

**Harris Review Panel Meeting 19**  
**10:30 – 16.30, 19 February 2015**  
**8.29B, 102 Petty France, London, SW1H 9AJ**

**Present:** Lord Toby Harris (TH), Stephen Cragg (SC), Meng Aw Yong (MAY), Philip Leach (PL) Dinesh Maganty (DM), Graham Towl (GT), Richard Shepherd (RS), Deborah Coles (DC), Deborah Browne (DB), Robyn Malan de Merindol (RM) Graham MacKenzie (GM)

**Apologies:** Matilda MacAttram (MM)

**Item 1: Minutes**

1. The minutes of meetings on 5 February and 19 February were accepted as a true record.

**Item 2: Action Log**

2. The panel were updated on Actions. The panel's attention was drawn Action 77 which concerns PIN phones, and for which we have not yet received an adequate response.

**Action 131: Secretariat is to follow up with NOMS and Private Office about whether anything has been done to improve the situation with regards to PIN access and time taken to get numbers on phones.**

**Item 3: Disclosure of information and information sharing**

3. DM told the meeting that he is not aware of any legal challenge regarding a breach of confidence. The discussion raised the following issues:

- In an acute situation such as police custody someone may be reluctant to share their information, for example if they are identified as impulsive this may be used to support a probability of guilt later on in court. Prison is a more settled place and the person will have entered a more settled less acute phase;
- Professionals don't share information and sometimes the patient isn't asked if they agree to sharing information;
- The panel need to consider if the duty under Article 2 to share information applies when the risk is to self rather than to others.

4. The papers were discussed highlighting the positive obligation to share information in a custodial setting and how families can be involved appropriately. Consent to share information should be sought proactively by a trusted practitioner and revisited if necessary. The Review should go back to the bodies who have signed up to the 'Information Sharing and Suicide Prevention Consensus Statement' and ask them to clarify if this also applies to people who have had their liberty taken away by the state, with reference to a 'duty of care'. The context of custody should be explicitly acknowledged.

**Action 132: Secretariat draft request to the bodies who have signed the *'Information sharing and suicide prevention consensus statement'*, requesting the context of custody and duty of care to be explicitly acknowledged.**

**Action 133: Secretariat to draft letter to the GMC for their consultation on confidentiality, concerning Article 2 consent in the custody setting.**

**Item 4: Discussion on Managing Vulnerability and ACCT**

5. The draft paper was discussed and points made to develop the themes concerned vulnerability ACCT, the Listener scheme and the support by management for the scheme, identifying a responsible officer and a Care Plan Approach:

**Action 134: Secretariat to pursue the lack of detail concerning ACCT in the Audit.**

**Item 5: Discussion of Family Contact and Liaison**

6: The draft paper was discussed and points made to develop the themes concerned the value and importance of families, PIN phones, the value of videoconference visits, family visiting facilities and practice. The early days risks of self-harm and suicide and how to mitigate this were discussed.

**Action 135: DC to contact VSOs to identify good practice around information packs for families.**

**Item 6: The context of Young Adulthood in custody**

7. The content of this section was discussed in the light of the evidence the Review had obtained. Points made in discussion of this section concerned a detailed discussion of maturity including social, emotional and physical maturity, minority groups and the problems of stereotyping, the use of remand and alternatives and formally identifying YAs as a discreet group.

8. It was agreed that there was no easy answer to whether young adults were best accommodated together or separately. It was felt that it was more important to look at what happens to them when they are there, rather than where they are. The importance of a distinct NOMS lead with accountability for young adults was discussed.

**Action 136: Secretariat to check that the profile of offences in the cohort is in line with the offences of this age group overall.**

**Action 137: Secretariat to check if there has been a response from Local Governments to questions concerning Care Leavers.**

**Action 138: SC to provide information on the health service charging LAs for care.**

**Item 7: Liaison and Diversion**

9. The Review recognised that some people have to be in custody and will acknowledge that in the report. Points made in discussion for this section of the report concerned appropriate disposals for mentally ill people, alternatives to custody, and the falling away of services when the age of 18 is reached. The cost effectiveness of early intervention in people's lives where there is risk of harm due to factors including, family breakdown, violence, bereavement and mental health issues and disability and the apparent lack of services such as CAMHS.