

**FORUM FOR PREVENTING DEATHS IN CUSTODY
MEETING 13 JUNE 2006**

MINUTES

Present:

Johh Wadham	Chair
Nigel Hancock	Safer Custody Group, NOMS
Stephen Shaw	Prisons and Probation Ombudsman
David Monk	Youth Justice Board
Claire McPherson	Youth Justice Board
Paul Fenning	HMCIP
Hazel Banks	Prison Service
Kate Caston	High Secure Hospitals, DH
Mary Piper	DH
Kieron Murphy	DH and Home Office
Jo Sherlock	DH
Rachael Hunter	DH
Richard Bates	ACPO
Selena Lynch	Coroners Society
Forbes Gallagher	HMIC
Craig Jennings	Mental Health Act Commission
John Crawley	IPCC
Ian Bynoe	IPCC
Nicholas Long	IPCC
Tom Burnham	IPCC
Deborah Coles	INQUEST
Alan Hollett	IND
Gordon Davison	NPD
Jerry Petherick	Private sector prisons
Kate Eves	Secretary
Baroness Vivien Stern	Joint Committee on Human Rights
Judith Bernstein	DCA

Item 1

Welcome and apologies

1. Apologies were received from Brian Pollett, IND (represented by Alan Hollett); John Scott, NPD (represented by Gordon Davison); Peter Todd, HMIC (represented by Forbes Gallagher), Alex Marshall (Richard Bates attended) and Richard Bradshaw.

2. John Wadham welcomed all to the meeting and asked that Members introduce themselves and explain whether they had attended the Forum's previous meetings. It was noted that there were several new additions to the Forum:

- David Monk and Claire McPherson from the Youth Justice Board
- Kate Caston from High Secure Hospitals
- Deborah Coles from INQUEST
- Hazel Banks from the Prison Service

Forum10/06.01 June Minutes

- Keiron Murphy from DOH
- Jerry Petherick from private sector prisons.

3. Kate Eves explained that she had taken up the secretariat role in February and had been working part time for the Forum since then. She said that funding had been agreed for the post to be full time and that she would be taking this role on from 1 July to continue until March 2008.

4. The Chair also welcomed two guests to the meeting; Baroness Vivien Stern from the Joint Committee on Human Rights and Judith Bernstein from the Department for Constitutional Affairs. It was noted that Ian Bynoe would be joining the meeting for item 3 in his capacity as IPCC commissioner for learning lessons.

Item 2 Matters arising

Minutes of previous meeting on 6 February 2006

5. There were no comments on the minutes of the last meeting. Referring to Annex B of the minutes, John Wadham confirmed that the first five action points had been addressed and asked for feedback from those responsible for taking forward the remaining action points.

6. PER form

In Alex Marshal's absence, Richard Bates reiterated the reasons why the Prisoner Escort Record (PER) form is under review. The form should be used every time a detainee is transferred within the criminal justice system; it is a key tool for capturing pertinent information about a detained person and should be used to communicate information about risk and vulnerability to staff. Questions have previously been raised both about the accurate completion of the form and whether the form is fit for purpose. Richard said that the PER form had been under review for at least 18 months and that NOMS are due to issue draft proposals imminently. It is anticipated that the proposals will include a provision to establish a quality assurance system and to address issues of inadequate completion. In the longer term, proposals may also include the use of a "PER passport" to negate the need for a new PER form every time a detainee is transferred within the criminal justice system. Ultimately, it is likely to be proposed that a computerised version of PER forms is used. It is acknowledged that this will raise issues around resources and the compatibility of IT systems.

Richard added that work was underway for PER forms to be used within the immigration estate. Nigel Hancock said that the report into the death of Zahid Mubarek (due to report at the end of June) is likely to add to any discussion about the PER form and that the Forum may wish to return to this issue at a later date.

Nicholas Long asked for clarification on who owns the PER form and questioned whether the Forum needed to consult with an editorial board. There was discussion over whether the form is owned by the Home Office and Nigel Hancock undertook to seek clarification on this and to report back in the October meeting.

Action: PER forms to be discussed as a matter arising at the October meeting. Nigel Hancock, in liaison with Kate Eves, to report back on who has ownership of the form.

7. PNC

Richard Bates reported that there had been little progress in this area. There continued to be a debate between ACPO and the Prison Service over prisons having full read and write access to PNC. Richard said that issues of ensuring accuracy of data and the limitations on adding free text to PNC were both still contentious. Hazel Banks explained that all prisons currently have access to a PNC terminal to perform checks but that they operate a cluster approach whereby one prison in an area will have a PNC terminal and others will have to approach them to request information. It was also noted that a new Prison Service Order requires that all prisons agree a protocol with their local PNC bureau on how they will communicate information about suicide risk.

It was proposed that ACC Feavyour (the ACPO lead on PNC) is invited to the October meeting to discuss how this can be progressed.

It was felt that there was a need to clarify whether each individual prison would need a PNC terminal. Questions were raised over the point at which a PNC check is carried out on a prisoner and what the specific purpose of the check is. PNC checks are frequently carried out by security departments who are then responsible for disseminating the results. It was considered that it would be helpful to know whether PNC checks could be carried out when a person is first received into prison. Hazel Banks, in liaison with Kate Eves, agreed to look into this and report back to the October meeting.

Action: Kate Eves to invite ACC Feavyour to October meeting.

Action: Hazel Banks to report back to October meeting on feasibility of PNC checks being carried out during prison reception procedures.

8. Post release deaths

Selena Lynch said that she had met with Alex Marshall regarding Coroners having access to PNC. Coroners would need to be given specific permission to have access to the system and the current lack of resources within the Coronial system means that there is little chance of this being taken further at present. In addition, as PNC does not record every custodial episode it is unclear whether it would provide Coroners with any assistance in identifying post release deaths. Mary Piper added that some information might be extracted from the national confidential inquiry database but she had been surprised to learn that there is no national database which records all deaths. Such a database would prove useful in analysing specific types of death (such as those that are drugs related) and in comparing patterns in regions. It was suggested that deaths could be reported to the Office for National Statistics. Selena undertook to continue discussions on identification of post release deaths with contacts provided by Mary Piper and to report back at the October meeting.

Nicholas Long added that early indications were that data collection on suicides following release from police custody was not accurate and this was being taken forward with ACPO. A definition for what is to be considered a post release death is being circulated and it is proposed that any death occurring within 7 days of release from police custody will be referred to the IPCC. It was acknowledged that there will be an onus upon police forces to effectively identify individuals who have been in

Forum10/06.01 June Minutes

their custody, and that this is an especially onerous task when a person may have been detained by one force but have died in the jurisdiction of another.

Action: Selena Lynch to report back any progress on identifying post release deaths at the October meeting.

9. Information sharing by health professionals

In Richard Bradshaw's absence, Keiron Murphy explained the structure and purpose of the 'Extending Offender Health Support' programme that the Department of Health and Home Office are sponsoring. It includes several workstreams and Kieron directed members to consult his paper Forum06/06.02 for further details. The main two work streams for members to note are those regarding data flows and information sharing. The Department of Health has engaged with NACRO on this work and their first meeting took place in May. The working group will meet bi-monthly and Keiron will report on progress when appropriate.

10. Prisoner resettlement packages

Mary Piper advised that the information on health issues available to those being released is now available in 40 languages. IND will be able to make use of this information although some of the contact information contained in the packs is regional so this will need to be addressed.

11. Report to Ministers

Nigel Hancock said that his group had reported back to Ministers and that, if necessary, this will be done again should the Ministerial responsibilities change. Nigel is meeting with Baroness Scotland in two weeks time and will be discussing how the Ministerial Roundtable on Suicides in Prisons may develop in the future. Questions had been raised over whether it might be appropriate to include representatives from other criminal justice agencies. It was also raised that it might be appropriate for the Department of Constitutional Affairs to be represented at the Roundtable.

Mapping the membership of other committees

12. Members were asked to consider whether they were aware of any additional committees or groups that the Forum may want to liaise with. It was noted that the Coroner's Society does not sit on the Suicide Prevention Strategy Group as had been suggested. Members agreed that it would be useful for the Forum to share agendas, minutes and papers with the other committees mentioned and this will be taken forward by the Forum's secretary. It was also agreed that members who sit on other committees in addition to the Forum will report back on matters of interest when this is necessary. Members were in support of Ministers being brought together to discuss the development of the committees and how they may complement each other. It was agreed that there may be scope for arranging joint meeting between the committee's chairs and other members at a future date.

Action: Kate Eves to approach the secretaries of the Ministerial Roundtable and Suicide Prevention Strategy Group to discuss the sharing of agendas, minutes and papers.

13. Potential additions to the Forum membership

Forum10/06.01 June Minutes

John Wadham said that members could feel encouraged that those working in the relevant sectors are aware of the Forum's existence and that there is an enthusiasm for being involved. It was agreed that, in order to prevent the Forum becoming too large to be effective in bringing about change, there should be no expansion to its membership. It was agreed that the Forum should engage appropriately with organisations outside its membership and that members with close working relationships with organisations outside the Forum could act as a liaison point between them and the group. Members were in support of establishing workstreams to include additional expertise from outside the Forum, and it was also agreed that the group should remain flexible in the future if it is felt that its work is being hampered by the need for additional expertise.

Richard Bates suggested that if the Forum is to take on a learning the lessons role in future then the current membership may need to be re-thought. John Wadham suggested that if each of the member organisations has a seat at the table then members may occasionally want additional people to attend but they will need to "sit behind" the representing member.

Nigel Hancock questioned whether current representation from the Home Office appropriately included police sectors. He and John Wadham agreed to discuss how to ensure that Home Office representation at the Forum included suitable representation of police interests.

Nigel also acknowledged that an issue arose in relation to the relationship between the Ministerial Roundtable and the Forum and it was agreed that he and John Wadham might need to take these issues up with Ministers.

Action: Nigel Hancock and John Wadham to discuss taking forward issues around Home Office representation and the relationship between the Forum and the Ministerial Roundtable.

Promoting the Forum

14. It was suggested that some changes needed to be made to the wording of the press release to ensure that healthcare professionals also feel engaged with the work of the Forum. In addition, it was noted that the use of the term "wardens" in the media launch strategy needed to be changed. Kate Eves agreed to make these amendments and asked that members contact her by 20 June with any additional comments. Kate said that it was hoped that members could suggest contacts for trade press that may be interested in featuring an article about the Forum. Members were in support of the suggested website and were told that Kate would approach them individually to discuss putting a link to their organisation on the Forum's website. It was also hoped that members may be interested in providing a link on their website to the Forum's own website and in publicising the press release there.

There was a discussion about the timescale for launching the website and John Wadham said that once comments had been received back and the website was finalised it would go live. It is intended that the Forum's agenda, minutes and papers will be published on the website. Members were reassured that the minutes will not be verbatim and that they will get the opportunity to comment on them before they are published.

Gordon Davison commented that the link between probation and the Forum may not be immediately obvious to those who access the probation service website. He

Forum10/06.01 June Minutes

suggested that a form of words may need to be added to the Forum's website to clarify NPD's role.

Action: Kate Eves to amend press release following feedback from members, and to reflect comments made at the meeting.

Action: Kate to liaise with National Probation Directorate regarding wording on the Forum's website.

Item 3

How organisations learn and share

John Wadham emphasised that this agenda item was the key issue for the meeting and asked that members discuss each institution type in turn.

15. Prisons

Stephen Shaw introduced his paper by outlining how the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman's Office (PPO) has now conducted some 400 death in custody investigations. He explained that in the first two years the office had been undertaking such investigations, it had lacked much of the necessary infrastructure. The office does not have any research staff or an IT system which is conducive to carrying out analysis. Nevertheless, the reports published on the website will in due course form a unique archive. The PPO has little or no information on inquest findings or on the findings of investigations into deaths in the military, in psychiatric settings or in other countries. Data on PPO investigations currently has to be extracted manually and whilst this is currently feasible, if time consuming, it will become less and less so as the number of investigations grows.

Stephen said that there has been little or no academic interest in the work of the PPO and that the scrutiny of research would help the office further improve its practices.

A positive step forward is the agreement of the Prison Service to share internal reports on near deaths with PPO. There was a discussion over PPO's investigation of near deaths and Stephen clarified that PPO is currently investigating a near death and will likely be carrying out at least one other such investigation. If the PPO were to take on the investigation of all near deaths in prisons, there would be huge resource implications. Nigel Hancock said that he considered it likely that near deaths would be investigated independently in the future. It was acknowledged that at least as much learning can result from investigating near deaths as from actual deaths.

Kate Caston suggested that it would be helpful to know how the definition of near deaths in other settings compared to the reporting definitions of Serious Untoward Incidents in the health sector.

Mary Piper mentioned a study due to be carried out in Oxford. The study will pair 50 women who have been involved in near deaths with 50 who have not. Mary believes the study is currently at the ethical approval stage.

It was noted by Paul Fenning that there can appear to be a lack of urgency to address the issue of near deaths in some prisons. Deborah Coles said that the Forum needs to be instrumental in getting issues such as near deaths higher on the agenda for organisations and to encourage a sense of urgency in their responses.

Forum10/06.01 June Minutes

Deborah told members that INQUEST is in the process of finalising a report on families' experiences of contentious deaths and that one of the frustrations experienced by families was a lack of a final report that encompasses all of the findings about the death, including those reached at the inquest, and the organisation's response to it.

Selena Lynch commented that she was surprised to learn that PPO are not routinely advised of inquest dates. Stephen Shaw said that in natural cause deaths investigators were not always made aware and Selena undertook to report this back to other Coroners and to remind them of the need to keep the PPO informed.

Nigel Hancock commented that there is no formal system in place for rule 43 reports to be fed back to those organisations that may have an interest, but that SCG was building up a database of these reports and was willing to share this information. SCG has a unit dedicated to scrutinising PPO reports and as part of its role it captures recommendations and the resulting action plans. It also looks at inspection reports and Coroner's rule 43 reports. Despite a reduction in the head count of SCG, there is a continuing commitment to this work.

It was noted that one of the key questions in addressing how organisations learn is to ask what happens to recommendations and action plans and how these are followed up.

Action: Kate Eves to research definitions of near deaths in each of the settings and to report back to the October meeting

16. Police

Presenting the IPPC paper on learning and sharing, Ian Bynoe commented that while learning lessons is one of the cornerstones of the IPCC, converting data into easily accessible, readable lessons is a challenge. The IPCC aims to make lessons accessible to the relevant force, ACPO and the Healthcare Commission where there is a need for change on a national level. Ian outlined that there are three types of learning embraced by the IPCC. Firstly, fast time learning whereby within days of an incident lessons are shared with those who have managerial responsibility to take action. Secondly, the statistically reliable, peer reviewed research carried out by professional research staff, and thirdly, learning which results directly from investigations and which needs to be communicated to front line staff in the form of practical and digestible bulletins. Ian emphasised that the IPCC is currently in the stages of yielding all three of these types of information and that the wider dissemination of such information is the next step.

There was a discussion over whether there is a risk of prejudicing the outcome of cases where information is shared when facts may still be contestable. It was suggested that the sharing of information in such cases should be subject to questions of public interest.

Members discussed the problem of ensuring that recommendations and action plans for specific institutions or establishments are effectively followed up. It was noted that the pressure that inspectorate bodies can exert in following recommendations following deaths is not always used to full effect. It was also acknowledged that there is disparity between organisations over their expectation to be scrutinised by their inspectorate bodies and the extent to which they equip themselves for this. It was

Forum10/06.01 June Minutes

agreed that this discussion should be revisited in the light of the establishment of the joint criminal justice inspectorate in April 2007.

David Monk said that the YJB draws upon the evidence of a number of different strands of investigative activity that surround the death of a child. The YJB's Serious Incident Programme Board has responsibility for developing actions plans following the death of a child in custody. David said that the processes for how actions plans are monitored and followed up is still being improved and developed.

Action: Kate to add discussion of joint inspectorate to the agenda for discussion at February/ June 2007 meeting

17. Immigration

Alan Hollett said that IND make submissions to Ministers at regular intervals following a death in custody, and include action plans in these submissions. It is felt that PPO reports are disseminated effectively and appropriate action plans are put in place.

The scrutiny of HMCIP is instrumental in ensuring that action plans are being followed up and there is still work to be done internally within IND to monitor how well the plans are being implemented.

There was a discussion about how recommendations and action plans are followed up in private sector custodial settings. It was suggested that wide external scrutiny and financial penalties may both affect how private prisons respond to and monitor action plans and recommendations.

Members discussed the difficulties of tracking recommendations and action plans a year or more after they have been developed. Custodial settings are dynamic and there remains a challenge in effectively monitoring the implementation of recommendations.

18. Mental health settings

Craig Jennings explained that the MHAC reviews deaths of patients where an individual has been detained under the Mental Health Act 1983. Its remit is to consider whether the Act has been used appropriately and in accordance with best practice. The MHAC do not carry out investigations into deaths as such. As part of their review of a death they would have access to internal Serious Untoward Incident review undertaken by the relevant Trust. The MHAC's commissioners may attend inquests or may provide the institution under whose care the death occurred with a report. If recommendations are made they are communicated directly to the hospital or institution concerned. Limited resources restrict the amount of analysis and follow up of recommendations. It was suggested that those commissioning Mental Health Services (Primary Care Trusts) should be evaluating the reports of the MHAC routinely as part of their review of the Trusts' Service Level Agreements.

Kate Caston suggested that deaths occurring in the three high secure hospitals are exposed to a greater level of external scrutiny than those in medium and low secure settings. Following the findings of a review of a death, each of the three hospitals would be asked to benchmark themselves against the recommendations. In medium and low secure settings, the mix of NHS and privately run accommodation causes difficulty in cross referencing issues highlighted following deaths. It was noted that the Department of Health is currently working collaboratively with the Healthcare Commission to develop minimum practice standards in privately run institutions. It

Forum10/06.01 June Minutes

was suggested that the Forum would like clarification on the how deaths in each type of hospital are investigated. Kate Caston and Kate Eves agreed to research this and provide explanation on the investigation processes, including the scrutiny afforded by police and the input of Strategic Health Authorities.

Members were interested to know how many people were detained in mental health settings. It was suggested that approximately 20,000 people are detained under the Mental Health Act in any year, but that the population is not a static one. Approximately 1,000 patients are detained in high secure hospitals, there are approximately 3,000 medium secure beds available, and it is not possible to define the amount of low secure accommodation. It was noted that the MHAC's remit only extended to individuals properly detained under a section of the Act. It was also noted that should a prisoner die whilst awaiting transfer to mental health accommodation, the death would also fall within the remit of the Department of Health's review arrangements.

Deborah Coles said that while INQUEST could routinely find out when deaths have occurred in prisons and immigration detention, information on deaths of detained patients is very scarce. Craig Jennings undertook to meet with Deborah Coles to discuss access to information on deaths of detained patients. Questions over the independence of investigations into the deaths of detained patients were again raised.

There was a discussion over the influence of the MHAC's biennial reports. It was suggested that their impact could be increased if Strategic Health Authorities sought feedback from Trusts on issues raised as part of reviewing Service Level Agreements.

Members discussed the NHS's clinical governance culture and acknowledged that it had taken many years to embed an ethos of investigating adverse incidents with a "no blame" approach. It was acknowledged that there are still improvements that could be made to the systems in place within the NHS. Members discussed the feasibility of setting up equivalent systems within other organisations and whether the Forum could be instrumental in this. It was suggested that the different sizes, remits and infrastructures of the members organisations would make a homogenous approach impractical and that such fundamental cultural change would have to be approached differently for each body.

Jo Sherlock said that work is underway to carry out analysis on the clinical aspects of PPO reports. Jo said that she would report back to the October meeting on any initial findings on emerging themes as well as reporting on the mechanisms that had been used to extract and analyse the data.

19. Other themes around learning and sharing

Members noted that near deaths was a key theme for each of the organisations. David Monk said that the YJB is faced with the challenge of recording adverse incidents consistently across three very different types of settings used to accommodate children. It was suggested that the Forum engage with the National Patient Safety Agency to learn from their approach to analysing adverse incidents. Members are keen to learn more about the tools used for analysis as well as how the Agency separates out learning from any legislative responsibilities to tackle misconduct. It was agreed that the Forum will return to this issue at a future meeting.

Item 4
Coroner's rule 43 reports

20. Rule 43 reports

Richard Bates said that research into how member organisations access and learn from Coroner's rule 43 reports had revealed a number of patterns. There are systems in place in respect of those relating to prison and immigration deaths; this is not true of deaths in police or mental health detention where there is no centralised collation or analysis of reports.

It was acknowledged that Coroners are a unique resource. Selena Lynch commented that their role in preventing future deaths (through the use of rule 43 reports) is key, and is something which the select committee will be taking forward in respect of the draft Coroners bill. Coroners lack the resources to collate and analyse rule 43 reports and there are difficulties in transferring information from one Coroner's jurisdiction to another. Fear of prejudicing the outcome of enquiries prevents external researchers being brought in.

Selena said there is a disparity between Coroners' interpretations of rule 43. Some consider that they should only report on matters that have not already been addressed by the relevant body, whilst others will report on all matters of concern that relate to the death. Coroners have encountered problems when it has been considered that they have reported on matters that are not directly linked to the cause of a person's death. The Coroners Charter states that rule 43 reports should be available publicly but case law appears to contradict this. It was noted that training for Coroners has been improved and that some of these issues are therefore being addressed. Selena commented that no requirement to respond is placed upon the body receiving a rule 43 report; members were surprised to learn that there is no obligation on organisations to report, publish or monitor reports. There was a discussion as to whether the introduction of a Chief Coroner will assist in collating rule 43 reports. Even if this were the case, as the changes would still be some years in the future, steps should be taken to explore alternatives in the interim.

Judith Bernstein emphasised that proposals in the draft bill to coordinate and oversee the Coroners Service will not result in a national service. It was also acknowledged that changes would not be implemented until April 2009 at the earliest. There would be a reluctance to ask Coroners to commit to additional work relating to rule 43 reports when the service is already under pressure. There was a discussion about making changes to rule 43 of the Coroner's Rules under secondary legislation and it was agreed that John Wadham would take this forward with the DCA Minister.

Members discussed whether there was a need for guidance for Coroners on the disclosure of rule 43 reports. It was noted that both Coroners and the recipients of rule 43 reports could be vulnerable to legal challenge if they disclosed reports inappropriately. It was proposed that, in the light of the current draft bill, John Wadham take this issue forward with Judith Bernstein and the DCA Minister.

Forum10/06.01 June Minutes

Nigel Hancock clarified that the Department of Health were consulted for their input in prison death rule 43 reports where this was appropriate. Nigel also said that analysis of prison rule 43 reports and their responses could be carried out and shared with the Forum. Kate Eves agreed to take this forward.

Deborah Coles said that INQUEST Law disseminates the findings and narrative verdicts of inquests and that member organisations could subscribe to this.

Action: John Wadham to liaise with Judith Bernstein regarding guidance on disclosure of rule 43 reports.

Action: John Wadham to meet with DCA Minister to discuss the use of secondary legislation to make amendments to rule 43 of the Coroners Rules.

Action: Kate Eves to liaise with Nigel Hancock to collate and analyse patterns and themes emerging from prison rule 43 reports and responses.

Item 5

The Forum's future meetings

October meeting

The meeting will focus on management of difficult detainees. It was suggested that the meeting will need to give special focus to the "softer skills" used to do this. Deborah Coles undertook to meet with Kate Eves to discuss the evidence INQUEST had given to the Rocky Bennett enquiry. It was noted that HMCIP have been working on a report on the use of segregation, the report has not yet been published.

Action: Kate Eves to liaise with Deborah Coles to discuss Rocky Bennett inquiry.

Future Forum meetings

There was a request for whistle-blowing and local prisons to be added to the list of future of meeting topics. Kate Eves undertook to do this.

There was a discussion as to whether it would be appropriate for families to attend the meeting which is to focus on family issues. It was suggested that Kate Eves meet with Deborah Coles to discuss this further and take forward.

It was noted that the Forum may wish to use a future meeting to focus on the transfer of prisoners and use of escort vans and that such a meeting should necessarily include consideration of the Christopher Alder review.

It was agreed that the Forum would continue to meet three times a year and that the meetings would be extended from 10am to 4pm. Future agendas will provide more precise timings for agenda items to enable members to attend for selected items if they cannot be present for the whole day.

Action: Kate Eves to add whistle-blowing, local prisons and the transportation of prisoners to list of future meeting topics.

Forum10/06.01 June Minutes

Action: Kate Eves to liaise with Deborah Coles regarding insuring the interests and concerns of families are represented at future meetings.

Item 6

Any Other Business

No items were raised under any other business. John Wadham thanked members for their contributions to the meeting.

Kate Eves
Forum for Preventing Deaths in Custody

19 June 2006

FORUM FOR PREVENTING DEATHS IN CUSTODY

MEETING 13 JUNE 2006

AGREED ACTION POINTS

Action	Member	Agreed Completion date
PER forms to be discussed as a matter arising at the October meeting. Nigel Hancock, in liaison with Kate Eves, to report back on who has ownership of the form.	Nigel Hancock and Kate Eves	October meeting
Kate Eves to invite ACC Feavyour to October meeting.	Kate Eves	October meeting
Hazel Banks to report back to October meeting on feasibility of PNC checks being carried out during prison reception Procedures.	Hazel Banks	October meeting
Selena Lynch to report back any progress on identifying post release deaths at the October meeting.	Selena Lynch	October meeting
Kate Eves to approach the secretaries of the Ministerial Roundtable and Suicide Prevention Strategy Group to discuss the sharing of agendas, minutes and papers.	Kate Eves	October meeting
Nigel Hancock and John Wadham to discuss taking forward issues around Home Office representation and the	Nigel Hancock and John Wadham	To report back to October meeting

Forum10/06.01 June Minutes

relationship between the Forum and the Ministerial Roundtable.		
Kate Eves to amend press release following feedback from members, and to reflect comments made at the meeting.	Kate Eves	Prior to press release launch (August)
Kate to liaise with National Probation Directorate regarding wording on the Forum's website.	Kate Eves	Prior to website launch (August)
Kate Eves to research definitions of near deaths in each of the settings and to report back to the October meeting.	Kate Eves	October meeting
Kate to add discussion of joint inspectorate to the agenda for discussion at February/ June 2007 meeting.	Kate Eves	February 2007
John Wadham to liaise with Judith Bernstein regarding guidance on disclosure of rule 43 reports.	John Wadham	To report back to October meeting
John Wadham to meet with DCA Minister to discuss the use of secondary legislation to make amendments to rule 43 of the Coroners Rules.	John Wadham	To report back to October meeting
Kate Eves to liaise with Nigel Hancock to collate and analyse patterns and themes emerging	Nigel Hancock and Kate Eves	To report back to October meeting

Forum10/06.01 June Minutes

from prison rule 43 reports and responses.		
Kate Eves to liaise with Deborah Coles to discuss Rocky Bennett inquiry.	Kate Eves and Deborah Coles	October meeting
Kate Eves to add whistle-blowing, local prisons and transportation of prisoners to list of future meeting topics.	Kate Eves	Complete
Kate Eves to liaise with Deborah Coles regarding ensuring the interests and concerns are represented at future meetings.	Kate Eves and Deborah Coles	Ongoing