

## MCASD 25<sup>th</sup> General Meeting 26-27 March 2018

### Attendees

#### MCASD

1. Mr Paris Aristotle AO, AM Chair
2. Air Marshal Ray Funnell AC (Retd)
3. Dr Maryanne Loughry AM
4. Dr Georgie Paxton
5. Ms Catherine Scarth
6. Associate Professor Mary Anne Kenny
7. Professor Nicholas Procter

#### Departmental Attendees

1. Mr Michael Pezzullo, Secretary
2. Mr Michael Outram, A/g Commissioner, ABF
3. Mr Steven Groves, A/g Deputy Secretary, Corporate Group
4. Ms Malisa Golightly, Deputy Secretary, Visa & Citizenship Services Group
5. Ms Linda Geddes, A/g Deputy Secretary, Policy Group
6. Ms Cheryl-anne Moy, First Assistant Secretary, Integrity, Security and Assurance Division
7. Mr Luke Mansfield, First Assistant Secretary, Refugee and Humanitarian Visa Management Division
8. Ms Peta Dunn, First Assistant Secretary, Community Protection Division
9. Ms Elizabeth Hampton, First Assistant Secretary, Health Services and Policy Division
10. Ms Claire Roennfeldt, A/g First Assistant Secretary, Children, Community and Settlement Services Division
11. Ms Vanessa Holben, Assistant Commissioner, Detention and Offshore Operations Command
12. Ms Miranda Lauman, Assistant Secretary, Humanitarian Program Capabilities Branch
13. Ms Alice Ling, Assistant Secretary, Humanitarian, Family and Citizenship Policy Branch

14. Mr David Norris, Assistant Secretary, Audit and Assurance Branch
15. s. 22(1)(a)(ii), A/g Assistant Secretary, Child Wellbeing Branch
16. Ms Sally Pfeiffer, A/g Assistant Secretary, Status Resolution Branch
17. s. 22(1)(a)(ii), A/g Assistant Secretary, Community Programmes and Reporting Branch
18. s. 22(1)(a)(ii), Acting Commander, Detention Operations
19. s. 22(1)(a)(ii), Director, Protection Assessment Support Section

#### External Attendees

20. Mr Dominic Downie, Child Protection Panel

#### MCASD Secretariat

1. s. 22(1)(a)(ii), Director, MCASD Secretariat
2. s. 22(1)(a)(ii), MCASD Secretariat

#### Apologies

3. Ms Kerrin Benson, MCASD Member
4. Bishop Eugene Hurley, MCASD Member
5. Ms Maria Fernandez, Deputy Secretary Intelligence and Capability Group
6. Ms Mandy Newton, A/g Australian Border Force Commissioner
7. Ms Rachel Noble PSM Deputy Secretary Executive Group
8. Mr Clive Murray A/g Deputy Commissioner Operations
9. Michael Burke, A/g First Assistant Secretary, Immigration and Citizenship Policy Division
10. Paul Grigson, Deputy Secretary, Home Affairs Programmes Group

Agenda item	MCASD General Meeting – Day one –Monday 26 March 2018, Department of Immigration and Border Protection, 6 Chan St, Belconnen ACT
1. Opening address	<p><b>Opening address</b></p> <p>The Council Chair opened by welcoming members, FAS Integrity, Security and Assurance (ISAD), Assistant Secretary Audit and Assurance Branch and the Secretariat to the meeting.</p> <p>The Chair began discussion by noting that this would be the last General Meeting for this term of the Council, which expires on 15 April 2018. He noted that the Minister may comment further on the future of ministerial councils in his address.</p> <p>The Chair noted that the agenda was structured around finalising advice to the Minister, prior to the term expiring.</p> <p><b>Apologies</b></p> <p>The Chair noted apologies from Bishop Hurley and Ms Benson.</p> <p><b>Declaration of any Conflict of Interest</b></p> <p>The Chair queried whether any members had any new declarations or conflicts of interest to declare since the last GM. No new declarations were made.</p>
2. Endorsement of previous minutes/actions	<p><b>Endorsement of Minutes</b></p> <p>Minutes from the 24th GM were endorsed.</p> <p><b>Endorsement of Action items</b></p> <p>Action items were endorsed.</p> <p>It was noted that Assoc Prof Kenny's name still appeared on the visit report to VIDC on 31/8/17 at paper 17.2 for the meeting. Professor Kenny did not attend that visit.</p> <p><b>Action 25/2.1</b></p> <p><b>Remove Assoc Prof Kenny's name from visit report to VIDC on 31/8/17.</b></p>

	<p><b>Operation Arete</b></p> <p>Ms Moy provided an update on Operation Arete. Ms Moy noted that Operation Arete was an enduring operation with a three year rolling plan. Phase one involved finalising consideration of 152 individuals of concern under Operation Pharaos. Phase two has focussed on education and building a positive integrity culture. Phase three will involve building matching capability to other systems.</p> <p>Ms Moy noted that there had been a significant change in culture. People are now proactively declaring information. A recent pulse survey found that 100% of ABF staff said they knew how to deal with an integrity issue. Ms Moy noted that all Employment Suitability Clearances (ESCs) for incoming staff to Home Affairs under machinery of government arrangements would be finalised by 30 June 2018.</p> <p>Ms Moy discussed the difference between security clearance and confidentiality agreements; reinforced previous advice that members of any future council will need to have at least baseline clearances; and information/evidence required in obtaining clearances.</p>
<p><b>3. Refugee Status Determination processing update</b></p>	<p>The IMA Legacy Caseload – Report on the Processing Status and Outcomes handout was provided to Council members. Mr Mansfield advised the Council only 71 IMAs out of the legacy caseload of 32,000 did not apply for a TPV or SHEV. Mr Mansfield highlighted that 90% of decisions are being affirmed at review; with approval rate after review at 72%. Primary processing of the legacy caseload likely to be ongoing into 2020-21.</p> <p><b>Renewal of temporary protection visas (TPV) or safe haven enterprise visas (SHEV)</b></p> <p>Mr Mansfield noted that the first five visas expire on 1 April 2018, of which two have already reapplied and three have been contacted. The next visas will expire in June.</p> <p>Mr Mansfield noted that the Department had engaged with stakeholders in a post NGO Dialogue workshop on engagement with people whose TPVs or SHEVs were due to expire. Mr Mansfield noted that much of the pre-1 October 2017 stakeholder concerns had largely dissipated, with stakeholders now holding the pre-October consultations as a model for ongoing consultation as visas come due to expire.</p> <p>Mr Mansfield advised that the renewal process will focus on changed circumstances to provide a simple, streamlined re-assessment. Applicants will only need to advise of changes in circumstances. The Department will commence messaging 6 months prior to a visa expiring, using ethnic liaison officers, email/letters, touch points (for eg. employment verification) and NGOs, where they are still in contact. Where clients apply prior to expiry of their visa, their TPV/SHEV will continue until their application is finally determined.</p>



	<p>Applicants will be interviewed where new, adverse information is provided, or where there is a positive change in country circumstances. The impact of any change in country information will be assessed individually, and nuanced against the person's circumstances.</p> <p>The Council noted that some children born in Australia may gain Australian citizenship. Mr Mansfield advised that Australian citizenship children are not considered as part of the protection assessment. Australia's obligations against ICCPR and CROC are, however, considered prior to removal of family members, should they be found not to be owed protection.</p> <p>The Council raised the paradox that where someone had done well in Australia, they may be found to be more able to re-locate, especially where there had been a shift in country information. Mr Mansfield indicated that he expected the renewal process to prioritise broader changes in country information rather than re-location assessments.</p> <p>Clarification was sought by the Council on the impact of adverse security information on assessments. Mr Mansfield advised that if a person had unresolved criminal charges, their application was unlikely to be prioritised until those charges had been finalised. Where someone had a qualified assessment, their application would be progressed. Third country resettlement options would continue to be pursued for persons with adverse security assessments.</p> <p>The Council noted that post NGO Dialogue workshop was a good example of positive, proactive engagement by the Department. There was discussion regarding the often passive nature of stakeholder engagement, and possible models were discussed which might encourage greater engagement between stakeholders and the Department.</p>
<b>4. Review of Government Funded Migration Assistance</b>	<p>Ms Lauman advised that the request for tender (RFQ) was issued on 6 March 2018 in AusTender, with submissions closing 16 March 2018. Two submissions were received, which are currently being assessed. The Department is seeking to commence the review in April, with it to be finalised within the financial year.</p> <p>Ms Lauman thanked the Council members for their advice to date. She confirmed that the study would not include a comparison of persons who received CAPs assistance to make applications in Nauru and Manus Island, as the funding for the project was tied to IMAs.</p> <p><b>Action 25/4.1</b></p> <p><b>Copy of RFQ to be provided to Council via Secretariat</b></p>

<p><b>5. Community Protection Assessment Tool (CPAT) demonstration</b></p>	<p>Ms Pfeiffer noted that when the CPAT was originally developed, it considered community protection risk and additional services required in detention. The revised, second generation CPAT has evolved to include people living in the community, with a focus on identifying services required to manage risks and needs of the person. A CPAT may, for example, trigger a SRSS referral, or referral for specialist advice on additional services. The CPAT provides transparency of decision making, a single point of accountability and brings together, in a single document, wide ranging information on the client. Officers are required to cross reference against TRIM evidence used in their assessment and store the completed CPAT and immigration history in TRIM and the CCMD portal. Ms Pfeiffer stated the Department is not looking to re-detain a person and is seeking positive engagement with people.</p> <p>Ms Pfeiffer went through the CPAT with the Council, detailing each category. Ms Pfeiffer noted that ratings for each category must be supported by comments and evidence. The information included in the CPAT results in an assessment on services and placement – s. 47E(d) s. 47E</p> <p>Dr Paxton queried whether health information was visible through the CPAT for consideration around placements and supports. Ms Pfeiffer noted that development of the revised CPAT had identified the need for greater visibility of health data and ongoing work developing a policy position on information sharing.</p> <p>The Council queried whether there were any concerns regarding data security and privacy. Ms Pfeiffer responded that access can be tracked; that the tool had been reviewed by privacy, legal and IT security areas; and that additional departmental safeguards (for example security clearances, firewalls etc) provided additional protection.</p>
<p><b>6. Finalising draft Council advice: SRSS client self sufficiency</b></p>	<p>Ms Dunn advised that the Minister approved the redesigned SRSS program on 8 February 2018, to be implemented through existing contracts. The redesigned process affirms that the program is designed to provide tailored short term assistance where there are status resolution barriers; it is not a welfare program; that individuals with work rights are expected to support themselves; and where there are demonstrated barriers, people may expect to be provided a level of support. The revised program is to be implemented from May 2018, following engagement with stakeholders.</p> <p>Ms Pfeiffer noted that over 10,000 persons had become ineligible for SRSS over the past 12 months as their status had been finally determined; or they had been identified no longer meeting eligibility; or had transferred funds above the allowed threshold. It will take to the end of the calendar year to complete re-assessments and eligibility checks. It was emphasised that for many, however, it was not about cutting off services, but rather re-tailoring to suit individual needs. Ms Pfeiffer reiterated that there will continue to be assistance for those that are vulnerable and need support.</p> <p>The Council noted that the length of time the legacy caseload had been in a precarious visa position and without work rights meant that they were subject to increased vulnerabilities in finding work compared to later arrivals. The Council noted the overall re-employment rate for long term unemployed Australians and workforce participation rates for refugees in the initial years after arrival remain very low. Ms Pfeiffer advised that persons may possibly initially be referred to Job Active, with SRSS providers providing additional</p>

	<p>assistance to assist them to obtain employment. Council members noted that entry-level Job Active support may not be adequate, and the need for transitional supports to enter sustainable employment pathways.</p> <p>The Council noted that helping people to become work ready places them also in a better position should they be required to return to their home country. She also noted the different skill sets of providers and different environments based on gender, age, skill level, education, rural/urban, types of jobs available etc. The Council encouraged the Department to retain a light touch on those no longer receiving SRSS to provide an evidence base on what happens to them – for example, that they are not driven into the black employment market.</p> <p>The Council also noted that service providers have different skill sets, as the SRSS program was implemented prior to application of workrights. The Department should encourage innovation amongst providers rather than rely on a static program of services.</p> <p>The Council highlighted the importance of transition support and enabling factors. She noted that with any sudden cessation of SRSS the imperative of meeting immediate needs, including housing and bills will mean people are unable to focus on finding employment. Access to child care and English language training are important enabling factors.</p> <p>While the Council supported the focus on self agency, it was noted that the challenge of encouraging agencies to build self agency was difficult and potentially resource intensive. The Council emphasised that a more effective way could be to provide individuals with an intrinsic motivation for self agency. The Council is preparing advice to the Minister on possible options which support this premise.</p> <p>The Council suggested charitable organisations may should be engaged in stakeholder discussions, and that a focus on welfare illness may possibly undermine efforts to promote self agency.</p> <p>The Council discussed the information currently being circulated within the community on the changes. The Council recommended that the Department be proactive in addressing misinformation.</p>
<p><b>7. Finalising draft Council advice - returns</b></p>	<p>Ms Dunn advised that the Department was still in contract negotiations. The principles around assisted return and repatriation programs remain unchanged.</p> <p>Ms Pfeiffer discussed the value of SRSS providers engaging clients early and providing support for discussions on options. Council noted, however, the duration of time from arrival, and that SRSS providers may not have the skills. Where there is anticipatory anxiety, discussion on returns can be a dangerous tipping point for clients. Dr Loughrey noted that SRSS stops when an individual is finally determined, so providers will not be available for discussions after this time.</p> <p>Dr Paxton asked about the process for children where there were active child protection considerations, and best interests assessments for children. Ms Dunn advised these issues are assessed by officers familiar with the case, in consultation with the Child Wellbeing Branch.</p>



	<p>The Council noted UK programs supporting reintegration which were effective in providing practical support in ensuring access to school and medical records, certificates, assets, unpaid salaries etc.</p>
<p><b>8. Finalising draft advice – maturing the SHEV pathway: BVE holders</b></p>	<p>Previous advice to the Minister on maturing the SHEV pathway was noted. Draft advice provided in agenda papers extends this advice to include BVE holders and individuals on a TPV. The draft proposal was outlined in the agenda papers, also noting the 2017 change to the Migration Regulations allowing for work/study undertaken by SHEV holders in regional Australia to count against the SHEV pathway requirements even if the regional area was not specified until after they commenced that activity.</p> <p>Ms Ling noted that without pre-empting the views of senior executive or the Minister, the proposal appeared sound from a policy perspective. Ms Lauman identified some practical aspects that would need to be considered if progressed: current policies penalise people in receipt of Centrelink provisions who move to areas with lower employment prospects; and ability of people to engage with the Department where they are working in rural areas. The Council questioned whether SRSS and SHEV policies were consistent in relation to location of work and noted the need to consider carefully crafted messaging</p> <p>The Council noted changes to SRSS promoting self agency, where providers are being asked to re-orient themselves to promote self agency amongst clients. The Council's view is that this could be more effective where there are also incentives for clients to be self-sufficient. The Council noted that there needs to be an ultimate resolution for TPV and SHEV holders and the need to have people self-reliant and productive, able to contribute to Australian society. It was noted that Council advice will be consistent with Minister Tudge's recent speech on citizenship and will support social cohesion and positive settlement outcomes.</p>
<p><b>9. Finalising draft Council advice – stakeholder engagement</b></p>	<p>The Council raised concerns that while there were multiple streams of engagement, many of which worked well, in some areas there was no onus on stakeholders to take mutual responsibility for engaging and contributing to dialogue.</p> <p>Discussion included different models: formal versus informal – informal discussions may achieve more and complement formal discussions; the TRG model, where participants independently caucus in advance what they want to discuss.</p> <p>The Council noted that people are wanting information, but have difficulty getting it. It was suggested that multiple groups be mapped. The Council further noted that welfare agencies were often not involved in discussions, and then advanced misinformation if information was not available, stakeholder sessions become focussed on getting information, with the effect of reducing dialogue and engagement; and that engagement would be more constructive where the Department could provide information in advance, and be more proactive with positive messaging.</p> <p><b>Action 25/9.1</b></p>

	Council members to review paper and provide to Chair comments on overarching goals and components.
--	--

DRAFT



Agenda item	MCASD General Meeting – Day two - Tuesday 27 March 2018 – Parliament House
10. Review of day one	<p>The Council reflected on day one:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RSD processing: Council considered projection of RSD processing to 2020/21 to be optimistic noting the additional workload of renewals. There are likely to be complex cases, including the possibility of Australian citizen children. Council noted the impact of ongoing uncertainty as people remain on BVEs. There is potential for there to be a hard core of persons found not to be refugees where there are barriers to return.</li> <li>• SRSS changes: The Council noted that as more people come off the program, providers will be supporting the most complex clients, but with reduced funding; and that funding for services provided to Australian citizens under Job Active voluntary stream A is very limited. The Council noted their support for the shift in emphasis to self-agency, but questioned whether objectives would be fully realised without revisiting resources and providing BVE holders with additional motivations to be self-sufficient. It was noted that the legacy caseload was not a short-term caseload and the duration since arrival. There was a paradox between this and Departmental messaging that SRSS program provided short term support.</li> <li>• CPAT: The Council noted that it was a positive intention to have a holistic view of a person, but queried the focus on placement, returns and removals. The Council encouraged visibility of health information for the Department from health and SRSS providers with client consent. The Council raised concerns as to how the information in the CPAT could be used to assess job readiness and determine SRSS eligibility. s. 47E(d)</li> </ul> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED] The Council suggested that it could be beneficial to get the client to self-assess first and then discuss, opening dialogue between the client and the Department. s. 47E(d)</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED] The Council noted the positive intentions behind the CPAT, but questioned whether it was seeking to do too much; and queried the process for SRSS providers to undertake reassessment with impending changes to the SRSS program.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stakeholder engagement strategy: The Council noted that A/g Deputy Secretary Policy was interested in discussing further. The Council commended the Department in engaging with stakeholders post 1 October.</li> </ul>
11. Child Protection Panel report Making Children Safer:	<p>Mr Downie outlined the methodology used by the Child Protection Panel (the Panel) in undertaking their review. He noted that the report found a remarkable shift in culture between the current review and the 2016 review. While the detention environment had changed, and few children were in held detention and decreasing numbers in residence determination, the Panel believed that the Department needed to maintain a state of operational readiness and focus.</p>

## Implementation Review

**Strengths and achievements-** Mr Downie noted the report found:

- a significant shift in culture. All understood the need for rapid and comprehensive response to incidents
- the introduction of the Child Safeguarding Framework (the Framework) and related policies and procedures provides the 'scaffolding' that was not previously there. For service providers, the Framework has symbolic value that the Department takes child protection very seriously and provides certainty as to what they are required to do. The report noted that the Framework, policies and procedures have penetrated through the Department and service providers
- marked improvement in incident reporting
- front line service provider staff to be well trained and supported.

**Risks-** Mr Downie noted the report found the following risks:

- there had been limited progress on developing high level strategic partnerships with states and territories. While four MoUs were now in place, they focussed more on held detention and had limited applicability
- there was no evidence that intelligence products relevant to children had been developed, or that they had been tasked. The report noted the importance of intel given the Department's lack of visibility of offences committed while on BVEs
- no 'mud map' of where to find information across varied systems had been developed, pending system improvements
- poor sharing of health and mental health information within department and with SRSS and other health providers
- Service providers noted emerging risks for children, especially those on BVEs (or other temporary visas) with no SRSS support. Service providers and SROs noted issues of child wellbeing concerns that did not meet reporting thresholds, family violence, forced marriage, grooming and children being abandoned when parents returned home
- varying capability of Detention Superintendents. Mr Downie noted that the Detention Superintendents felt vulnerable, with limited visibility over children in residence determination. The Panel found Child Wellbeing Officers were providing support and making a difference

**Framework and policies – Mr Downie:**

- acknowledged Dr Paxton's contribution in providing comment
- advised the Panel had provided feedback to Child Wellbeing Branch on ways to improve the Framework and policies and procedures

Mr Downie thanked the Council on their willingness to assist and acknowledged the substantial work of the Child Wellbeing Branch. Ms Moy thanked Ms Allison for attending the Royal Commission. The Chair commended the Panel on their report and subsequent

	<p>positive changes within the Department. The Council queried how the Framework could be used as a model in other areas of the Department; and how the Department engages in determining the best interests of the child where their family are found not to be owed protection and have been in Australia for an extended period.</p>
<b>12. Minister's address</b>	<p>The Chair opened discussion by acknowledging the progress the Department had made in protecting children; summarising the areas of advice currently being prepared for the Minister's consideration; and opportunities for a future ministerial council.</p> <p>The Minister thanked the Council for their contribution. He noted in particular his appreciation of the Council's professionalism in retaining confidentiality. He wished to further consider what form an advisory council could take in the new Department. The Minister highlighted the ongoing importance of immigration issues, as reflected in his ministerial title and the creation of a junior ministry. He expressed his resolve that immigration will remain a priority. The Minister noted that child protection remained a key area of focus for all, as reflected in the recently announced \$70 m investment in the Australian Centre to Counter Child Exploitation. He thanked the Chair for his leadership and advice.</p> <p>The Council thanked the Minister and senior leadership for being generous with their time.</p> <p>The Chair noted his recent meetings with German officials who are looking to Australia when addressing issues in integration. These meetings were of strategic importance to Australia given the powerful role Germany plays in Europe.</p>
<b>13. Secretary and Commissioner's address</b>	<p>The Secretary reflected on the Minister's remarks and emphasised that the new Department of Home Affairs brings citizenship, immigration, multiculturalism and social cohesion together for the first time, and creates a department with a greater ability to inform and drive policy agendas.</p> <p>Discussion occurred over the cross cutting nature of issues and value in being able to make integrated decisions that cover end to end process; the value of expert advice on technical issues such as health and detention; and cross cutting agendas across ministerial councils.</p> <p>The Council thanked the Secretary and A/g Commissioner for their work in driving improvements to child protection within the Department.</p> <p>The Secretary thanked the Council for its wise advice, pragmatism, professionalism, diligence and conscientiousness. He noted it has been an invaluable forum, which has engendered a level of trust and engaged in robust discussion. He had enjoyed his engagement with the Council and looked forward to their final reports. The Secretary extended his thanks to the MCASD Secretariat for their work.</p>



<p><b>14. Suicide Prevention Framework</b></p>	<p>Ms Hampton advised that the Framework is with Legal Division for clearance. It had, given the passage of time and breadth of consultations, undergone some further editing, but concepts remain the same. Ms Hampton advised the next step would be to develop a suite of policies and procedures, and for these to be imbedded across service provider policies and procedures, as benchmarks for expectations.</p> <p>The Council advised that 'Safety Plans' were now the national and international standard for individuals at risk of suicide and recommended that the Department require service providers to prepare safety plans for people identified at risk of suicide. The Council further advised that process should be put in place to ensure that departmental communications and policies were compliant with the Framework; that the Framework become embedded in all the Department's work.—It was noted that small things could make a significant difference to the way in which information is received and a person's reaction to it – for example, it was suggested the Department could start any letters (particularly positive ones) with a simple statement 'you have been granted a visa' – followed by all the required text for legal compliance; similarly, people conducting interviews should be cognisant of the effect of the way in which they structure the interview.</p> <p>Dr Paxton noted that the IHAP had not yet seen the Framework. She asked whether there would be opportunities for amendments if necessary. Ms Hampton confirmed that the document was always open to amendment if required.</p> <p><b>Action 25/14.1</b></p> <p><b>Copy of draft Framework to be provided to Professor Procter.</b></p>
<p><b>15. Changes to policies for visitors to immigration detention centres</b></p>	<p>Ms Holben advised that there were currently 1383 people in detention, with an average stay of 468 days. Dr Paxton recommended that the Department report on average stay of detainees excluding airport turnarounds, to track the length of stay for medium and longer term detainees.</p> <p><b>Youth in detention</b></p> <p>Ms Holben sought Council advice on an emerging pipeline of 16-17 year old minors who are likely to come into detention as they cannot continue to be held in youth detention centres. At present, the immigration detention system is not well equipped to handle young people. They will need services that are not currently provided eg. example educational services. As these minors will eventually move back into communities, either in their home country or in Australia, what is the Department's role in rehabilitation?</p> <p>The Council suggested bringing key stakeholders (ABF, Serco, IHMS, status resolution and child wellbeing) to consider the issues at hand, and Council sought clarification of the legislative provisions around cancellations for minors.</p>

	<p>The Council noted the current mixed detention cohort and problems related to grooming and bullying, and the risk this would pose for minors. The Department would need safeguards around daily activities – for example where best to have meals, go to gym – with appropriate assurance.</p> <p>The Council also noted that cognitive capacity and function is likely to be an issue. A recent study in youth detention in Western Australia found that almost all young people had neurodevelopmental impairment.</p> <p>The recent management in South Australia of an extremely violent person was discussed; where staff were asked to volunteers to work with him. Staff were trained in trauma informed practice and in identifying triggers. It was successful in providing continuity in staffing and consistency in management, and provided a sense of community for support workers.</p> <p><b>Visitor policy</b></p> <p>Ms Holben advised new detention visitor policies and processes were introduced on 22 January 2018. Visitors must now complete an application on line, provide 100 points in identification and declare any criminal record. Detention Superintendent is the delegate. The first phase has been to establish an on-line system.</p> <p>Changes were required to ensure the Department knew who was visiting, to plan and manage visits; and to manage any potential increase in contraband. Approvals are currently taking less than one day, although the standard is five days. No visits have been refused. Visitors are categorised from 1 to 4, indicating level of mitigation required to manage the visit.</p> <p>The changes have been designed for individual visits, and have proved not to be as conducive for visits to groups of detainees. The next phase will include a trusted visitor scheme. The potential risks during school group visits to detention centres should be further examined.</p> <p>The Council noted concerns raised in the Victorian Community Consultative Group (CCG) around providing 100 points of identification each time; and that a 90 year old nun could no longer visit as she cannot evidence 100 points; with a perception that the Department was trying to make it difficult for visitors. The Council reinforced that this was again a stakeholder engagement issue, and the benefit of providing context and perspective.</p>
<b>16. Escort of detainees to medical and torture and trauma appointments</b>	<p>Ms Holben advised that following escapes in late 2017, the Department needed to take action to review current processes.</p> <p>Ms Holben indicated that her expectation is that low and medium risk detainees should not be restrained when being escorted to medical or torture and trauma appointments. Similarly, however, she expects high to extreme risk detainees to be restrained if</p>

	<p>services cannot be provided within the centre. Most torture and trauma providers in states, with the exception of NSW and Queensland, will provide torture and trauma services within the centre to high and extreme risk detainees.</p> <p>Council noted concerns raised in detention visits (which could not be verified) that some individuals had claimed that escorts were insisting remaining in the rooms during hospital visits/ treatment, and in one case a person had alleged they were restrained during treatment. Dr Paxton confirmed that hospitals are able to deploy their own risk management policies where concerns are raised for the safety of medical staff.</p>
<b>17. Finalising 2017 Detention visit report</b>	<p>It was highlighted that the visits were now historical and no feedback was provided on their 2016 report.</p> <p>Air Marshall Funnell agreed to provide a summary of issues identified during 2017 visits.</p> <p><b>Action 25/17.1</b></p> <p><b>Air Marshall Funnell to use previous draft report to prepare 2017 detention visit report within next two weeks.</b></p>
<b>18. Expiry of Council's term</b>	<p>Mr Norris noted that all departmental passes will need to be returned prior to expiry of term. He encourage Council members to submit any claims prior to the end of their term.</p> <p><b>Action 25/18.1</b></p> <p><b>Department to communicate with CCGs about the operation of CCGs within context of Councils expiry.</b></p>
<b>19. Closing remarks</b>	<p>The following action items were agreed:</p> <p><b>Action 25/19.1: Dr Paxton to prepare the draft covering policy advice to the Minister</b></p> <p><b>Action 25/19.2: Ms Scarth to streamline and finalise SRSS paper. Council members to provide input to Secretariat for onforwarding to Ms Scarth</b></p> <p><b>Action 25/19.3: Secretariat to provide departmental briefing template as possible template for reports</b></p> <p><b>Action 25/19.4: Ms Kenny to finalise SHEV (BVE) paper</b></p> <p><b>Action 25/19.5: Chair to finalise stakeholder engagement paper</b></p>