



Annual Report of the Independent Monitoring Board at HMP Littlehey

**For reporting year
1 February 2024 to 31 January 2025**

Published January 2026



Contents

		Page
Introductory sections 1 – 3		
1.	Statutory role of the IMB	3
2.	Description of the establishment	4
3.	Key points	5
Evidence sections 4 – 7		
4.	Safety	11
5.	Fair and humane treatment	14
6.	Health and wellbeing	18
7.	Progression and resettlement	22
The work of the IMB		25
	Board statistics	26
	Applications to the IMB	26-27
Annex A		
	Service providers	28

All IMB annual reports are published on www.imb.org.uk

Introductory sections 1 – 3

1. Statutory role of the IMB

The Prison Act 1952 requires every prison to be monitored by an independent board appointed by the Secretary of State from members of the community in which the prison is situated.

Under the National Monitoring Framework agreed with ministers, the Board is required to:

- satisfy itself as to the humane and just treatment of those held in custody within its prison and the range and adequacy of the programmes preparing them for release.
- inform promptly the Secretary of State, or any official to whom authority has been delegated as it judges appropriate, any concern it has.
- report annually to the Secretary of State on how well the prison has met the standards and requirements placed on it and what impact these have on those in its custody.

To enable the Board to carry out these duties effectively, its members have right of access to every prisoner and every part of the prison and also to the prison's records.

The Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (OPCAT) is an international human rights treaty designed to strengthen protection for people deprived of their liberty. The protocol recognises that such people are particularly vulnerable and aims to prevent their ill-treatment through establishing a system of visits or inspections to all places of detention. OPCAT requires that states designate a National Preventive Mechanism to carry out visits to places of detention, to monitor the treatment of and conditions for detainees and to make recommendations for the prevention of ill-treatment. The IMB is part of the United Kingdom's National Preventive Mechanism.

2. Description of the establishment

2.1 HMP Littlehey, located in the village of Perry in Cambridgeshire, is a category C training prison (for those who cannot be trusted in an open prison but are judged unlikely to try to escape) for men convicted of sex offences (PCoSos). It is the largest prison in Europe for men convicted of sexual offences. The prison housed 137 foreign national prisoners¹, representing 53 nationalities and 31 religious denominations, including those stating 'no religion', atheist or agnostic.

2.2 The prison held 1,229 prisoners at the end of the reporting period, compared with an operational capacity (the maximum number of prisoners that can be held without serious risk to safety, security, good order and the proper running of the planned regime) of 1,241 and an average end-of-month population of 1,231². There were 1,225 prisoners held at the end of the previous reporting period, which had an average end-of-month population of 1,236.

2.3 A total of 510 (41%) of prisoners were aged over 50 years at the end of the reporting period, slightly lower than the figure of 528 (43%) in the previous reporting period.

¹ Figures included in this report are local management information. They reflect the prison's position at the time of reporting, but may be subject to change following further validation and therefore may not always tally with Official Statistics later published by the Ministry of Justice.

² Source: the prison's performance hub.

3. Key points

3.1 Main findings

3.2 Safety

3.2.1 The Board observed that, generally, HMP Littlehey continued to be a safe and secure prison.

3.2.2 The prison continued to have a relatively low rate of prisoner-on-prisoner violence.

Fair and humane treatment

3.2.3 From the Board's observations, prisoners were generally treated with respect, decency and humanity. The support provided for ill prisoners and the engagement with their families at end-of-life care demonstrated compassion and respect, and is frequently commented on by the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman (PPO), the independent organisation that investigates deaths in custody.

3.2.4 The mental health team are particularly notable for their consistently high level of committed support for prisoners, particularly for those identified as being at risk of self-harm.

3.2.5 The monitoring of diversity and inclusion is particularly rigorous and transparent, in the Board's view, which gives the whole prison population confidence that they are being treated fairly and humanely.

3.2.6 It is a constant battle to keep hot water and heating supplied to all the wings and other buildings. In the Board's opinion, there needs to be more clarity between HMPPS National Service Estates and the prison about when the money needed to bring the Woodlands system up to standard will be available, given that £6.5 million has already been spent on the Lakeside systems over the past years.

Health and wellbeing

3.2.7 In the Board's view, the support and resources provided by the prison to meet the prisoners' health and wellbeing needs are good, although the lack of on-site 24-hour social and health care continues to be an issue of debate.

Progression and resettlement

3.2.8 As stated in many previous reports, HMP Littlehey is not a resettlement prison and is not funded for this activity, although it typically releases significant numbers of prisoners directly into the community every year. The Board acknowledges that the numbers so released have fallen over the last few years.

3.2.9 Given the lack of funding and limited resources available, the prison continues to make good efforts to support the resettlement of prisoners. However, the challenges created by prisoners often having to be resettled outside of their home area continue for those involved in preparing prisoners for release.

3.2.10 The Board is extremely disappointed that, by the time of writing the report, in November 2025, the education budget has been cut by 35% by HM Prison and Probation Service (HMPPS). HMP Littlehey is supposed to be a training prison.

3.3 Main areas for development

TO THE MINISTER

3.3.1 The Minister will wish to note the Board's dismay at the refusal to extend a member's tenure, condemning the Board to two members in 2026, against a complement of 16 in a prison with some 1,240 prisoners. This will make it impossible to deliver all our statutory requirements; by necessity, there will be periods when we are unable to provide duty cover, and it will take longer to answer prisoners' applications. Also, if one of the two remaining members needs to resign, due to personal circumstances, for example, the other member will not attempt to continue solo, without peer review. Thus, the Board could close at short notice. The Board is eager to know how the Minister will prevent this from happening.

3.3.2 The Board is, again, disappointed that, despite repeated requests for change, the IMB recruitment process continues to be inadequate and inappropriate to support the timely recruitment of candidates with the necessary qualities and skills. Again, the Board is eager to know what improvements the Minister plans to address this issue.

TO THE PRISON SERVICE

3.3.3 The Board wishes to commend the extremely positive outcome from the establishment of the CRED team, which uses prisoners' skills to undertake maintenance tasks far more quickly and cheaply than could be achieved otherwise, in our view. The Board is aware that many other prisons have not used this initiative. Also, the GFSL team should be commended for both managing the CRED team and being very pro-active with other, more complex maintenance tasks. Does the Prison Service intend to introduce CRED teams at other prisons?

3.3.4 The Board would also like to commend the introduction of a small team of prisoners to maintain the external prison grounds by using the ROTL process to assess risk and authorise the prisoners. The impact on prisoner welfare has been significant, and the prison offender managers are highly enthused. Does the Prison Service have any intention of introducing this at other prisons?

3.3.5 While the number of property complaints on transfer have fallen since last year, they are still far higher than they should be, and continue to cause much anguish for prisoners. Will the Prison Service implement a system of recording the number of complaints about missing property on transfer as a specific metric for every prison? And if not, why not?

3.3.6 What is the timeline to bring the heating and hot water systems for Woodlands up to the required standard, so that the prisoners are not continually being disrupted in their ability to wash, shower and clean their crockery?

3.3.7 The Board is staggered that there should be a 35% reduction in the training budget at a training prison. Why is the Prison Service making these cuts at a time when there is already poor provision for work and training in prisons and what plans does it have to offset the problems it will likely cause?

TO THE GOVERNOR

3.3.8 The Board notes the continued high level of internal complaints at HMP Littlehey. We acknowledge the work being done to improve the complaints system and will continue to monitor developments.

3.3.9 The Board considers the current arrangements for the provision of social care for

prisoners after-hours to be inadequate. Will the Governor make sure that this remedied when the healthcare contract is next reviewed?

3.4 Response to the last report

Issue raised	Response given	Action taken
To the Minister		
The Minister should note that the IMB has been operating with just three active members against an establishment of 16; and that, with such low numbers, it is increasingly difficult to meaningfully carry out the statutory requirements.	I am sorry to learn of the problems being experienced recruiting new members. I am advised that three recruitment campaigns were facilitated in 2024, and clearly it is proving to be a struggle to find suitable candidates. The IMB Staff Group (formerly the 'Secretariat') have confirmed that your Board has been treated as a priority in recruitment campaigns, with advertising spend being directed to recruiting for Boards in a similar position.	There is only one campaign in 2025 and the refusal to extend the tenure of one of our members condemns us to two members in 2026.
The Board is disappointed that, despite repeated requests for change, the IMB recruitment process continues to be inadequate and inappropriate to support the timely recruitment of candidates with the necessary qualities and skills.	The reason the IMB Staff Group is not able to have a continually open campaign is due to the expectations set out in the Governance Code on Public Appointments, where a campaign needs to have a start and an end date for applications. The IMB Staff Group continue to seek improvements to its recruitment processes to support both the candidate journey and Boards that are keen to recruit members. The IMB Staff Group will reach out to you to discuss concerns directly to see if there are any lessons to be learned. Monitoring guidance is available as an aid to Boards with low numbers to help prioritise their monitoring activity alongside their statutory responsibilities, pending any additions to the Board. I sincerely hope the situation improves over the next reporting period.	The wording on the IMB website still leads enquirers to think that new recruits are not needed, despite requests to change it. Also, there has been no meaningful dialogue on improving the recruitment.
As stated in the reports of the last two years, there continue to be too many prisoners forced to share cells, including those initially designed for single	I fully understand the Board's concern around crowding and the sharing of cells originally designed for one prisoner. I would like to reassure the Board that cells are only shared where a Prison Group Director	The Board is aware of the current status across the prison estate and has no further comments to offer.

<p>occupancy. While the Board acknowledges the Minister's response to this point in our last report, it remains concerned that the number of prisoners being forced to share a cell continues to increase. With the pressures on the prison population continuing to grow, what strategies will the Minister deploy to ensure prisoners are safe and treated with respect, and that the level of cell sharing in unsuitable conditions is addressed?</p>	<p>has assessed them to be of adequate size and condition and meets certain standards to ensure prisoners are accommodated safely. On 12 July 2024, the Lord Chancellor announced a package of measures aimed at addressing prison capacity issues and preventing the collapse of the criminal justice system. Further, on 11 December 2024, we set out our long-term plan for prison capacity through the publication of the 10-year Prison Capacity Strategy. This sets out our plans to deliver 14,000 additional prison places and create a resilient prison estate that includes the construction of four new prisons, as well as expansion and refurbishment of the existing prison estate. Whilst this does not address the immediate crowding and cell-sharing issues at HMP Littlehey, the strategy underlines our commitment to improving the overall estate and future direction.</p>	
--	--	--

To the Prison Service

<p>The Board is disappointed that the estate-wide management of prisoner property on transfer continues to be extremely poor, and that staff are not adhering to the policy guidelines for transfer of legal papers. Also, when problems do arise, even senior staff appear indifferent to resolving issues, with too many problems having to be referred to the Independent Prisoner Complaints Investigations (IPCI) team. Next to cell sharing, this is the biggest problem affecting prisoners' wellbeing, and the Board was extremely</p>	<p>The Prisoners' Property Policy Framework aims to ensure consistency and fairness and to enhance prisoners' satisfaction with processes and outcomes. A common area for problems is when excess prisoner property is forwarded on when a prisoner transfers. It is therefore imperative that prisoners comply with volumetric control limits, since anything within those limits will transfer with them. The framework is clear that legal papers are exempt from volumetric control limits. They should move with prisoners when they transfer. HMPPS is focusing on what more can be done to ensure compliance with the requirements of the framework, and we are grateful for the continued feedback from IMB members. We will continue to work closely with Boards on identifying solutions when issues arise</p>	<p>The Prisoners' Property Policy Framework is being ignored too often. The Board recommends that prisoners' property complaints should become a metric for every prison.</p>
--	--	---

<p>disappointed by the failure to acknowledge the seriousness of this issue when it was raised in our last report.</p>		
<p>The Board would like to know when IT systems that have been deployed in other prisons, to better manage internal complaints, are going to be deployed in HMP Littlehey. This would allow a significant improvement in the tracking and analysis of complaints, as well freeing up a significant amount of staff resource.</p>	<p>HMPPS does not currently have an estate-wide IT upgrade planned for complaints tracking. Some prisons have developed their own systems using the Microsoft suite, which is available across the estate, but there are no immediate plans to provide a new system to help prisons manage requests and complaints. For prisons where the Launchpad service is currently deployed, there is a way to submit complaints via the Launchpad devices themselves or via the kiosks. There is not currently a defined timeline for the wider rollout of Launchpad to all prisons, therefore predominantly paper-based processes remain in place generally for non-Launchpad sites. At HMP Littlehey, the digital logging of complaints has been updated this year to gather a more useful dataset. In addition, it clearly indicates the timescale for responses. Overdue complaints are compiled and presented at the daily morning meeting to heads of functions, custodial managers and senior officers. This will be further developed by amending the route staff access the complaints, with the aim to reduce response times further.</p>	<p>The number of complaints at HMP Littlehey has continued at the same level and the Board is disappointed to note that the IT system is not planned. The Board will continue to monitor the internal management initiatives.</p>
<p>To the Governor</p>		
<p>The Board notes the continued high level of internal complaints at HMP Littlehey. Notwithstanding the comment to the Prison Service, above, the Board considers that a significant number of complaints could be</p>	<p>The Board has discussed this several times with the Governor throughout the year and is aware of the continuing attempts to improve the process.</p>	<p>The Board will continue to monitor progress.</p>

avoided by better communication between staff and prisoners, particularly, but not exclusively, during key worker sessions. The Board will be monitoring the effectiveness of initiatives put in place to improve communication between staff and prisoners.

Evidence sections 4 – 7

4. Safety

4.1 Reception and induction

4.1.1 During the reporting period, 476 prisoners transferred to Littlehey, a significant reduction from the 555 in the previous reporting period and closer to previous norms, with the impact of opening the new wing in 2023 having passed. The number of transfers per month varied, from the lowest of 27 in June, to the highest of 54 in May. Arrivals after the ‘lockout time’ of 4pm have continued, with prisoners who arrive later receiving the ‘basics’, including seeing healthcare, but with the full process being conducted the following day.

4.1.2 From the Board’s observations, in general, the reception process for those arriving at the prison is well managed, with good collaboration between the reception staff, orderlies (trusted prisoners who take on work to provide services that contribute to the running of the prison) and induction wing officers.

4.1.3 The induction wing contains only double cells, and the 1,241 operational capacity of the prison assumes that all these will house two prisoners. However, the prison receives high-risk prisoners who cannot share a cell and have to be accommodated in the induction wing. This results in induction staff having to move prisoners out early to create the wing spaces required to accommodate new arrivals to the prison.

4.2 Suicide and self-harm, deaths in custody

4.2.1 During the reporting year in HMP Littlehey, there were 18 deaths in custody, of which 17 were due to natural causes. For these 17, the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman’s (PPO) investigations into prisoner deaths all concluded that the clinical healthcare received at HMP Littlehey was good. Sadly, one of the 18 deaths was self-inflicted and this was the fourth self-inflicted death at Littlehey in three years. The PPO reported that the prisoner had given no indication to staff that he was at risk of suicide in the lead up to his death and the PPO investigator was satisfied that staff could not have foreseen his actions. There was a delay in staff starting CPR when they found the prisoner unresponsive. Neither of the two staff who found him were trained in first aid. Despite HMP Littlehey’s health and safety risk assessment stating that 80% of staff on duty at night should be first aid trained, only 14% were on the night of the death.

4.2.2 Several of the PPO reports specifically commented on the compassionate end-of-life care for prisoners at HMP Littlehey and the Board, again, wishes to commend the prison for this.

4.2.3 HMP Littlehey continues to participate in the Samaritans’ Listener scheme (where prisoners are trained by the Samaritans to offer confidential emotional support to their peers). There were 12 active Listeners on the rota for the last month of the reporting period, providing invaluable support to their fellow prisoners. The Listener team was being called an average of about 40 times per month at the beginning of the period, but this rate has fallen with the completion of the in-cell phone roll-out. Some prisoners need Listener support on a regular basis, in addition to that provided through other channels, such as the assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) process (which is used to support and manage prisoners at risk of self-harm and suicide). The Board is pleased to note the multiple support channels available to those at the prison who need them.

4.2.4 The Board notes that self-harm incidents appear to have decreased during the

reporting period, from 365 per 1,000 prisoners at the beginning, to 173 per 1,000 at the end, having peaked at 565 in August (according to the prison's performance hub). This is well below the national average.

4.3 Violence and violence reduction, self-isolation

4.3.1 In the Board's view, HMP Littlehey continues to be a relatively safe place for staff and prisoners alike. Prison records show similar trends to those reported last year, with the number of assaults on staff increasing slightly from 19 in the previous reporting period to 22 in the reporting period, while prisoner-on-prisoner assaults increased from 79 to 83 over the same period (according to figures from the performance hub). While this is, once again, a disappointing increase, it remains significantly lower than the national rates.

4.4 Use of force

4.4.1 The management of the use of force (UoF), both during and after an incident in the prison, was closely monitored by the Board. It is disappointing to report that, according to the prison's records, force was used 166 times (134 unplanned and 32 planned) during the reporting period. This is a significant increase from 147 in the previous period, and a return to the levels of three years ago, although the numbers are still low. The number of prisoners involved increased to 89 (around 7% of the prison population), from 65 (5% of the population) in the previous period. In comparison with eight other benchmarked vulnerable prisoner (VP) establishment populations, it is third overall by a significant margin. Of these incidents, the majority, 24%, were for 'refusing to locate to a cell'. In other significant categories, UoF was used 'to prevent harm or assault' (11%) and 'to prevent harm or assault to others' (11%). UoF categorised as 'risk reduction application of cuffs for escorting' was used 24 times (14%), although it could be argued that this is planned use and does not necessarily reflect the broader picture of prisoner conduct.

4.4.2 Body worn video cameras (BWVCs) are recorded as being worn on 119 (72%) of the occasions where force was used, and the Board is pleased to note that this is an improvement on the 98 occasions during the previous reporting period; the use of BWVC is gaining more traction. This may appear to be still less than satisfactory, but the planned UoF may not always justify the use of BWVCs and, overall in the year, use was greater than 90% in five of the months.

4.4.3 Pava incapacitant spray was drawn, but not deployed, three times in the reporting year, compared with two in the previous year, while batons were drawn, but not used, four times. The use of these restraint resources is benchmarked with eight other VP prisons and, measured against these overall populations, the drawing (not the use of) of Pava spray (0.36%) and batons (0.33%) are the highest in the measured group. In practice, the actual numbers are considered by the Board to be low.

4.4.4 UoF data is diligently recorded and analysed by prison management and a multidisciplinary team reviews the data every month. Board members observe these reviews and the detail, analysis, learning and follow-up is seen to be excellent. For example, patterns of incidents are looked at in terms of days of the week, times of the day, location, ethnicity, age, religion, sexual orientation and neurodiversity factors, while the officers involved and their approach and conduct during the incidents is assessed. BWVC footage is reviewed, critiqued, with training needs drawn from the reviews. There appears to be no apparent disproportionality in the UoF involving prisoners of different ethnicities, religions or sexual orientations.

4.4.5 Overall, the Board is pleased to report from its observations that the UoF in the prison is appropriate, measured and well-managed.

4.4.6 The national tactical response group (NTRG), a specialist unit assisting in safely managing and resolving serious incidents, was not deployed to HMP Littlehey during the reporting period.

4.5 Preventing illicit items

4.5.1 Mandatory drug testing (MDT) has been in place during the reporting year. Over the 12 months, 735 MDTs have taken place, of which only 61 were positive (according to security team statistics). This is higher than the figure of 43 for the previous reporting period, but it is still far lower than the 120 of the previous year in review. There were also 42 fermenting liquid finds.

5. Fair and humane treatment

5.1 Accommodation, clothing, food

5.1.1 Excluding the care and separation unit (CSU), where prisoners are kept apart from the rest of the prison population, there are 1,125 in-use cells at HMP Littlehey, all certified normal accommodation, or CNA (the number of prisoners a prison can hold without being overcrowded), for single occupancy. However, 116 of these cells have been approved for double occupancy by the Prison Group Director (PGD), giving an operational capacity (the maximum number of prisoners that can be held without serious risk to safety, security, good order and the proper running of the prison) of 1,241. There were four constant-watch cells available, including one in the CSU.

5.1.2 The wing functions were restructured after the opening of G wing during the previous reporting period. Prisoners now know when they come into reception where they will live to start with, what each wing does and how they can move around as part of their progression. F wing is now a resettlement unit. G wing continues to be reserved for prisoners who have demonstrated the best behaviour and are serving sentences of ten or more years; it offers the opportunity for them to demonstrate independent living and emotional management. E wing is the reception wing; I and J wings provide support for elderly prisoners; and M wing is for those with imprisonment for public protection (IPP) sentences. A wing is a recovery unit, while D wing is predominately for prisoners with life sentences. There is also a veterans' spur. The other wings are community wings.

5.1.3 The residential accommodation, set in extensive well-maintained gardens, comprises two distinct facilities (Lakeside and Woodlands), built at different times and to standards applicable at the time of construction. This creates challenges for the maintenance of the infrastructure, fixtures and fittings. Reflecting the two facilities, there are also two kitchens, two healthcare centres, two libraries, two gyms and two multi-faith rooms. There is one all-weather sports pitch, the second having been decommissioned to make way for the new G wing. The prison also has a visits' hall, an education centre, workshops and a CSU, which has eight operational cells.

5.1.4 As in previous years, there have been issues with water and heating on the wings. At times, the water temperature and pressure have been erratic, while the heating has been insufficient. However, the Board is pleased to note that a change to the local Gov Facility Services Limited, or GFSL, organisation (which is part of the Ministry of Justice and provides facility maintenance services to prisons) has seen a significant improvement in the response to maintenance problems. However, legacy problems remain and it is a constant battle to keep the hot water and heating supplied to all the wings and other buildings. In the Board's opinion, there needs to be more clarity between HMPPS National Service Estates and the prison about when the money needed to bring the Woodlands system up to standard will be available, given that £6.5 million as already been spent on the Lakeside systems over the past years.

5.1.5 The continued development of the CRED (clean, rehabilitative, enabling and decent) team to support the work of GFSL has meant that thousands of small jobs have been completed at minimum cost and with maximum speed. The Board is very pleased to note this excellent initiative and has recommended it to other Boards at the East Region meetings.

5.1.6 In the Board's view, the standard of food provided by the two kitchens continues to be of a high quality. There have been significant safety issues with major kitchen equipment, but sustained effort over many months by the IMB, the Governor, the health and safety lead and GFSL has seen the issues resolved.

5.1.7 The Board is pleased to see both the food focus group and the prison council continuing to develop into more meaningful meetings and the staff are now providing much more timely responses to questions. However, communication amongst the prisoners could still be better, as the Board is still asked questions that should be directed to wing representatives.

5.2 Segregation

5.2.1 The CSU has a total capacity of nine habitable cells. A tenth is usable for searching purposes and an adjudication holding cell only. Two were out of use for a lengthy period, but one was recently back online and the other remains out of use due to extensive repair work still required. However, the cells are often trashed by prisoners, resulting in them being unusable until the damage can be repaired. On occasion, the existence of one constant-watch cell has resulted in prisoners who should be held in the CSU being held in the few constant-watch cells on the wings. Those who have had adjudications (disciplinary hearings when a prisoner is alleged to have broken prison rules) and been confined to their cells have also sometimes had to be located in these cells on the wings.

5.3 Staff and prisoner relationships, key workers

5.3.1 The Board is pleased to note that staff training and development is a priority for the Governor and his team. Local training sessions are being introduced, there is more prioritisation of key worker sessions and extra staff have been brought into development roles. From our observation, we are continually impressed by the positive attitude that many of the staff members have, although there is still room for improvement in others.

5.4 Equality and diversity

5.4.1 The Board has been very pleased to see the development of the diversity and inclusion statistics from mere data into meaningful information. This clarifies the real situation in the prison, fully addressing the concerns raised by HM Inspectorate of Prisons (HMIP) in the previous reporting period. Indeed, it is telling that the diversity and inclusion action team (DIAT) meetings are so well attended by both the senior leadership and prisoner interest groups, who now have confidence in the data that is being collected and can see that it is being acted on.

Older prisoners

5.4.2 Of the 1,231 prisoners, 422 (34%) were over 55, of which 138 were aged between 66 and 75; 58 between 76 and 85; and 12 over 85. The Board is pleased to note that HMP Littlehey has continued to be proactive in seeking to meet the needs of these older prisoners. Notable examples have included extending the activities available to this population and working with the gym team to provide gym sessions appropriate for them. These initiatives add to the continuing close collaboration between prison staff, the social care team and the dementia specialist, as well as the ongoing training of the staff on these wings to enable them to provide appropriate support.

Learning difficulties and disabilities (LDD)

5.4.3 The Board is very pleased to note a second neurodiversity support appointment of a support officer, who will provide a positive link between operational and non-operational perspectives, with targeted support for higher needs/complex individuals amongst other duties.

5.4.4 The neurodiversity support manager (NSM) now has the work set in five priority levels. All are ongoing, with priority 1 processes firmly established and working well with

the other four levels being addressed. Priorities 2-4 are expected to develop well, but priority 5, which is focused on resettlement, could be a challenge, as HMP Littlehey is not a resettlement prison.

Black, Asian and minority ethnic prisoners

5.4.5 As referenced above, the DIAT is a very thorough and transparent meeting, which is very well attended by the prison Governors and prisoner group representatives. The data is thoroughly analysed from every perspective of protected characteristics (including, among others, race, religion, age, disability, sex and sexual orientation) and does not seem to show any adverse behaviour towards black, Asian or minority ethnic prisoners. Also, the Board is not aware of any issues from any other perspective.

5.5 Faith and pastoral support

5.5.1 The chaplaincy continues to provide support to all faiths and provides services for all the religious festivals, with the music groups and choirs making a significant contribution to the Christmas services. The Board would like to congratulate them for winning the Team of the Year award for their contribution to the life of the prison.

5.6 Incentives schemes

5.6.1 The HM Prison and Probation Service (HMPPS) Incentives Policy Framework (IPF) is fully implemented. The Board is pleased to see the continuation of IPF forums, involving prisoners, to review the implementation of the policy, consider any concerns, moderate the application to ensure consistency, and determine ways of ensuring that the policy is better understood. The analysis and publication of data relating to IPF status for groups of the prisoner population is welcomed as part of creating a transparent picture of diversity and inclusion.

5.7 Complaints

5.7.1 The total number of internal complaints and appeals (Comp 1s and Comp 1As) has increased from 2,945 in the last reporting period to 3,751 in the year in review. The Board is disappointed to note, again, that this high number of internal complaints includes a disproportionately high number of complaints from a relatively small number of 'serial complainers' and that many of the issues could have been handled by staff or key workers. The Board is aware that the complaints procedure is being reviewed so that more of them can be dealt with more efficiently and we look forward to seeing the impact.

5.7.2 The number of complaints to the Governor (Comp 2s, which are confidential) has remained at a broadly consistent level, from 389 in the 2022-2023 reporting period to 370 last year and 392 in this reporting period. However, there has been a decrease in the level of complaints (Comp 1s and Comp 1As) from HMP Littlehey to other prisons, from 425 in the previous reporting period to 276 this year, which is a return to the level of 2022-2023. Also, the number of complaints from other prisons to HMP Littlehey has fallen from 163 to 110, which, again, is a return to the level of 2022-2023.

5.7.3 The Board is pleased to note that the focus on improving the low and disrupted staffing levels in the business hub has improved the processing of internal complaints, as well as canteen (a facility where prisoners can buy snacks, toiletries, stationery and other essentials using their allocated funds) and catalogue orders. On average, just over 10% of complaints are answered outside of the prescribed timescale. Although this is sometimes irritating for prisoners, the Board accepts that the prison seems to be doing its best.

5.8 Property

5.8.1 Again, the Board, as well as prisoners, continues to be frustrated that the Prison Service is still unable to properly manage prisoners' property when transferring between prisons. We have not had as many property complaints in the reporting period as in the previous year, but there are still a significant number of complaints leaving HMP Littlehey about missing property. The organisation of the database doesn't make it easy to interrogate, but it would appear that over 50% of the 240 external complaints from HMP Littlehey prisoners concerned missing property. Although not quite as high as last year, it is still a significant number.

5.8.2 Unfortunately, the revised structure of the complaints database makes it almost impossible to determine which of the complaints have come from other prisons and which of them concern property. This points to a fundamental issue that prisons do not report any statistics on missing property on transfer. It is the Board's opinion that it would be very simple to make prisons responsible for monitoring and reporting on missing property on transfer. If someone was then responsible for the end-to-end process, it would be possible to highlight problem areas and drive improvements.

6. Health and wellbeing

6.1 Healthcare general

6.1.1 The overall provision of healthcare at HMP Littlehey is contracted to the Northamptonshire Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust, which, apart from delivering primary care, also commissions specialist services both within and outside the prison, as needed. In the prison, primary and in-patient healthcare is centred on two dedicated, but separately sited, two-storey facilities, supplemented by medical staff visiting prisoners in their cells. Off-site delivery is largely provided by Peterborough City Hospital and Hinchingbrooke Hospital in Huntingdon, with other, more specialist hospitals being used as appropriate. The Sue Ryder St John's Hospice, at Moggerhanger, in Bedfordshire, is used for certain end-of-life cases.

6.1.2 From the Board's observations, a period of management stability and strategic recruitment within the healthcare department has resulted in a well-resourced team that is respected, well-lead, well-informed and open to ideas for continuous improvement. A primary care nursing complement of 11.5 and a mental health complement of 6.4 are 'frontline' in the prison, which has a total population of around 1,240. Effective and regular communication with the prison senior management team, evidenced by the Board, ensures that issues are resolved as quickly and effectively as can be expected.

6.1.3 Excellent performance data effectively informs the healthcare management team of trends and patterns, which are used to highlight issues that need attention or intervention. This supports the position of the team when working with the prison senior leadership team to resolve matters.

6.1.4 The responsiveness of healthcare provision is closely monitored by the department. The Board is pleased to note that, overall, the response times across the various activities of primary and in-house healthcare are satisfactory.

6.1.5 The prison population is significantly aged, with the average over 50 cohort being around 41%, (a slight reduction on previous years). The nature of the prison environment, the relatively sedentary lifestyle of prisoners, the mental health issues prevailing and the bias towards agedness all result in significant healthcare and mobility demands on the team. The Board is pleased to report that, generally, across the prison, the healthcare team provides tailored support to their client base.

6.1.6 From the Board's observations, prisoners' formal complaints are well-managed and, as previously reported, an initiative to conduct meetings and consultations with prisoners has significantly reduced complaint numbers. There can be as few as around seven complaints per month but also a peak of over 20; there doesn't seem to be a trend. In the reporting year, the numbers have evidently fallen overall for the reasons described above. Themes or patterns of specific complainant issues are noted on the performance data report and are available for review and management intervention at regular meetings.

6.1.7 At the end of the reporting year, there were five vacancies in the healthcare department at HMP Littlehey; of these, three positions had been offered or were waiting for the person to start, one was in the process of selection, and one was being advertised. (The Board is pleased to note that, by the end of February 2025, all the vacancies had been filled, one of which was a much-needed mental health nurse.) Overall, from our observations, we are pleased to report that team in the prison does a good job and is efficient and effective.

6.2 Physical healthcare

6.2.1 Previous reports have highlighted the need for 24 hour on-site healthcare provision and this is often mentioned by prisoners who, understandably, feel vulnerable outside of the regular working hours. In mitigation, the responses to out-of-hours medical emergencies have been satisfactory, in the Board's view.

6.2.2 Short-term, there is a need for 24-hour social care. After 8pm, there is no support available to prisoners who need assistance with using the toilet, turning in their beds and taking medications, etc, a situation that has to be tolerated by prisoners until the start of the next working day. This provision is not an acceptable experience for prisoners.

6.2.3 The in-patient buildings have lifts to take prisoners who have mobility issues to the first-floor level. For many years, they have been unreliable and frequently broken. This has had a huge impact on the healthcare team delivering controlled drugs to prisoners waiting on the ground floor. In practice, two staff members have to chaperone the secure medical box to each prisoner for dispensing individually, thereby requiring multiple trips up and down the stairs to attend each of the prisoners. This makes for an expedient but inefficient resource-heavy situation. For the prisoners, this also means waiting for extended periods, often outside in inclement weather and with a limit of times allowed by their regimes. Capital funding for replacement lifts has been submitted, but has not been approved in the reporting year. While the capital expenditure is awaited, there is a reluctance to undertake extensive and expensive repairs to lifts that will be replaced, added to which, some parts are unavailable.

6.2.4 The prison regime frequently (and inevitably) impacts healthcare service delivery. Close working between the healthcare department and the prison's senior leadership team (SLT) has been evidenced by the Board and this does, to some extent, resolve issues as they arise.

6.2.5 The healthcare department routinely carries out patient surveys. The Board is pleased to note that they usually return scores in the high 90% area on a monthly basis, albeit with low numbers of returned survey forms. 'Patient experience group' forums are held from time to time, which also formally take on board feedback from prisoners.

6.2.6 The number of prisoners who did not attend healthcare appointments, also referred to as 'DNAs', is measured on a monthly basis across six clinics run at the prison. GP appointments and nurse and healthcare assistant appointments experience the highest number of DNAs (typically 10%-15%), simply due to the throughput. This means that valuable appointment slots are wasted. The reasons for DNAs are varied and include implementation of regimes within the prison, but the IMB also has evidence of poor administration at operational level, resulting in prisoners being unaware of their appointments. On a sample of like-for-like annual data, the DNAs for attendance at an in-house nurse appointment increased significantly and, apart from the waste of resources, the levels of DNAs are not really acceptable in the controlled prison environment.

6.2.7 Secondary appointments at hospitals are sometimes lost due to DNAs, because prisoners do not want to be seen in public in restraints, despite officers appearing to use discretion in these situations. In the Board's view, there is no obvious solution to this disincentive.

6.2.8 In a sample of like-for-like annual data, the wait times for different categories of specialist healthcare remained largely the same over the year, with the notable exception of the times to see a GP, which greatly increased. (Specific data has not been included in the report because, on a standalone basis, it does not show the complete picture.)

6.3 Mental health

6.3.1 Prisoners can benefit from the very proactive mental health support team, supplemented by a psychiatrist visiting on a weekly basis. During the reporting period, the average wait time to see a psychiatrist was 15 weeks, but this has greatly improved since January 2025. The demands on the mental health team are high and additional recruitment was planned in the reporting year to help handle the caseload. Reviews carried out in the CSU are always attended by a member of the mental health team, who appears to actively contribute, while they also attend all ACCT reviews. Drop-in clinics were held and were much in demand but, sadly, a regime change precluded these and, by January 2025, they were not taking place. At the end of the reporting period, the wait time to see a member of the mental health team was a commendable 5-7 days, with all urgent referrals seen within 24 hours. Their primary and secondary caseload was 55, a marginal reduction on the same month in the previous year. Board members have observed that the mental health nurses have a good professional relationship with prisoners and are well-respected by both their client base and the prison management.

6.4 Social care

6.4.1 From our observations, we are pleased to report that the high standard of social care at HMP Littlehey continues, with strong links between the prison, the healthcare department and the social care team. The level of palliative care also remains high, and the Board is confident that the growing need for such care at the prison will be met with professionalism and empathy.

6.4.2 The Board is also very pleased to note the significant level of time and thought given by both staff and prisoners to programmes to support disabled prisoners.

6.5 Exercise, regime

6.5.1 HMP Littlehey continues to provide an excellent PE/exercise regime management plan, with options for engaging in PE/exercise during the day, evening and at weekends. These options included team activities, covering cricket, football, running, badminton and basketball, as well as standard gym, weights and weight-loss circuit classes. Many of the team sports run as leagues, including an inter-wing football league, with enthusiastic participation by both prisoners and the staff managing these events.

6.5.2 The Board is pleased to note that prisoners are still engaged in around 3½ hours of personal physical activity each week. This is significantly above the HMPPS benchmark of 2½ hours per prisoner, per week. The prison is at an excellent 70% prisoner participation level and has been recognised nationally as providing the best practice for remedial PE. The Board notes that these achievements have been gained despite curtailments, due to staff redeployment or regime changes necessitated by staff shortages.

6.5.3 The PE department continues to run activities for specific groups within the prisoner population, including those involved with the substance misuse team and the LGBTQ+ community, with extended options for older prisoners, including walking-football and yoga sessions. These have proved extremely popular and have increased the time out of cell for those who might not otherwise bother with any activity. There have also been events run specifically to support initiatives such as Black History Month. There are sessions run exclusively for those imprisoned for public protection (IPP). They are very well received and give this group an opportunity to talk about their concerns with others in a similar position while exercising.

6.5.4 The Board is also pleased to note the continuing strong links between PE,

healthcare and education, which have enabled the provision to be tailored to the needs of the prisoners. The provision of accredited courses in structured vocation PE, leading to vocational qualifications such as first aid, diet and nutrition and healthy living, and the PE orderlies being registered for peer monitoring qualifications, are also to be applauded. Equally, the running of specific events in support of local charities is an extremely positive move, which enhances the prisoners' sense of contribution and the prison's reputation in the local community.

6.5.5 The repair and replacement of gym equipment continues to be challenging, due to insufficient funding.

6.6 Drug and alcohol rehabilitation

6.6.1 A Phoenix Futures team continues to provide prisoner wellbeing services, in addition to the charity's support for prisoners with substance misuse issues. They continue to see all new arrivals to the prison, to undertake a full assessment of substance misuse, and are available to prisoners by self-referral. In addition to four practitioners working closely with prisoners on a one-to-one basis, their work also covers providing brief interventions and welfare checks, as needed by prisoners or the prison. In addition, they run a support group in A wing, the recovery and wellbeing wing, and fellowship meetings for Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) and Narcotics Anonymous (NA), with specialist AA and NA support staff visiting weekly. As at the end of the reporting year, they were providing support for over 20% of the prison population; they work with probation staffs in the community, too. The Board is pleased to note the increasing number of support groups each week, which include three general support groups, two acupuncture sessions, one yoga session and one for Japanese origami. We also note the continued visibility of the services offered by this recovery and wellbeing team and their responsiveness in supporting the needs of the prisoner population, which is very positively received.

6.7 Soft skills

6.7.1 The Board is pleased to see the continuation of peer-led workshops in the evenings, as tier 2 planned purposeful activity. Many of the activities are wing based, such as quizzes, chess and scrabble groups. However, there are also intra-wing groups such as choirs, bible studies and prayer groups.

6.7.2 The Board notes the continuing activities days, where some 150 prisoners at each event are encouraged to share their skills and talents with other prisoners. This gives those who demonstrate their skill a real sense of achievement, while offering other prisoners opportunities for personal development.

6.7.3 Prisoners were also able to benefit from a range of extracurricular activities including the Mothers' Union-run workshops on positive relationships, and many other individuals providing skills instruction. The Board is particularly impressed that a member of staff on one of the programmes offers counselling to prisoners one day each week in her own, personal time.

6.7.4 In summary, there are a vast range of opportunities for soft skills at HMP Littlehey, which is a huge benefit to the prison population.

7. Progression and resettlement

7.1 Education, library

7.1.1 The Board notes that the prison has almost doubled the number of prisoners in Maths classes, from 30 to 60, and more than doubled the number of prisoners in English classes. The Board also acknowledges the continuing supportive role played by the Shannon Trust reading and literacy charity in this output. However, we are concerned that all this good work seems to have been wiped out, and a further 16 places lost, due to the 40% reduction in the training budget.

7.1.2 The Board notes that a reading strategy to support literacy is well embedded, with over 900 assessments completed. It is used to guide the provision of reading support, using support coordinators and the Shannon Trust. The comments from the Ofsted report in the previous reporting period have been successfully addressed. More widely, a digital education platform has been introduced so that tutors can access more resources to help with course teaching.

7.1.3 The Board can report that the library provision is much improved since the previous reporting period. The Woodlands library has always been available, but the Lakeside library now has established library managers and is reliably open for three days each week. All prisoners on the wings have the opportunity to visit the library, and it continues to provide outreach services so that prisoners can access all library resources. The library also timetables sessions for the Shannon Trust; for quiet time when prisoners can conduct their own research; education for those on courses; and games. All wings also have small libraries.

7.2 Vocational training, work

7.2.1 The Board notes that the number of prisoners with no assigned activity for any part of the day has, again, fallen significantly, and is now down to below 70, a huge drop, from 300 at the end of the 2022-2023 period.

7.2.2 The Board also reports that the number of prisoners assigned to workshops is now over 250, compared with 250 reported last year, with an attendance rate of over 95%. An extra 88 spaces were created, and there is an initiative to work with an external company on developing skills in the prison and employ prisoners on release. In the Board's view, this is an outstanding initiative, which will be of huge benefit to some prisoners. Unfortunately, all the extra spaces have been lost by a 35% cut to the education budget as this report was being finalised, an unbelievable cut to make to a training prison.

7.2.3 The Board, once again, notes the excellent work carried out at HMP Littlehey by the Fine Cell Work charity (which creates handmade products in British prisons) and their continued support of prisoners involved in this work following their release. The exceptional work completed by prisoners employed by Fine Cell, either in their workshop or via in-cell work, is truly admirable and something they should be very proud of.

7.2.4 However, we are disappointed to note that the roof of the workshops' building was leaking for the whole of the reporting period, without any clear plan to repair or replace it.

7.2.5 The Board is pleased to see the continuing development of the CRED (clean, rehabilitative, enabling and decent) team to support the work of Gov Facility Services Limited (GFSL), with the plan to increase the team to over 20 and give it its own workshop. In the Board's view, this is an excellent initiative that saves money and allows some prisoners to develop or maintain skills and gain a sense of contributing to their community.

7.3 Offender management, progression

7.3.1 The Board reports that there are dedicated prison offender managers (POMs) acting as single points of contact (SPoC) for specific wings to support sentence progression and raise prisoners' awareness of the support available. Also, there are two offender management unit (OMU) orderlies, who attend inductions weekly to speak to new receptions about the role of the OMU. Also, as D wing is being developed for ISP (life sentenced and IPP) prisoners, OMU clinics are being provided each month to deal with questions specific to those prisoners.

7.3.2 The Board notes that progress on OASys (offender assessment system) reports has continued and the backlog is now down to 50. Also, there appears to be an improved focus on progressions through the prison, with F wing being used for prisoners with two years to go to parole and an increase in category D boards (which assess if a prisoner is eligible for transfer to an open prison).

7.3.3 The Board is extremely pleased to note the success of the ROTL (release on temporary licence) scheme, introduced over summer for prisoners to work improving the grounds around the outside of the prison. This has been undertaken in consultation with the local council and the prisoners are subject to the full ROTL review process, as though they were being released into the community. The scheme is restricted to prisoners on G wing (who are the most trusted and well behaved men) who volunteer. Their application goes to their POM and a full risk assessment within OMU is made, leading to a review board chaired by one of the senior probation officers (SPO). A licence is then generated and the community offender manager (COM) is consulted before a recommendation is made to the Governor. This is proving to be a significant benefit in developing prisoners towards eventual release, and the POMs are seeing huge improvements in their confidence, self-esteem, sense of responsibility and appreciation.

7.3.4 Since the last report, the offender behaviour programmes have been changed nationally, from Kaizen and Horizon to Building Choices. Unfortunately, there was a gap between the old programmes being withdrawn and the staff being trained on the new programmes, leaving some prisoners unable to complete the necessary courses. The broad range of programmes is overseen at a national level by intervention services and they briefed parole boards on what was happening. However, parole boards still must manage the risk and there was a reluctance to recommend a prisoner release if he hadn't completed a programme that had previously been identified as necessary on his OASys, resulting in parole delays for some prisoners. The problem was made worse by a rule that limits programmes to only two or three prisoners who maintain their innocence in any group a challenge at Littlehey, where a high proportion of prisoners do so.

7.3.5 Also, there is a mismatch between programmes and OMU/parole boards in prioritising prisoners for courses. Programmes will try to schedule prisoners onto courses two years before their release date. However, they have to prioritise recalls, which often disrupts planning schedules. National policy prevents programmes from scheduling preparation for a category D move until much closer to release, even though this move can occur up to five years before release.

7.3.6 However, the Board is extremely pleased to note that programmes are holding clinics on each wing weekly on a rolling basis, with the schedule sent to the wings in advance.

7.4 Family contact

7.4.1 The Board notes that the prison continues to give prisoners up to 2½ hours with

visitors rather than the mandated one hour. We have observed the continued effective working relationship that has developed between the prison and Invisible Walls (a not-for-profit organisation), which took over the management of social visits in October 2022.

The continuing attention being given to providing social visit days for specific groups in the prison is also to be commended. Examples of this are the family days (which bring together prisoners and their families outside of their statutory entitlement to social visits, usually in more informal settings) run for ISP (life sentenced and IPP) prisoners and those run for one adult only and the one child visits, all of which are well received by prisoners and their families. Also, the Board is pleased to see social video calls in the visits hall.

7.5 Resettlement planning

7.5.1 As in previous years, HMP Littlehey continues to release significant numbers of prisoners directly into the community, despite it being a training, rather than a resettlement, prison. During the reporting year, 144 prisoners were released into the community, which is a welcome reduction on the 190 who were released in the last reporting period (according to figures from the OMU).

7.5.2 The Board is encouraged that, again, no prisoners were released to transient accommodation or without accommodation.

7.5.3 We are pleased that pre-release planning continues to be very thorough, with excellent links between the OMU staff and outside agencies. This results in prisoners getting as good a start as can reasonably be expected.

8. The work of the IMB

8.1.1 Theoretically, the period began with four Board members, but one resigned at the end of the period, leaving the Board with just three members against a complement of 16. A recruitment campaign resulted in two accepted applicants but they both withdrew before vetting.

8.1.2 The Board considers the current IMB recruitment wording to be inadequate. When a campaign is not open, which is the vast majority of the year, the IMB website simply states, 'We are not currently recruiting at this location. Please register your interest and we will let you know as soon as the next campaign opens.' This gives the reader the impression that the relevant Board doesn't need any new volunteers. We asked for the wording to be changed in January but, at the time of writing (October), there has been no change.

8.1.3 One of the remaining Board members' tenure ends in December 2025, which would result in the Board reducing to two. The IMB staff don't have a process for applying for a tenure extension, so an appeal was made directly to the Minister, in accordance with Section 3 of the Cabinet Office Governance Code on Public Appointments, dated 8 February 2024. The Board was dismayed by the response from the Head of Public Bodies Centre of Expertise, who refused the extension, having been assured by the IMB Staff Group that there were 'already robust plans in motion to stabilise the Board at HMP Littlehey, increase membership, and ensure that statutory functions can continue to be delivered'. We have not been apprised of any such plans and, given that there are not to be any further recruitment campaigns in 2025, we are now consigned to having only two members as we go into 2026. That will undoubtedly mean there are times when we cannot provide a duty member. Also, we will be able to do even less monitoring of the estate and we already get comments from prisoners that they don't see the IMB as much as they do in other prisons. Therefore, the next annual report will be dramatically curtailed. Also, due to other commitments of the two remaining Board members, there will be periods throughout the year when we are unable to provide duty cover. We have continually stated that, should one of the remaining two members have to resign, due to personal circumstances, for example, the remaining one will not attempt to continue solo, because it would be too easy to make an error of judgement or an inappropriate statement without peer review in contentious circumstances. Therefore, we will be moving into 2026 with the possibility of the Board disbanding at short notice.

8.1.4 During the reporting year, the Board held 11 board Meetings, with the Governor providing very good support. For monitoring purposes, it attended the CSU every week, when prisoners were in situ, and conducted weekly sessions to answer prisoner applications (written representations) to the Board. Monitoring visits have necessarily been ad-hoc. Prison management meetings were also monitored on an ad-hoc basis.

8.1.5 The Board is a good team, with varied backgrounds and a range of complementary skills and strengths. It enjoys generally good relations with prisoners and staff, evidenced by the number of people who approach Board members when they are in the prison. It will be a great shame that our level of interaction will necessarily reduce further.

Board statistics

Recommended complement of Board members	16
Number of Board members at the start of the reporting period	4
Number of Board members at the end of the reporting period	3
Total number of visits to the establishment	261
Total number of segregation reviews observed	190

Applications to the IMB

8.1.6 IMB applications increased marginally from 246 to 263, showing a consistent level across the years. The total of 263 is not simply the sum of the individual categories, because some IMB applications cover more than one complaint. The vast majority of applications were answered by letter from the IMB office, with meetings held with prisoners to clarify issues when needed. Unfortunately, a significant percentage of these applications are about matters that have not already been submitted through the internal complaints process, or where a prisoner is attempting to change an operational decision.

8.1.7 The significant decrease in the number of applications relating to accommodation from 2023 was the result of improvements to the heating system after the major failures during the previous reporting period. But problems with hot water and heating remain. Complaints about food and kitchens have remained low, but transfer complaints have continued to rise as the prison estate stays full and transfers are difficult to arrange. Property complaints to the IMB on transfer have fallen back to the 2023 level.

8.1.8 From January 2023, the IMB was no longer part of the confidential access process.

Applications to the IMB

Code	Subject	Reporting year 2023	Previous reporting year 2024	Current reporting year 2025
A	Accommodation, including laundry, clothing, ablutions	52	19	31
B	Discipline, including adjudications, incentives scheme, sanctions	7	16	15
C	Equality	9	1	7
D	Purposeful activity, including education, work, training, library, regime, time out of cell	22	21	16
E1	Letters, visits, telephones, public protection restrictions	24	10	18
E2	Finance, including pay, private monies, spends	6	9	9
F	Food and kitchens	9	3	2
G	Health, including physical, mental, social care	8	17	15
H1	Property within this establishment	13	26	28
H2	Property during transfer or in another establishment or location	22	37	25
H3	Canteen, facility list, catalogue(s)	10	9	11
I	Sentence management, including HDC (home detention curfew), ROTL (release on temporary licence), parole, release dates, recategorisation	7	9	9
J	Staff/prisoner concerns, including bullying	21	28	18
K	Transfers	5	10	18
L	Miscellaneous, including complaints system	31	31	41
	Confidential access	22	0	0
	'No shows'	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total number of applications		268	246	263

Annex A

Service providers

Service	Provider
Dental care	Prisoner Centred Dental Care
Diversity and Inclusion	Zahid Mubarak Trust (ZMT)
Education	People Plus CF03
Library	Suffolk Libraries
Healthcare, including mental health	Northamptonshire Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust
Pharmacy	Lloyds Pharmacy
Prisoner support	Samaritans Prison Fellowship Peace Partners Relate Shannon Trust Sue Ryder Christians against Poverty Mothers' Union
Resettlement	National Probation Service
Social care	Cambridgeshire County Council
Substance misuse programmes	Phoenix Futures Recovery and Wellbeing Team
Visitors' centre and hall	Invisible Walls (a G4S company)



This publication is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. To view this licence, visit nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3

Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

This publication is available at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications>

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at imb@justice.gov.uk