMP/YOI NORWICH	Knox Road, NORWICH, Norfolk NR1 4LU	(01603) 708600	(01603) 708601	M L YOI(CL)
HMP NOTTINGHAM	Perry Road, Sherwood, NOTTINGHAM NG5 3AG	(0115) 872 3000	(0115) 872 3001	M L
HMYOI ONLEY	Willoughby, RUGBY, Warwickshire CV23 8AP	(01788) 523400	(01788) 523401	YOI CL J
HMP/YOI PARC * http://www.g4s.com/uk/uk-what-we-do/uk-justiceservices/uk-prisons/uk-hmp_parc.htm	Heol Hopcyn John, BRIDGEND, Mid-Glamorgan CF35 6AP	(01656) 300200	(01656) 300201	M L B YOI(CL,RC)
HMP PENTONVILLE	Caledonian Road, LONDON N7 8TT	(020) 7023 7000	(020) 7023 7001	M L
HMP PETERBOROUGH* http://www.kalyxservices.com/locations/hmp_peterborough.aspx	HM Peterborough Saville Road PETERBOROUGH PE3 7PD	(01733) 217500	01733 217501	M F L RC
HMYOI PORTLAND	The Grove, PORTLAND, Dorset DT5 1DL	(01305) 715600	(01305) 715601	YOI CL
HMP/YOI PRESCOED	Coed-y-Paen, Pontypool, Gwent NP4 0TB	(01291) 675000	(01291) 675158	M CL C O D YOI(O)
HMP PRESTON	2 Ribbleson Lane, PRESTON, Lancashire PR1 5AB	(01772) 444550	(01772) 444551	M L
HMP RANBY	RETFORD, Nottinghamshire DN22 8EU	(01777) 862000	(01777) 862001	M CL C
HMP/YOI READING	Forbury Road, READING, Berkshire RG1 3HY	(0118) 9085000	(0118) 9085001	YOI RC
HMP RISLEY	Risley, WARRINGTON, Cheshire WA3 6BP	(01925) 733000	(01925) 733001	M CL C
HMP ROCHESTER	1 Fort Road, ROCHESTER, Kent ME1 3QS	(01634) 803100	(01634) 803101	YOI

PRISON	ADDRESS	TELEPHONE	FAX & EMAIL	CATEGORY
HMP RYE HILL* http://www.hmpryehill.co.uk/	Willoughby, RUGBY Warwickshire CV23 8SZ	(01788) 523300	(01788) 523311	M B
HMP SEND	Ripley Road, Send, WOKING, Surrey GU23 7LJ	(01483) 471000	(01483) 471001	F CL
HMP SHEPTON MALLETT	Cornhill, SHEPTON MALLETT, Somerset BA4 5LU	(01749) 823300	(01749) 823301	M CL C
HMP SHREWSBURY	The Dana, SHREWSBURY, Shropshire SY1 2HR	(01743) 273000	(01743) 273001	M L B
HMP SPRING HILL,	Grendon Underwood, AYLESBURY, Buckinghamshire HP18 0TL	(01296) 443000	(01296) 443001	M O D
HMP STAFFORD	54 Gaol Road, STAFFORD ST16 3AW	(01785) 773000	(01785) 773001	M CL C
HMP STANDFORD HILL (Sheppey Cluster)	Church Road, EASTCHURCH, Sheerness, Kent ME12 4AA	(01795) 884500	(01795) 884638	M O D
HMP STOCKEN	Stocken Hall Road, STRETTON, Oakham, Rutland LE15 7RD	(01780) 795100	(01780) 410767	M CL C
HMYOI STOKE HEATH	Stoke Heath, MARKET DRAYTON, Shropshire TF9 2JL	(01630) 636000	(01630) 636001	YOI CL J
HMP/YOI STYAL	Styal, WILMSLOW, Cheshire SK9 4HR	(01625) 553000	(01625) 553001	F CL L
HMP SUDBURY	Ashbourne, DERBYSHIRE DE6 5HW	(01283) 584000	(01283) 584001	M O D
HMP SWALESIDE (Sheppey Cluster)	Brabazon Road, EASTCHURCH, Isle of Sheppey, Kent ME12 4AX	(01795) 804100	(01795) 804200	M CL B
HMP SWANSEA	200 Oystermouth Road, SWANSEA, West Glamorgan SA1 3SR	(01792) 485300	(01792) 485430	M L RC(YOI)
HMYOI SWINFEN HALL	Swinfen, LICHFIELD, Staffordshire WS14 9QS	(01543) 484000	(01543) 484001	YOI CL
HMYOI THORN CROSS	Arley Road, Appleton Thorn, WARRINGTON, Cheshire WA4 4RL	(01925) 805100	(01925) 805101	YOI O J
HMP USK	47 Maryport Street, USK, Gwent NP15 1XP	(01291) 671600	(01291) 671752	M C CL
HMP THE VERNE	The Verne, PORTLAND, Dorset DT5 1EQ	(01305) 825000	(01305) 825001	M CL C
HMP WAKEFIELD	5 Love Lane, WAKEFIELD, West Yorkshire WF2 9AG	(01924) 246000	(01924) 246001	M A
HMP WANDSWORTH	PO Box 757, Heathfield Road, LONDON SW18 3HS	(020) 8588 4000	(020) 8588 4001	M L

PRISON	ADDRESS	TELEPHONE	FAX & EMAIL	CATEGORY
HMYOI WARREN HILL	WOODBIDGE, Suffolk IP12 3JW	(01394) 633400	(01394) 633401	YOI CL
HMP WAYLAND	Griston, THETFORD, Norfolk IP25 6RL	(01953) 804100	(01953) 804220	M CL C
HMP WEALSTUN	WETHERBY, West Yorkshire LS23 7AZ	(01937) 444400	(01937) 444401	M CL C O D
HMP WELLINGBOROUGH	Millers Park, Doddington Road, WELLINGBOROUGH, Northamptonshire NN8 2NH	(01933) 232700	(01933) 232701	M CL C
HMYOI WERRINGTON	Werrington, STOKE-ON- TRENT, Staffordshire ST9 0DX	(01782) 463300	(01782) 463301	J
HMYOI WETHERBY	York Road, WETHERBY, West Yorkshire LS22 5ED	(01937) 544200	(01937) 544201	CL J
HMP WHATTON	14 Cromwell Road, NOTTINGHAM NG13 9FQ	(01949) 803200	(01949) 803201	M CL C
HMP WHITEMOOR	Longhill Road, MARCH, Cambridgeshire PE15 0PR	(01354) 602350	(01354) 602351	M A
HMP WINCHESTER	Romsey Road, WINCHESTER, Hampshire SO22 5DF	(01962) 723000	(01962) 723001	M L B
HMP WOLDS * http://www.hmpwolds.co.uk/	Everthorpe, BROUGH, East Yorkshire HU15 2JZ	(01430) 428000	(01430) 428001	M L
HMP WOODHILL	Tattenhoe Street, MILTON KEYNES, Buckinghamshire MK4 4DA	(01908) 722000	(01908) 867063	M L A
HMP WORMWOOD SCRUBS	PO Box 757, Du Cane Road, LONDON W12 0AE	(020) 8588 3200	(020) 8588 3201	M L
HMP WYMOTT	Ulnes Walton Lane, Leyland, PRESTON PR26 8LW	(01772) 442000	(01772) 442001	M CL C