

For the attention of the Legal Division of the Danish Prison and Probation Service

Side 1 af 1

Fra: Batten, Sibylle [NOMS] [sibylle.batten@noms.gsi.gov.uk]
Sendt: 14. november 2012 15:10
Til: \$Juridisk kontor (101jur)
Cc: Vibeke Greve (101vig)
Emne: For the attention of the Legal Division of the Danish Prison and Probation Service
Vedhæftede filer: Danish query Nov 2012; Danish Government Response Nov 2012.doc

<<Danish query Nov 2012>> <<Danish Government Response Nov 2012.doc>>

Dear Colleagues

With reference to your enquiry received by the National Offender Management Service in October 2012 (copy attached), please find also attached a copy of our response.

I would like to draw to your attention the offer of our colleagues to meet with you in person should you find that helpful. If you wish to visit and explore the responses in more detail, please do not hesitate to get back to me as my department would be happy to assist with such a visit.

I would be grateful if you could confirm the receipt of the document.

Sent with kind regards
Sibylle Batten

Sibylle Batten
Head of Market and International Development

Ministry of Justice - National Offender Management Service (NOMS) HQ |
Directorate of Commissioning and Commercial |
Post Point 5.12, 5th Floor, Clive House, 70 Petty France, London SW1H 9HD |
tel. +44 (0)7530 264212 | email: sibylle.batten@noms.gsi.gov.uk |
web: www.justice.gov.uk/about/noms.htm

The original of this email was scanned for viruses by the Government Secure Intranet virus scanning service supplied by Cable&Wireless Worldwide in partnership with MessageLabs. (CCTM Certificate Number 2009/09/0052.) On leaving the GSi this email was certified virus free. Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.

Questions 1077 and 1078 of the Legal Affairs Committee

1. The following seeks to answer the four questions at the beginning of page 2 of Danish Ministry of Justice's letter.

- (1) How does HM Prison Service ensure optimum and cost conscious shift planning taking into consideration the specific security and safety issues in prisons?
- (2) Has any best practice for 'shift planning' been developed?
- (3) Have any IT tools to facilitate this process been developed?
- (4) To what extent do the British prisons experience situations in which a prison officer is the only member of staff on duty in a housing unit for prison inmates?

Preliminary comments

2. Before seeking to respond to each of these questions we offer the following preliminary comments which help contextualise our response:

- (i) This response to your questions is based on the experience of the public sector Prison Service in England and Wales: the prisons in Scotland and Northern Ireland are run independently by devolved administrations; and 12 of the 135 prisons in England and Wales are run under contract by the private sector¹. While some of the principles of staffing prisons are shared, different answers to the questions asked would be provided especially by the operators of private prisons.
- (ii) While we have sought to answer each question discretely, there is inevitably an overlap. Indeed, in many respects it might be easier to provide the full response required by meeting: we strongly recommend that if the answers we provide are of interest arrangements are made for representatives of the Danish Ministry of Justice to meet us so that we can provide a fuller account.
- (iii) Two fundamental factors determine much about the staffing levels in prisons: first, the prevailing culture of the country in which a prison is run. This may not appear as obvious as it should be but it is a salutary reminder of the difficulties of seeking to learn from the practices of prison services in other jurisdictions. To a greater or lesser extent these practices are based on deep-

¹ It is Government policy in to use competition as a means of driving innovation and improved efficiency and effectiveness in prisons in England and Wales. Twelve of the 134 prisons in England and Wales are run by private sector companies. A competition for 15 year contracts to run nine prisons, eight of which are at present run by the public sector prison service is currently in progress.

seated social mores and long-standing legal traditions. To adopt practices from one jurisdiction requires a carefully consideration of the cultural implications. We have learned this through the frequency with which we have visited prisons in the USA. Within what might be termed a 'Western European' democratic tradition, which the Council of Europe's instruments and institutions have so effectively embodied, there are differences in penal practice.

Secondly, much of how we deploy staff in prisons run by the public sector in England and Wales is determined by the Terms and Conditions of the staff we employ and the agreements reached with staff associations (Trades Unions) on issues such as shift length, meal breaks and overall patterns of staff attendance. These factors substantially determine efficiency, although as our response will show, there is scope for ensuring that within the parameters set by Terms and Conditions and agreements, more efficient and effective deployment arrangements can be achieved. We are in the process of introducing a revised terms and conditions ('Fair & Sustainable') for all new staff. It is worth us summarising what these are because they will critically affect the efficiency with which we deploy staff.

(iv) 'Fair and Sustainable' therefore provides a template underpinning which are the optimum comparators of every type and size of prison. This corporate approach to resourcing means that our resourcing proposals are more robustly and rigorously worked up than if they had been the outcome of work developed purely for this competition. It thereby provides a very transparent and objective means of sense checking and approving our resourcing levels. Specifically, 'Fair and Sustainable' enables us to provide:

- A much more competitive price for our resourcing arrangements than we were able to provide in PCP1 over the life of the contract
- A more streamlined management structure which ensures that every managerial role adds value to operational effectiveness and efficiency
- A very robust methodology for defining (a) the role of every member of staff, (b) the weighting of each job and therefore the skills required to perform that role effectively and efficiently

- A remuneration package which accurately and equitably reflects the methodology to define roles and job weighting, which ensures value for money and avoids the wasteful misattribution of skills and resource
 - A completely coherent set of arrangements for integrating the work of different professionals and disciplines of the staff we directly employ which provides a robust basis upon which our partners can dovetail their staffing and managerial arrangements with our own
- (v) Critically, the financial model underpinning the 'Fair and Sustainable' has had to be approved at the most senior levels in the Ministry of Justice. One of the main drivers of the 'Fair and Sustainable' reforms has been the need to make our resourcing arrangements more competitive in cost terms as well as confidently deliverable operationally.
- (vi) In determining the detail of our resourcing proposals, the sophisticated Job Evaluation Scheme (JES) has ensured that we can assess the relative value of different jobs and the pay of the people undertaking them. The transparency of this job evaluation process means that the basis upon which we have developed our staff resourcing proposals is open to scrutiny. Therefore any changes we make to resourcing arrangements in the light of any new requirements you might make of us as a provider in the course of the contract life have a clearly predictable outcome. This makes our price as well as the detail of our resourcing model more reliable.
- (vii) It is helpful to describe those elements of the 'Fair and Sustainable' package to identify how it has provided the means of sense-checking and approving our proposals. In essence 'Fair and Sustainable' will deliver:
- A new operating structure for all grades based on 11 separate bands
 - A new job evaluation scheme for all roles in the National Offender Management Service
 - New clear and defined job descriptions for all roles
 - One core prison officer level
 - A new supervisory role above prison officer
 - Three levels of management: (i) Custodial Manager (a new uniformed role) and Hub Manager (for non operational grades); (ii) Head of Function; and (iii) Senior Manager

- A new approach to administration through the creation of administrative hubs in establishments
- Open pay ranges for managers in Bands 6-11 (i.e. there are no fixed pay points between the top and the bottom of the pay range)

(viii) The rigour with which we have attributed resource is evidenced by the application of the JES. Every role is evaluated to produce a JES score which then places that role within the appropriate band. The 'factor plan' lies at the core of our job evaluation scheme. It describes the characteristics and requirements of jobs across the Service. It comprises the nine factors in which all jobs will be evaluated and measured against. The nine factors are:

- Skills and knowledge
- Accountability and decision making
- Problem solving
- Resource management and financial impact
- Organising and planning
- People management
- Information management
- Influencing and interaction
- Emotional demands and risk

(ix) Scoring is simple and transparent. The nine factors measure job demands and are scored over six levels, or in the case of Factor 9, only four levels. All factors are equally weighted and each level is worth 100 points. All jobs score a minimum of 100 points on each factor, so in effect the minimum a job can be scored is 900 points and the maximum is 5,200. Jobs that score similarly under JES will fall in the same bands in the future, even though they may come from different occupational groupings. This gives us a way of ensuring fairness in pay across our organisation, through a transparent process.

(x) Each band has an associated basic pay range. Any applicable allowances or additional payments (such as unsocial hours payments) will be paid on top of this. All members of staff in prisons will move to the new bands either by being matched to their equivalent role in the new structure or by being mapped to the family of jobs of which their current job belongs. The band they move to will be on the basis of the JES score for the job description to which they will work. The transition to the new

working structures will only take place once the number of posts at each band has been determined by the Governor and agreed by their line Manager.

(xi) The new structures include a new approach to administrative activities by creating hubs that will provide administrative support across the establishment rather than through standalone roles. There will be four types of hub:

- People Hub – this will pool administration resources to cover activities such as training, staff detail and rostering and HR support
- Business Hub – this will pool administration resources to cover finance and performance, audits, stores and contract and facilities support
- Offender Management Hub – this will pool administration resources to be case administrators and move away from the traditional custody office standalone roles such as Discipline Clerk, Parole Clerk and so on
- Activities Hub – this will pool administration resources to support resettlement and industries and workshop activities including procurement and regime monitoring

(xii) The process for moving staff to roles in the new structure has been designed to take into account the specialist nature of some job descriptions, and the more flexible nature of others, while being as fair as possible to staff in both types of role. All job descriptions will be listed as either “rotational” or “non-rotational”, based on whether or not a role requires specialist skills, qualifications or experience. This approach will be applied to both Operational and Non-Operational roles. Non-rotational roles are those that require specialist skills or qualifications. Examples of non-rotational roles include Health & Safety Manager, Chaplain and Specialist Officer PEI.

(xiii) Rotational roles are those where the nature of a job is a generic one, or where for operational reasons assigning a role to a specific individual would be impractical. Rotational means the individual could be rotated between a number of different job descriptions, in the same job family (group profile) at the same band. Examples of rotational roles include OSGs, Prison Officers, Business Administration Officers and Operational Heads of Function.

(xiv) Some roles, such as Governor, Deputy Governor and Head of Function, map into different bands. This is because the complexity, size and scope of an establishment impacts on the JES score of the role. These levels of complexity for establishments have been defined as Complex and Diverse, Complex and Standard. A central panel, chaired by a NOMS Director and comprising job analysts and observed by trade union officials, decided the level of each establishment using information provided to them by the Director of High Security and Deputy Directors of Custody against a standard set of indicators.

2. In addition, we do think it is helpful to preface our response to the four questions about staff deployment by outlining some of the features of the long-standing agreement we have with the principal Trades Union (the Prison Officers' Association) about the length of shifts and other matters concerning patterns of attendance. This agreement, which is referred to as 'Bulletin 8', was the basis of a major reform of working practices over 20 years ago which significantly removed 'overtime' payments from the routine remuneration of prison officers.

3. Bulletin 8 is a very detailed document which sets out not only standards hours to be worked each week (39), the maximum and minimum shift lengths (12 hours and 6 hours respectively) but matters such as meal breaks and the requirement for officers to work 'alternate weekends'. It also specifies the conditions under which staff can be called on to work when not on duty to deal with operational emergencies. (in prisons run by the private sector their officer equivalents are sometimes deployed. While it may be argued that Bulletin 8 inhibits a more flexible set of attendance arrangements, it continues to provide a reasonable basis on which to deploy staff and to maintain a 'work/life balance'.

RESPONSE TO THE QUESTIONS

(1) HOW DOES HM PRISON SERVICE ENSURE OPTIMUM AND COST CONSCIOUS SHIFT PLANNING TAKING INTO CONSIDERATION THE SPECIFIC SECURITY AND SAFETY ISSUES IN PRISONS?

(2) HAS ANY BEST PRACTICE FOR 'SHIFT PLANNING' BEEN DEVELOPED?

4. The methodology we now use to determine staffing levels has been developed in competition. It represents a break with a traditional rather laborious and

very detailed ('task focused') system of identifying work and attributing individual members of to specific tasks. This traditional approach tended to result in an inflexible use of staff and, in places, a 'rule-bound' approach to work which could be inefficient. We have called this methodology a 'zero-based' approach. Before outlining it, it must be noted that it is used once we have identified which work can be done by which staff. This is crucial and can require assumptions to be challenged. Simply because certain work has traditionally been performed by a particular grade of staff doesn't mean that they necessarily should continue to perform it all. In the last 20 years the prison officer workforce has undergone several changes. Not the least of these has been the development of a cadre of staff who perform 'operational support' functions. The key distinction between prison officers and our 'operational support grades' is that the latter while uniformed, they do not require the full training required of a prison officer. Critically, 'operational support grades' are not empowered to use force.

5. We set out our response to your questions (1) and (2) as follows:

- Description of the Factors Considered in drawing up staffing levels
- The rationale underpinning our staffing levels, shift patterns and management supervision ratios
- The 'quality assurance' checks we use to ensure that the staffing arrangements we propose are 'fit for purpose'
- An explanation of how our staffing arrangements give us confidence in knowing that they are able to provide an effective response to emergencies (outbreaks of concerted indiscipline etc).

Description of the Factors Considered in drawing up staffing levels

6. We consider the following factors in drawing up staffing levels:

- (i) The numbers of prisoners and capacity of each of the areas of the prison in which prisoners are accommodated – including the wings and each of the activity areas – and the type and needs of the prisoners in each area.
- (ii) The nature of the work we require staff to undertake and therefore the skill mix we need to ensure that work is most efficiently and effectively completed to the required standard.

- (iii) The design of buildings and facilities which prisoners access.
- (iv) The size of the prison site and the layout of the buildings.
- (v) How staffing critically contributes to the achieving the 'Whole Prison Approach'

(i) Number of prisoners and accommodation capacity

7. Clearly the resourcing of a prison is contingent on its size and function. We begin by plotting how many prisoners are in each part of the prison throughout each 24 hour period – thereby ensuring that we understand all the variations in patterns of prison movements and locations. We do this using a plan of the prison and 'walking through' each period of the day identifying where prisoners would be required to be, and the number of staff that would be needed to supervise and interact with them in each location.

8. Some adjustments to the Core Day (the term we use to describe the period in the day from the first unlocking of prisons in the morning to the final locking up of prisoners for the night) and the routine within the Core Day were made to ensure we optimise the purposeful activity time and the staff resource we would need to deploy, thereby avoiding the 'dead time' which institutional routines can impose. For example, we have moved away from locking prisoners up at lunchtime.

(ii) Nature of the work and skill-mix

9. Within the framework of Core Day, we resource the prison flexibly using experience to gauge the time and resources required to undertake finite tasks. But wherever possible we resist attributing a specific task over a particular period of time to a set number of officers – the rigidity of this reinforces an old fashioned 'task dropping' mentality in staff and managers. Our approach provides a staff resource sufficient to undertake the work required, delivering the operational services using team working and dynamic first line management rather than task lists.

10. We also consider the nature of the work which staff would be required to do and the precise skills needed to complete that most effectively. This aspect of our approach includes considering whether work needs to be done at all, or at the time when we had assumed or planned it would be done. This consideration further

enables us to optimise the flexibility inherent in some work requirements without comprising on the 'fixed' nature of other aspects of service delivery.

(iii) The design of buildings and facilities which prisoners access

11. Another important consideration in refining our staffing proposals is the design of the buildings and facilities in which prisoners live, work and recreate. Good lines of sight within buildings enable a leaner staffing proposition. An equally important consideration is the nature of the activity in which prisoners are engaged in each building and facility.

(iv) The size of the prison site and the layout of the buildings

12. The totality of the prison site is considered as part of the resourcing model. Particularly for movements of prisoners to and from activities and in making adequate provision for alarm response, the distances involved and the routes involved are key.

(v) How staffing critically contributes to the achieving the 'Whole Prison Approach'

13. Critically, our resourcing model underpins the arrangements for delivering our 'whole prison approach'. The careful integration of our staff resourcing with the other elements of our proposals ensures that the impact and benefit of our operational effectiveness is greater than the sum of its parts. Central to achieving this placing the prisoner - and the need to ensure that all we do helps reduce reoffending - at the heart of everything we do. This approach helps overcome the institutional tendency to departmentalisation and for working relationships within institutions to be defined by inter-disciplinary rivalries. Embodying this approach is the common thread connecting all the systems, processes and procedures and the contribution which everyone who works in this prison will make to ensuring that 'Every Contact Matters'.

14. Every Contact Matters because however small or fleeting, experience and the desistance research shows that even the most common day-to-day interactions between everyone who works in a prison and prisoners can and do make a difference. They make a difference to the tone and culture of institutional life which becomes self-perpetuating: when positive this helps not only promote safe, decent and secure conditions but potentiates the benefits which 'what works' literature

shows that the delivery of services which meet prisoners' criminogenic needs can realise. An important judgement for us therefore is how to ensure that we have sufficient staff to deliver on the promise of making 'every contact matter'; and that embedded in the deployment and behaviour of staff was a clear understanding of and a firm commitment to this principle.

15. Every Contact Matters is the touchstone of the effective working practices within our teams, between our teams, and with and between individual members of staff and prisoners. And it models behaviour which in turn influences how prisoners behave for the better. The central importance of Every Contact Matters provides the focus for everyone who works for us and with us - it is the currency of our interaction amongst everyone who lives and works in the prison; and it is the currency of our interaction with visitors and the wider community. It is more than a slogan: it is a belief underpinned by the three fundamental features of all our proposals:

- Our experience in managing some of the very best prisons
- Our ground-breaking partnerships which reconfigure the model of public sector delivery (which we set out separately below); and
- The findings of the research Cambridge University has conducted into the characteristics of the best prisons and our use of it to provide an annual 'health check' of achievement

16. Our experience includes the 'know how' of optimising (sometimes but 'turning round') operational culture and performance. What characterises these prisons are features which are able to deliver here:

- Committed and confident leadership
- Dedicated staff capable of exercising authority with discretion and humanity
- A culture which is both mutually supportive and transparently accountable
- 'Know how' embodied by professionalism and 'prison craft'

17. Over several years the Institute of Criminology at Cambridge has established a revealing insight into the culture of prisons, and particularly what makes prisons 'good' or 'bad'. Going beyond the conventional metrics, the research has found that while all high performing prisons – contracted-out and public sector prisons – share

some characteristics, there are some features of the best of public sector prisons which are seen less prominently in our competitors.

18. Critically, the features which distinguish prisons best able to promote the changes in prisoners which reduce reoffending, depend on staff professionalism. The most recent findings of the Cambridge research (a useful summary of which, *Values and Practices in Public and Private Sector - Prisons: A Summary of Key Findings from an Evaluation*, was published in the *Prison Service Journal* July 2011 edition) strongly indicate that in general, the public sector has an advantage over most private sector prisons in this area because staff tend to be more experienced and more confident in using their authority. This use of authority is about exercising discretion in using power and the adept setting and policing of boundaries to create a safe, decent environment, the foundation on which prisoners can change their lives.

19. Our staff resourcing model is heavily influenced by the well-established research of Cambridge University into the culture of prisons, the role of staff and the impact on prisoners and their life changes. Indeed, our proposals include an annual, independent assessment (using MQPL and SQL) of the effects we are confident our staff resourcing model will deliver. Probably the most crucial feature we will be seeking these assessments to identify is the extent to which the culture of the prison potentiates the most important work of prisons: reducing reoffending. Of the six 'dimensions' used to analyse the culture of prisons, that which measures the extent to which prisoners are able to develop, to change is crucial in determining the ultimately effectiveness of the prison in reducing reoffending. And it is around the features of that sixth dimension which our 'whole prison approach' is built. Central to this is our decision to model the Offender Management function using prison officer resources. Rather than hiving off Offender Management work to a discrete unit, the core OM function is rooted in the work officers undertake on the wings and in supervising prisoners else where. This approach provides a seamless integration of prison officer work across the breadth of the prison's activities including those provided by out partners.

20. This dimension concerns the 'personal development' of prisoners and is based upon the precepts of desistance – that reducing offenders' risk of reoffending is contingent upon providing them with help to change, to adapt law-abiding and useful lives. Potentiating change in prisoners is the 'silver bullet', and this is what our 'whole prison approach' will provide. We can infer from the Cambridge research what

it is about our approach to running and particularly staffing prisons that results in this important differentiation. This extensive and respected body of literature points up the cultural differences our best staff make. Central to this is the confidence our staff have to use their authority well – with discretion, demarcating boundaries making prisoners and their colleagues feel safe and secure. The research shows too that this confidence needs to be grown and sustained by good leadership and by strong foundations which our change management proposals will establish and which our annual audit of these arrangements will closely monitor.

The rationale underpinning our staffing levels, shift patterns and management supervision ratios

21. The rationale we use to determine our staffing numbers is a resourcing model which 'zero bases' assumptions and staff numbers, what we term our 'Zero Based Resourcing Approach (or ZeBRA). Underpinning this approach is a challenge to basic assumptions so that nothing is a 'given'. This forces us to look afresh at the way we determined staff numbers by requiring us to start from the assumption that we required no staff unless any one member of staff was justifiably required. Applying this approach to each area of the prison at different times of the day or night inevitably elicited different answers but ensured a very rigorous ('zero based') outcome.

22. What is most novel in this approach was the question we were challenged to ask about skill-mix – and critically the mix of skills between prison officers and Operational Support Grades (OSGs). The next stage in the ZeBRA approach having determined bottom-up the necessary level of staffing for each function is to check that the numbers across the prison 'add up'. This sense check is more than checking for operational/contingency cover but to see how best to group work and hence the staff undertaking it. ZeBRA requires uniformed staff groups to be large so that the economies of scale in deployment are realised – with smaller staff groups proportionately more resource needs to be provided to ensure that absence on leave, training and sickness are covered reliably. In the following paragraphs we provide the detailed outcome of applying the ZeBRA for one prison. The following table summarises the number of unified staffing levels at by grade and period of the core day.

Staff Group	Monday- Friday			Weekend			Nights
	AM	PM	ED	AM	PM	ED	
Custodial Manager	3	3	1	2	2	0	1
Supervising Officers	6	6	4	3	3	1	0
Officers	28	29	23	22	23	8	4
OSGs	11	11	7	7	8	3	3
Totals	48	49	35	34	36	12	8

23. To flesh-out the numbers we provide here a summary of the role that each of these grades of staff perform:

- Custodial Managers:** Custodial managers are a new grade of staff. The role these managers perform as the direct 'operational focus' is pivotal in providing both first line management grip and presence and a contribution to the work of the wider leadership team. As the only uniformed, management grade within establishments Custodial Managers have a unique and very important role to play. Staff will look to their Custodial Managers for leadership, guidance, support and development. Senior Managers will look to Custodial Managers for good quality management, ensure good order and discipline, decency and to give invaluable feedback and management information on behalf of both staff and prisoners. This is a significant operational management role that is at the forefront of managing change, leadership and delivering real results
- Supervising Officers:** The Supervising Officer has no line management responsibility but is required to act as a regime driver in the residential and operations aspect of our delivery. Our strategy for Supervising Officers has been to use them in a hiving role in the smaller wings and as part of the Safe, Decent & Secure Operating levels for the larger wings. The Supervising Officer also carries out Offender Management work. As such we have incorporated all our Supervising Officers and Offender Managers into one profile for both efficiencies and as an acknowledgment that 'every contact matters' and as such our staff can carry out this dual role seamlessly

- **Officers:** The officer role is defined by reference to the 'core' function staff trained to work with prisoners (and use force when necessary). While traditionally the role of the officer has been broad, the approach we have adopted in our resourcing model is to focus the use of their skills very particularly in delivering services which necessarily require the skills of a trained prison officer with constabulary powers - Officers will be engaged in work including Personal Officer work, searching, and Hygiene. In addition staff will support off wing activities such as legal visits, planned and ad hoc medical escorts and additional work such as work on Equality and Safer Prisons.
- **OSGs:** The officer role is defined by reference to the 'core' function staff trained to work with prisoners (and use force when necessary). While traditionally the role of the officer has been broad, the approach we have adopted in our resourcing model is to focus the use of their skills very particularly in delivering services which necessarily require the skills of a trained prison officer with constabulary powers.

Shift patterns

24. Our shift attendance systems are determined by a long-standing agreement with the Prison Officers' Association called 'Bulletin 8'. This agreement provides the flexibility to ensure we optimise uniformed staff attendance and provide staff to complete the work profiled for each part of the day. The nature of the shift pattern arrangements we use (based on an alternate weekend pattern of working for almost all uniformed staff), results in 'peaks' and 'troughs' of work and resourcing. We have ensured that where possible we have 'smoothed' the work profile by reallocating work which does not have to be undertaken at particular times of the day (so called 'flexible' tasks). This enables us to optimise the resource allocated through predictable shift patterns so that no staff resource is not meaningfully deployed. We have achieved this partly by reducing the number of staff on the wings between 'peaks', which include 'unlock', the serving of meals, movements and association. Finally, we have also made provision in determining shift patterns for:

- A factor necessary to reflect staff absences through annual leave, training and a notional amount of sickness. We have used a tried and tested value of a 31.2 hour working week to represent this factor in our calculations
- Sufficient resource to cover handovers and patrols

Numbers of Staff Needed for Additional Movements

25. The staff profiles for each of the wings include a resource over and above that which is needed to ensure we achieve the Safe Decent and Secure benchmark during the Main shift period (the principal daytime activity period). This ensures that sufficient staff are available to undertake activities which take them off the wings – these include *ad hoc* medical escorts, activity patrols or visits for example. Mass movements will involve the lining of the route to the various activity areas. This will be supported by the following staff from residential and operations areas at pre determined timings (see core day):

- 2 x Activity patrols
- Additional wing staff (confirming identification at point of entry and exit from wings)

26. Other movements will be supervised under the following arrangements:

- Ad hoc moves will be facilitated by the issuing of movement slips. The activity patrols will ensure prisoners arrive at the required destination
- The issuing of medication will be carried out on the wings and each wing has sufficient staff to enable this to happen at the appropriate time
- IDTS medication issue will be supported by one dedicated officer seven days a week
- Externals (including Planned Medical Escorts) will be covered by two officers. This is based on an analysis of the previous 12 months
- Chapel Services will be supported by two officers

Alarm Bell Response

27. Two characteristics underpin our approach to ensuring that we have sufficient numbers of the right staff to respond to alarm bells or any other incident which poses a threat to the good order and control of the prison:

- Our knowledge of the prison and years of experience of managing all types of incident informed by an analysis of the number and the frequency with which incidents have occurred here.
- Secondly we plot the number of prisoners and the number of staff on plans of the prison and tested at random times of the day throughout the week how many staff were available for an alarm response. This ensures that we have considered the physical layout of the buildings and the distances between them in formulating this element of the staff resourcing proposals.

28. The outcome of this analysis enables us to identify the following numbers of staff as being available to respond to alarm bells and other incidents without impairing the supervision of prisoners so that we are confident of isolating and 'nipping in the bud' any difficulty: These figures are consistent with the current numbers of staff available to respond to an incident. Additional staff would be made available should the need arise.

Group	Mon - Fri	Evenings	Weekends	Nights
Duty Governor	1	1	1	On call
Custodial Manager	3	1	2	1
Supervising Officers	4	2	2	0
Officers	9	6	6	4
Total	17	10	11	5

29. The number of staff identified above includes those capable of performing the Bronze Command role and the duty managers (capable of performing the Silver Command role). A proportion of the former will have a 'roving' rather than a static

function which adds flexibility to the resource available to respond to alarm bells and incidents.

The 'quality assurance' checks we use to ensure that the staffing arrangements we propose are 'fit for purpose'

30. Part of this consideration was the checks and tests we applied to quality assure the development of staffing proposals. Even where it would appear that we would use a particular number or type of skill, we challenge that presumption so that we can be confident of providing the best attribution of skills in the right number. While we also naturally ensure that we have provided the fewest number of staff required to deliver all the required services to the standards required, reliably, we review each decision on staffing levels and skill mix to check that too.

31. An important aspect of the checking and testing process we employ includes drawing up of 'safe systems of work' (an example is included below) following the risk assessment of key areas of operational work. These are informed by our analysis of incidents at the prison and detailed consideration of the particular incidents with those most recently involved. In addition we undertake 'desk top' exercises and produced 'safe systems of work' for the prison's operation and we which we attach the following example on Alarm response.

HMP Coldingley - SAFE SYSTEM OF WORK		
ESTABLISHMENT	Coldingley	
DEPT / AREA	All areas	TASK /PROCESS Responding to a General Alarm
DATE:		
SPECIAL EQUIPMENT, PRECAUTIONS OR PPE NEEDED		
Personal radio, Baton, Whistle, General Alarm Bells		
DETAILED STEPS TO FOLLOW		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All staff are reminded that it is the responsibility of the Alarm Bell Response Teams to respond to alarms in the first instance. Obviously staff in the immediate vicinity of an incident will respond to an incident, and on many occasions will have the incident under control by the 		

time the Alarm Bell response teams arrive. On the arrival of those teams, and Oscar 1, or Oscar 2 an evaluation of the circumstances will take place and the incident will then be dealt with on the basis of that

- Staff must remember that while any alarm must be responded to and dealt with in the appropriate way, it is important that only designated staff (Alarm Bell response teams) respond initially
- Officers must ensure that any area, or Prisoners they are responsible for, are secure, and are not left either Unsupervised before leaving to attend an incident

REMEMBER A PRISONER COULD ACTIVATE ANY ALARM IN AN ATTEMPT TO MISDIRECT STAFF, OR PROVIDE A DIVERSION.

- Staff responding to any alarm must not run. It is preferable that staff turn up at the scene of an incident a few seconds later, rather than not at all due to injury.(Be aware of trailing cables, spillages, obstructions, uneven and raised surfaces, other staff, prisoners, members of the public, and adverse weather conditions etc)
- Once the type of incident has been identified the appropriate contingency plans will be employed by the Duty Manager without delay
- In the event of anyone being none co-operative staff must seek to deal with the situation without escalating it. Should circumstances require it, line management must be informed and if necessary addition staff summoned

EMERGENCY PROCEDURES AND/OR CONTACT POINT

In the event of an emergency the alarm is to be raised calling for assistance on the radio, personal alarm or general alarm. Staff are to wait until an adequate response team arrives before engaging prisoners.

In the event that staff are at risk they are to raise the alarm and remove themselves from the area.

PERSONNEL AUTHORISED TO CARRY OUT TASK - Officer Grades and above & personnel trained.

PERSONNEL AUTHORISED TO TEACH / SUPERVISE TASK - Officer Grades and above & personnel trained.

ASSESSMENT / TRAINING MANUAL REFERENCE

SIGNED

DATE

32. One of the outcomes of the process of checking and testing our resourcing model is our confidence in the minimum staffing levels our proposals will deliver. These minimum levels will ensure the optimum delivery of the regime to deliver fully the service requirements. We will manage any unexpected change in staff availability (in responding to Tornado or local operational pressures) by the reallocation of 'flexible' work. Our multi disciplinary proposals for areas such as Offender Management, Interventions and Workshops would enable us to operate these areas even if Prison Officers were not available. In the unlikely event of us having a sustained period of operating at MSL we would develop and publish a predictable regime for Evenings & Weekends reductions based on equality for all areas. The table below identifies the Minimum Staffing Level (MSL) required to deliver the above and maintain our 'Safe, Decent & Secure Operating Levels:

	Monday - Friday			Weekends			Nights
Staff Group	AM	PM	ED	AM	PM	ED	
Custodial Manager	1	1	1	1	1	0	1
Supervising Officer	3	3	3	2	2	1	
Officers	20	20	23	18	20	6	2
OSGs	9	9	7	6	6	3	3
Totals	33	33	35	27	29	10	6

An explanation of how our staffing arrangements give us confidence in knowing that they are able to provide an effective response to emergencies (outbreaks of concerted indiscipline etc).

33. Our proposals for managing incidents flow from the principles upon which our resourcing proposals are based – ensuring sufficient resource is available for managing incidents is a key consideration in the development of the package of our proposals. Importantly, the arrangements we explain here are for the management of incidents using the resources we propose for this prison: these arrangements are not contingent on the support of another prison.

34. Our thinking on the management of incidents is shaped by:

- (i) The analysis of incidents – using data from the performance hub we carefully analyse the frequency and nature of incidents at the prison to understand the type and scale of the incident management resource.
- (ii) The structure of our incident management arrangements – we look again at the tried and tested structure of our incident management arrangements (Gold, Silver and Bronze) to ensure that the numbers, experience and expertise of the resources we propose are capable of providing the required response.
- (iii) How we have used our corporate expertise and experience – underpinning the analysis in (i) and the (ii) consideration of how our incident management structure will work, is the corporate expertise and experience we have used to shape our thinking.
- (iv) How we have tested our incident management arrangements
- (v) The competence and training of Operational Managers –we set out the training and competence-based reinforcement of that training which gives our managers confidence in being able to manage incidents.

(i) The analysis of incidents

35. A typical analysis of incidents for a particular prison looks like this:

Incident type	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar
Self Harm	1	4	9	8	6	2	3	3	7	5	4	2
Assault	3	1	3	1	3	2	3	4	2	8	5	2
Use of Force	10	11	6	7	15	7	1	3	4	16	4	3
Reportable Incidents	6	6	19	14	23	7	10	13	13	20	14	8

36. The above data shows a fairly consistent number of incidents with an average of 10.16 reportable incidents per month. Whilst there are some notable exceptions to this average (June, August and January), no particular area has been identified as a 'hot spot' and as such no need to make a significant adjustment to our staffing proposals.

37. However, rather than depending on this set of data and anticipating that we would be making changes to the way the prison operated, we obtain a broader measure of the likely frequency and incidents. To do this, we undertake a comparative analysis of similar prisons – that is, prisons of a similar size and function. Taking into account that the design and layout of prisons affect internal operational matters, we are able to identify confidently the profile of incidents our arrangements would need to be capable of managing effectively.

(ii) The structure of our incident management arrangements

38. We would be complacent if we were to assume that the tried and tested Gold, Silver and Bronze command structures would provide what was required. To be confident that they would, particularly following the introduction of new management structures which 'Fair and Sustainable' will drive, we think carefully particularly about how the Bronze and Silver command arrangements would work in this prison. This ensures that we do not depend upon what might be regarded as the 'safety net' of Gold Command and the availability of resources from other prisons. We need to satisfy ourselves that up to the point it is practicable that our arrangements to manage incidents in this prison are 'self-sufficient'.

39. To do this, we look again at the pattern of incidents which had occurred at this and comparable prisons and think through how the level of management cover would respond. This involves analysing how the 'Hold, Plan, Act' approach which underpins effective incident management could be applied with the level of resource we have provided. We therefore consider the scope of managerial cover, examined in each of the types of incidents what sort of a Bronze and Silver command response would be needed; and we consider in practical terms how different incidents would be managed – again, this element of our thinking was more fully developed when we tested the arrangements (described below). The outcome of this aspect of our thinking was confidence that we have the right number of managers to manage the incidents 'on site':

	Monday - Friday	Evening Duties	Weekend	Nights
Silver Commanders*				
Band 10	1			(On call)

Band 8	1				*Our Operational Manager coverage
Band 7	3	1	1	(On call)	
Sub-totals	5	1	1	(+2)	
Bronze Commanders					
Custodial Manager	3	1	2	1	
Supervising Officer	6	4	3		
Sub-totals	9	5	5	1	

r arrangements (bands 7 -10) will ensure that not less than a band 8 will be IC Monday to Friday and a band 7 on a weekend and evenings.

(iii) How we have used our corporate expertise and experience

40. Our corporate expertise and experience includes the capacity and capability to perform the Gold Command function for NOMS. The roster of Deputy Directors Custody (all of whom are very experienced operational managers and former Governors of large prisons in their own right). One of these Deputy Directors Custody is responsible for the development of these bid proposals. His experience includes the management of a contracted out prison in Wales; and the evaluation of staffing resource proposals in PCP1. We have put this experience and expertise to good use in ensuring that the incident management arrangements we propose are credible.

41. In addition to the value of this expertise, our thinking is informed by the outcome of a day-long analysis of incidents which involved all the Gold Commanders at prison Service Training College earlier this year. While this event consider specific features of Gold Command, it also highlighted good practices and weaknesses in the management of incidents locally. Also, five Gold Commanders each of whom will have operational line management responsibility for at least one prison in this competition if we win, have considered the staffing proposals and specifically the incident management arrangements.

42. A particular feature of this consideration was the implications of the new management structures which 'Fair and Sustainable' will introduce. The thinning of management layers and the new spans of managerial control were important considerations in our thinking about the incident management arrangements we have proposed.

43. Finally, we have also used the experience of incident command which our position as the current provider of eight of the prisons in this competition has developed. We have used the Governors and key members of their Senior Management Teams who are the team that will implement the bids if we are successful, to test our thinking behind the incident management arrangements. This has been particularly valuable when interpreting the analysis of the incidents (see above) and understanding from a very practical point of view how our proposed management structures will be capable of responding effectively and efficiently to any contingency.

(iv) How we have tested our incident management arrangements

44. We describe above how in addition to the knowledge and experience we have acquired operating so many prisons of this size and type, which inform our judgement about resourcing levels, we used an analysis of data on the number of incidents which have occurred in this and comparable prisons. An important part of our thinking is the process of refining the incident management arrangements in the light of a consideration of the different staffing levels and management structure we are proposing in the bid compared to how we operate most of the prisons we run. This part of our thinking was informed by three different perspectives:

- The perspective of experienced operational managers who designed the resource model
- The perspective of the Governor designate of the prison should we win and key members of The Senior Management Team; and, from
- The perspective of the Deputy Directors Custody who would be operationally accountable for the performance of the prison – and who would command any serious incident as Gold Commander

45. We test our thinking principally using 'desk-top' exercises to walk through various scenarios and incidents. This methodology is also informed by the outcome of the regular contingency planning exercises each of the Governors who designated to implement each of the bids if we are successful; and by the learning which the Gold Command expertise we possess has accumulated supplemented by the advice of two of the Gold Command suite's Senior Coordinators who form part of the bid team.

46. The scenarios we particularly consider are those at times of the week when staffing would be at its most stretched - i.e. when most prisoners are unlocked and when the activities in which they are involved are (a) most dispersed across the site and (b) most concentrated in particular areas. We first select three particular times of the week (10.00 hours Saturday, 14:00 hours Wednesday and 17:45 hours Thursday) to test our resources. We create 'heat maps' using a plan of the prison on which we plot the whereabouts of all the prisoners and the staff, walk through each scenario, 'stress-testing' the assumptions we made about the:

- The number of staff available to respond (which we have set out in a table in part of our response above to Question 3c)
- The distances those staff would have to move to attend an incident in different parts of the prison; and
- The number of managers and their likely whereabouts so that the effectiveness of the response we had planned is also tested

47. The outcome of these tests gives us confidence that the number of staff and managers we have are sufficient to manage any incident. Of course, numbers are only part of the equation: we need to ensure that the competence and experience of the managers our resourcing model provides is also sufficient to meet the requirements of this potentially very demanding aspect of operational management.

(v) The competence and training of Operational Managers

48. All our operational line managers are trained to be able to perform competently and with confidence in the role of:

- Incident scene commander – taking charge of an incident, the initial response to which is often crucial in determining its scale and seriousness. This role is about having the presence of mind to react in ways which minimise the risk of escalation; and it is about having the managerial competence to direct the immediate actions of other staff to contain and take other immediate action

- Bronze Commander – taking charge of an incident at or close to the scene it has occurred once the formal incident command structure has been in place, providing the Silver Commander with clear and timely information about developments; and commanding the resources and following the procedures of managing an incident which will be set out in the contingency plans they will be familiar in rehearsing

49. The skill of our managers is not only in being able to respond to incidents effectively – to nip them in the bud and achieve immediate resolution or at least containment – but in being able to anticipate where incidents may occur. This is partly about ‘prison craft’ – being able to sense if something is not quite right and knowing what action to take to address that thereby preventing an incident or a more incident from occurring. It is also about the importance we attach in our ‘whole prison approach’ to ‘every contact matters’. This is about much more than good security intelligence – though here too we are confident that the culture we will instil will ensure a reliable stream of accurate intelligence we can use to pre-empt difficulties arising and to defuse them when they do.

50. In addition to the competence of our managers in being able to respond effectively as ‘first on scene’ and as Bronze Commanders, every manager who performs the role of Duty Operational Manager during the day, which means that they are effectively in charge of the prison, will have completed the incident training course run at the Prison Service College. This provides those attending it with an understand of the principles of operational command, the difficulties of command and a stressful ‘live incident’ experience to test the lessons learned.

Management Cover and On-Call Arrangements

51. Our Operational Manager roster ensures that there is at least a Band 7 in charge as the ‘Designated Duty Operational Manager’ every evening and at least a Band 8 in charge of the prison at weekends. In the event of an incident at this time, the Duty Operational Manager at either Band 7 or 8 would assume the role of Silver Command until relieved by the Governor or Deputy Governor if that were necessary. In the course of the ordinary working week, either the Governor or the Deputy Governor will be on-hand to assume the role of Silver in any serious incident. The following table identifies the minimum number of operational managers on duty during the week.

Group	Monday - Friday	Evening Duties	Weekend	Nights
Band 8 or 10 (IC)	1			(On call)
Band 7	3	1	1	
Sub-totals	4	1	1	(+1)

52. All our Operational Managers are trained and experienced in dealing with incidents; and our Band 10 (Governor) are required to have successfully completed incident management training. This training is based on the distilled learning HMPS has developed over many years through an analysis of incidents and the way in which they are managed. Our contingency plans have been generated in line with PSO 1400 (Incident Management) and include the procedures for calling in staff as applicable. These arrangements will ensure that we have also on call the following expertise:

- Hostage Negotiators x 2
- C&R tornado commanders x 3
- C&R officers x 18
- Duty Chaplain
- Duty IMB
- Staff Care & Welfare
- Duty DBA

(3) HAVE ANY IT TOOLS TO FACILITATE THIS PROCESS BEEN DEVELOPED?

53. We have developed an efficient shift planning arrangements by the effective use of an IT based resourcing product called 'Integrated Profiling System' (IPS). This tool identifies:

- Required activity (Work)
- Number of staff required to undertake the activity
- Time taken for the activity

54. This generates the overall number of staff required to cover all the work over the course of seven days. The system is based on a 39 hour week but can be amended to include different working arrangements. In addition the tool calculates the total Non Effective (NE) hours required to support Annual leave, Training and sick. This is based on a 20% ratio but again can be amended to reflect need. The tool is able to generate shift attendance systems for all staff using the IPS. This is based on a Prison Service agreement called Bulletin 8. It can also generate European Working Time Directive shift attendance patterns.

55. In addition the Prison Service has developed a system of 'Self Rostering', which allows staff to pick and choose, which shifts they would like to cover. All staff have to do a certain number of anti social hours (Evenings, weekends and nights) as part of the process. The Prison Service has introduced a range of Benchmarking policies, which identify the approximate resource required to deliver a particular piece of work.

56. Outputs are delivered by the monitoring of the MyDetail Corporate Rostering Tool, which identifies the actual delivery against the planned activity.

(4) TO WHAT EXTENT DO THE BRITISH PRISONS EXPERIENCE SITUATIONS IN WHICH A PRISON OFFICER IS THE ONLY MEMBER OF STAFF ON DUTY IN A HOUSING UNIT FOR PRISON INMATES?

57. We do not routinely operate with one officer working alone except in Category D ('open) prisons when prisoners are unlocked. For all other prison types, we would ordinarily have at least two officers present when prisoners are unlocked or engaged in activities. Our staffing levels are based on a Safe, Decent and Secure Operating Level (SDSOL) and are based on the number of prisoners, their security category and the geography and layout of an area. For example, we routinely operate ratios of 1:30 in the majority of our prisons and as such the SDSOL for a wing of 150 would be 5. However this figure is for peak periods only (full unlock) and our levels can be reduced as prisoners leave the residential areas to attend activities.

58. Officer do work alone when prisoners are locked in their cells and the prison or wing is in 'patrol state'.

Specification Benchmarking and Costing Programme (SBC)

The Danish Government may wish to be aware of the work undertaken by the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) by the Specification Benchmarking and Costing Programme (SBC) to specify and cost the work of the prison and probation services which is funded by NOMS and delivered to offenders, defendants, victims and courts. The results are published in the NOMS "Directory of Services" on the Ministry of Justice (MOJ) website at <http://www.justice.gov.uk/about/noms/noms-directory-of-services-and-specifications>.

For each service, the work specifies the outcomes and outputs required (the "what" not the "how") and calculates what it should cost when delivered efficiently. A minimum level of service (legal, safe and decent) is identified, with costed options above this. The Danish Government may wish particularly to look at individual service specifications and supporting documents including those for "Residential Services" and "Nights" which relates to staffing of housing units in prisons. The published operating models and cost models enable prisons to calculate efficient staffing models based on the size, complexity and function of the prison. In addition the specification "External Movements and Appearances" covers the transfer of prisoners to and from courts.

The SBC work is being used to drive improvements in efficiency and effectiveness in prisons and probation, by:

- enabling effective commissioning decisions to target available resources to maximum effect
- supporting competition for services using provider-neutral, outcome-based specifications
- supporting devolution of decision making, by removing unnecessary prescription of inputs and processes to free up local innovation
- enabling effective benchmarking, by creating common definitions of services which are used by the PREview (probation) and INview (prisons) costing systems to collect robust and comparable data on the actual costs of delivering the services.

The specifications were rolled out as they were completed so benefits could be realised at the earliest opportunity. The final service specifications were published in November 2011 and introduced in prisons and probation from April 2012 under

Service Level Agreements and Contracts. These documents are also published on the MOJ website at

<http://www.justice.gov.uk/information-access-rights/transparency-data/prison-service-level-agreements-and-probation-trust-contracts>.

INview produces reports on the cost and staff resources by grade used to deliver each of the specified services and the remaining services delivered by establishments but not specified by SBC, such as Information Technology and Estates & Facilities. These reports are based on activity data from the My Detail Rostering Tool along with data on pay and non-pay costs and establishment returns on use of staff not covered by the Rostering Tool.

Reports on staff hours used by grade for each service have just been made available to establishments as part of the national trial of the system. Reports on the cost of each service, including non-pay costs, will be added in January 2013. Regular quarterly reporting is due to begin in 2013-14 once there has been opportunity to refine the data quality. These reports will support establishments in understanding their own costs and use of resources as well as benchmarking with similar establishments.

Question 1079 of the Legal Affairs committee

Management of Sickness Absence

Absence management has been an area of significant and sustained improvement for Public Sector Prisons in England and Wales. Absence rates in prisons have reduced by some 33% in the past 10 years and by 15% since 2006/07 (which is estimated to have saved £12.9m in otherwise lost time).

No single factor is evident for this past sustained reduction but there are a number of contributory actions that NOMS believes have made an impact – these are summarised below.

It should be noted however that the rate of year on year improvement has now slowed to an extent that, at best, is stable at an average of 10 days of absence per person per year (Average Working Days Lost or AWDL). As such the Prison Service remains at the higher end of the spectrum with regard to Civil Service sickness

levels, and our success at reducing overall absence levels, needs to be viewed in that context.

Key Elements Contributing to Absence Reduction

a) Ownership within the 'line' and support infrastructure

The HR Operating Model within NOMS requires line managers to take ownership of managing the absence of their staff. This provides for more direct ownership of the process and interaction with absent colleagues. This continues to be an area where line managers need guidance to ensure that correct process is followed and NOMS is happy to invest in the level of support required.

There is nationally agreed policy on absence management which makes clear the different roles, responsibilities and activities required when managing an absence.

Since 2006, NOMS has made significant investment in an HR model that provides for 24/7 support and guidance to line managers via a range of tools including: written information and guidance available via the Intranet; the facility to ring the Shared Services Contact Centre if a manager is unclear of what they need to do; the provision of HR qualified Case Managers to support line managers with complex cases.

The intranet provides direct access to: knowledge based advice, direct links to process and policy and also to standard forms required to access interventions. My Services also contains a wide range of 'how to guides' and system 'walk-throughs'.

b) Occupational Health Provision

In 2010 NOMS revised its arrangements for providing Occupational Health advice and entered into a new contract for OH services with a 3rd Party Provider. These new arrangements provided for Occupational Health Advisers (OHAs) to be based locally within each establishment for a set number of days/appointments per year.

These arrangements have improved referral times and allowed for more timely advice to support staff returning to work. The on site OHA also obtains greater localised knowledge of the working environment and is directly accessible to managers and staff whilst on site. In many Prisons the on-site OHA has direct involvement in case conferencing and sickness management panels

c) Provision and use of Management Information

Since 2007/8 resources have been invested to improve the availability and use of HR metrics and Management Information. A number of reports are available to Establishments and HR staff to detail and analyse sickness absence reasons, working days sick, and overall sickness management procedures. The reports are accessed by Functional Managers/HR staff directly from the HR records database.

Additional MI is available that charts performance against target (AWDL) and enables comparison between different Establishments, Regions and Establishment type. Recently this has been supplemented by the introduction of a Management HR Dashboard (although it is too early to identify any improved use of information as a result of this product launch)

Summary

The above highlights the organisational and process changes that are believed to have made the most significant contribution to reducing sickness levels within Public Sector Prisons in England and Wales.

What should not be underestimated however is the impact that sustained engagement, at a local level, by senior management can have on absence levels.

It is generally evident within NOMS, that where the 'culture' within a Prison is one of Governor and Senior Management Teams engagement in staff sickness and staff well being, that Prison will, over time, consistently have lower levels of staff sickness.

Thus experience indicates that the most effective measure for reducing sickness absence remains senior management engagement and intervention.

Question 1092 of the Legal Affairs Committee

New Build prisons

The most recent phase of competition in the custodial estate, PCP1 (Prison Competition Phase 1), is estimated to deliver an estimated savings of £216 million over the duration of the contract. This competition also delivered the first prison transfer from public to private sector, and the first custodial contract to be delivered on a 'payments by results'.

In particular, the new build element of PCP 1, HMP Oakwood, will cost £13,000 per place per annum to operate. This compares to the average direct resource cost per place of £27,851. HMP Oakwood is by far the cheapest prison in the estate.

Question 1101 of the Legal Affairs Committee

Prisoner Escort

The function of escorting prisoners from prisons to court was first contracted out to the private sector in 1993. The contract allowed for the transport of all prisoners with the exception of those classified "Category A" (Violent/ High escape risk). This work had previously been done by HM Prison Service.

The contractors also transport people from police stations to court (i.e. defendants who have been held overnight in police stations and are due in court the following day).

The contract for this work was retendered nine years ago and again two years ago. The current (third-generation) contract, following a competition for four geographical lots, was awarded to two suppliers: Serco Wincanton (a previous contractor) won one lot; and GEOAmev PECS Ltd (a newcomer to the market) won three.

When the first-generation contracts were awarded, Prison Service staff did not transfer to the new contractors. This is because escorting was a small proportion of the role of a Prison Officer. New staff were recruited by the contractors; subsequently, staff have transferred to new contractors as each new contract was awarded.

The published savings for the contracts awarded in 2011 was £230 million. This was a 20 per cent saving on the previous cost.