1	Friday, 1 April 2022	1	was that before you joined?
2	(10.00 am)	2	A. It was, yes.
3	THE CHAIR: Good morning. Thank you.	3	Q. And allegations within that were made about the
4	MS MOORE: Good morning, chair. We start with the evidence	4	treatment of detainees there. Shortly after that, there
5	of Mr Hewer.	5	was an unannounced HMIP inspection and the CQC
6	MR STEVEN HEWER (sworn)	6	inspection, and then there were four independent
7	Examination by MS MOORE	7	reviews, I understand, by Kate Lampard for Serco, by
8	MS MOORE: Good morning, Mr Hewer.	8	Stephen Shaw for the Home Office, by Bedford Council and
9	A. Good morning.	9	by the CQC, and responses were drawn up both by Serco
10	Q. Could you confirm for us your full name please?	10	and the Home Office?
11	A. Steven Hewer.	11	A. Yes.
12	Q. You should have documents in front of you which I may	12	Q. We are not going to go through those reports, but one
13	refer you to, but I will probably show them on the	13	helpful source of the primary findings is the NAO
14	screen instead. Tab 1 of that folder is your witness	14	report, which I would ask to be brought up on screen, it
15	statement which you made to the inquiry and signed on	15	is at <inq000186>, please, which you should see up here</inq000186>
16	1 March 2022, and you might wish to have that open.	16	before you in a moment and if we could go, when that is
17	Chair, I would ask for that to be adduced in full.	17	open, to page 9, please, paragraph 5.
18	The reference is <ser000451> and what that means,</ser000451>	18	So in summary, this report says that the reviews did
19	Mr Hewer, the fact that that is adduced means that we	19	not find evidence of a culture of abuse and it notes
20	will not have to go over everything in your statement,	20	that 80 per cent of residents felt that staff were
21	that is already your evidence to the inquiry	21	treated staff treated them with respect, but, as we
22	A. I understand.	22	see at paragraph 5, there were a number of problems
23	Q we just want to focus on some key issues. So you are	23	identified and the report says there were common themes
24	giving corporate evidence today to the inquiry on behalf	24	between them which included:
25	of Serco and that is due to your current role. You are	25	"The quality of the services and facilities
	Page 1		Page 3
1	the director of Gatwick IRCs, which is Brook House,	1	provided, for example residents, many of whom were
2	Tinsley House and the pre-departure accommodation?	2	vulnerable, were not able to access a comprehensive
3	A. That's correct.	3	mental healthcare service;
4	Q. You set out in your statement, at paragraph 12, your	4	"The needs of residents and the extent to which they
5	professional background. So, page 1, you have worked	5	are being met, for example staff were not properly
6	for Serco for 27 years, predominantly in custodial	6	trained to understand residents' experiences, and there
7	settings, which includes managing prisons, secure	7	were not enough female staff; and"
8	training centres and secure escorting services?	8	Finally:
9	A. Correct.	9	"The management decisions and measures taken by
10	Q. And as to the immigration sector, you first worked at	10	contractors to ensure that services met residents needs,
11	Yarl's Wood IRC and that was as a director, you say six	11	for example residents who had been victims of torture
12	years ago, so 2016?	12	were not identified when they arrived, or identified
13	A. Correct, yes.	13	quickly enough."
14	Q. And you became director of Gatwick IRCs when Serco took	14	So they were the summary of concerns.
15	over Brook and Tinsley House, which was on 21 May 2020?	15	Then, if we go to page 10, paragraph 7, there is
16	A. Yes.	16	some comment on the source of those issues. So I will
17	Q. As you say at paragraph 2, Serco only runs one other	17	not read them all, but the first bullet point there says
18	IRC, which is Yarl's Wood, which they have run since	18	that problems arose from the Home Office's contract,
19	2007, and which you were director of, as I said before,	19	which allowed for a reduced number of staff, and notes
20	Brook House, which is a centre for women, adult families	20	that a number of the reviews criticised staff shortages.
21	and, on a short-term basis, men, I think?	21	Second, there were gaps between the two contracts'
22	A. That's right, yes.	22	specifications, primarily on healthcare issues, with no
23	Q. We have seen some reports about Yarl's Wood around this	23	clear process of raising concerns.
24	time. To summarise, there was an undercover documentary	24	And, thirdly, provisions in the contract were not
25	as well about Yarl's Wood. That was in March 2015. So	25	fully implemented; for example, Serco staff were
	Page 2		Page 4

1	supposed to receive mental health training from	1	Q. First, did you personally work on developing the bid or
2	G4S Health staff, but no training actually happened	2	the contract for Brook House?
3	until a year after the contract and, at the date of the	3	A. I assisted in part of the reviewing of the bid process,
4	NAO review, only 27 per cent of staff had received it	4	yes, as part of the team.
5	then.	5	Q. We will come on to that in a bit more detail shortly,
6	We will not go much further into this document, but	6	but do you know how, if at all, learning from what had
7	it notes under the next heading that the Home Office had	7	happened at Yarl's Wood, and the reviews that followed,
8	not reflected lessons. So under "Key findings", the	8	fed into that contract?
9	Home Office had not reflected lessons from inspections	9	A. It is fair to understand that the Brook House contract
10	when agreeing the service specifications with Serco.	10	is a totally different contract to what the Yarl's Wood
11	For example, it notes that many of the concerns raise in	11	contract is, so it is obviously a mandated staffing
12	2015 had also been raised in 2011 and 2013. In	12	model, there's more resources, more staffing resources,
13	particular, it refers to rule 35 reporting issues and,	13	within that and I think that is learned from some of the
14	at the next paragraph, that Serco's reduction of staff	14	learning from the contract at Yarl's Wood where there
15	meant that there were insufficient operational or	15	was a reduction in staff numbers when the contract was
16	management staff. And in summary it states that, by the	16	relet to Serco in 2015, so totally different model and
17	2015 report, 59 per cent of the 2013 recommendations had	17	some of the learning from the NAO report, the Lampard
18	not been achieved with little evidence that issues had	18	report, the Shaw report, was obviously put into the bid
19	been tackled until recently.	19	model and to the upper (inaudible) from the Home Office
20	We can take that off the screen now. Obviously, you	20	for the contract for Gatwick.
21	would have been aware of the various reviews and reports	21	Q. As we saw with the last thing that I mentioned in
22	I have mentioned and summarised in the NAO report?	22	relation to the NAO report, there appears to have been
23	A. Yes.	23	an issue with the Home Office not implementing
24	Q. And of concerns raised about things like staffing	24	recommendations from previous HMIP reports. Is that
25	levels, mental health training and the needs of	25	something that you were aware of and alive to?
	Page 5		Page 7
	- 1,51		- 118- 1
1	vulnerable residents.	1	A. Not that I was aware of. We - from a Serco
2	A. (Witness nods).	2	perspective, which I managed from Yarl's Wood, and
2	A. (Witness nods).  Q. Sorry, instead of nodding, you have to say "yes" for the	2 3	perspective, which I managed from Yarl's Wood, and likewise in Gatwick, we have a performance improvement
2 3 4	<ul><li>A. (Witness nods).</li><li>Q. Sorry, instead of nodding, you have to say "yes" for the transcript.</li></ul>	2 3 4	perspective, which I managed from Yarl's Wood, and likewise in Gatwick, we have a performance improvement plan, we look at all third party recommendations, and
2 3 4 5	<ul><li>A. (Witness nods).</li><li>Q. Sorry, instead of nodding, you have to say "yes" for the transcript.</li><li>A. Yes. Sorry.</li></ul>	2 3 4 5	perspective, which I managed from Yarl's Wood, and likewise in Gatwick, we have a performance improvement plan, we look at all third party recommendations, and HMIP recommendations, and we will action and go through
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A. (Witness nods).</li> <li>Q. Sorry, instead of nodding, you have to say "yes" for the transcript.</li> <li>A. Yes. Sorry.</li> <li>Q. Those concerns that you would have been aware of, would</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	perspective, which I managed from Yarl's Wood, and likewise in Gatwick, we have a performance improvement plan, we look at all third party recommendations, and HMIP recommendations, and we will action and go through those and discuss and sit down with the Home Office as
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A. (Witness nods).</li> <li>Q. Sorry, instead of nodding, you have to say "yes" for the transcript.</li> <li>A. Yes. Sorry.</li> <li>Q. Those concerns that you would have been aware of, would they have been shared across the immigration estate, so</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	perspective, which I managed from Yarl's Wood, and likewise in Gatwick, we have a performance improvement plan, we look at all third party recommendations, and HMIP recommendations, and we will action and go through those and discuss and sit down with the Home Office as well and share that detail.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A. (Witness nods).</li> <li>Q. Sorry, instead of nodding, you have to say "yes" for the transcript.</li> <li>A. Yes. Sorry.</li> <li>Q. Those concerns that you would have been aware of, would they have been shared across the immigration estate, so with other centres?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	perspective, which I managed from Yarl's Wood, and likewise in Gatwick, we have a performance improvement plan, we look at all third party recommendations, and HMIP recommendations, and we will action and go through those and discuss and sit down with the Home Office as well and share that detail.  Q. And when a business takes over like Serco, takes over
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. (Witness nods).</li> <li>Q. Sorry, instead of nodding, you have to say "yes" for the transcript.</li> <li>A. Yes. Sorry.</li> <li>Q. Those concerns that you would have been aware of, would they have been shared across the immigration estate, so with other centres?</li> <li>A. The NAO report was published in, I think, June 2016,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	perspective, which I managed from Yarl's Wood, and likewise in Gatwick, we have a performance improvement plan, we look at all third party recommendations, and HMIP recommendations, and we will action and go through those and discuss and sit down with the Home Office as well and share that detail.  Q. And when a business takes over like Serco, takes over a new contract rather than in relation to its ongoing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. (Witness nods).</li> <li>Q. Sorry, instead of nodding, you have to say "yes" for the transcript.</li> <li>A. Yes. Sorry.</li> <li>Q. Those concerns that you would have been aware of, would they have been shared across the immigration estate, so with other centres?</li> <li>A. The NAO report was published in, I think, June 2016, just a little time before I started as director of</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	perspective, which I managed from Yarl's Wood, and likewise in Gatwick, we have a performance improvement plan, we look at all third party recommendations, and HMIP recommendations, and we will action and go through those and discuss and sit down with the Home Office as well and share that detail.  Q. And when a business takes over like Serco, takes over a new contract rather than in relation to its ongoing contracts, do you look at previous HMIP
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A. (Witness nods).</li> <li>Q. Sorry, instead of nodding, you have to say "yes" for the transcript.</li> <li>A. Yes. Sorry.</li> <li>Q. Those concerns that you would have been aware of, would they have been shared across the immigration estate, so with other centres?</li> <li>A. The NAO report was published in, I think, June 2016, just a little time before I started as director of Yarl's Wood, because I started in July, 4 July 2016, so</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	perspective, which I managed from Yarl's Wood, and likewise in Gatwick, we have a performance improvement plan, we look at all third party recommendations, and HMIP recommendations, and we will action and go through those and discuss and sit down with the Home Office as well and share that detail.  Q. And when a business takes over like Serco, takes over a new contract rather than in relation to its ongoing contracts, do you look at previous HMIP  A. Yes, yes, from a Home Office perspective, still legacy
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. (Witness nods).</li> <li>Q. Sorry, instead of nodding, you have to say "yes" for the transcript.</li> <li>A. Yes. Sorry.</li> <li>Q. Those concerns that you would have been aware of, would they have been shared across the immigration estate, so with other centres?</li> <li>A. The NAO report was published in, I think, June 2016, just a little time before I started as director of Yarl's Wood, because I started in July, 4 July 2016, so I was fully aware of the report and some of the findings</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	perspective, which I managed from Yarl's Wood, and likewise in Gatwick, we have a performance improvement plan, we look at all third party recommendations, and HMIP recommendations, and we will action and go through those and discuss and sit down with the Home Office as well and share that detail.  Q. And when a business takes over like Serco, takes over a new contract rather than in relation to its ongoing contracts, do you look at previous HMIP  A. Yes, yes, from a Home Office perspective, still legacy actions that we pick up that the previous contractor may
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. (Witness nods).</li> <li>Q. Sorry, instead of nodding, you have to say "yes" for the transcript.</li> <li>A. Yes. Sorry.</li> <li>Q. Those concerns that you would have been aware of, would they have been shared across the immigration estate, so with other centres?</li> <li>A. The NAO report was published in, I think, June 2016, just a little time before I started as director of Yarl's Wood, because I started in July, 4 July 2016, so I was fully aware of the report and some of the findings and concerns, and there was, at that point in time,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	perspective, which I managed from Yarl's Wood, and likewise in Gatwick, we have a performance improvement plan, we look at all third party recommendations, and HMIP recommendations, and we will action and go through those and discuss and sit down with the Home Office as well and share that detail.  Q. And when a business takes over like Serco, takes over a new contract rather than in relation to its ongoing contracts, do you look at previous HMIP  A. Yes, yes, from a Home Office perspective, still legacy actions that we pick up that the previous contractor may have not completed, and we will address those as well.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. (Witness nods).</li> <li>Q. Sorry, instead of nodding, you have to say "yes" for the transcript.</li> <li>A. Yes. Sorry.</li> <li>Q. Those concerns that you would have been aware of, would they have been shared across the immigration estate, so with other centres?</li> <li>A. The NAO report was published in, I think, June 2016, just a little time before I started as director of Yarl's Wood, because I started in July, 4 July 2016, so I was fully aware of the report and some of the findings and concerns, and there was, at that point in time, an action plan, from a Serco perspective, to address the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	perspective, which I managed from Yarl's Wood, and likewise in Gatwick, we have a performance improvement plan, we look at all third party recommendations, and HMIP recommendations, and we will action and go through those and discuss and sit down with the Home Office as well and share that detail.  Q. And when a business takes over like Serco, takes over a new contract rather than in relation to its ongoing contracts, do you look at previous HMIP  A. Yes, yes, from a Home Office perspective, still legacy actions that we pick up that the previous contractor may have not completed, and we will address those as well.  Q. Are you able to say whether, specifically in relation to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. (Witness nods).</li> <li>Q. Sorry, instead of nodding, you have to say "yes" for the transcript.</li> <li>A. Yes. Sorry.</li> <li>Q. Those concerns that you would have been aware of, would they have been shared across the immigration estate, so with other centres?</li> <li>A. The NAO report was published in, I think, June 2016, just a little time before I started as director of Yarl's Wood, because I started in July, 4 July 2016, so I was fully aware of the report and some of the findings and concerns, and there was, at that point in time, an action plan, from a Serco perspective, to address the concerns and the actions as well.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	perspective, which I managed from Yarl's Wood, and likewise in Gatwick, we have a performance improvement plan, we look at all third party recommendations, and HMIP recommendations, and we will action and go through those and discuss and sit down with the Home Office as well and share that detail.  Q. And when a business takes over like Serco, takes over a new contract rather than in relation to its ongoing contracts, do you look at previous HMIP  A. Yes, yes, from a Home Office perspective, still legacy actions that we pick up that the previous contractor may have not completed, and we will address those as well.  Q. Are you able to say whether, specifically in relation to Brook House, that was done with the new contract there?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. (Witness nods).</li> <li>Q. Sorry, instead of nodding, you have to say "yes" for the transcript.</li> <li>A. Yes. Sorry.</li> <li>Q. Those concerns that you would have been aware of, would they have been shared across the immigration estate, so with other centres?</li> <li>A. The NAO report was published in, I think, June 2016, just a little time before I started as director of Yarl's Wood, because I started in July, 4 July 2016, so I was fully aware of the report and some of the findings and concerns, and there was, at that point in time, an action plan, from a Serco perspective, to address the concerns and the actions as well.</li> <li>Q. What about sharing it with other immigration detention</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	perspective, which I managed from Yarl's Wood, and likewise in Gatwick, we have a performance improvement plan, we look at all third party recommendations, and HMIP recommendations, and we will action and go through those and discuss and sit down with the Home Office as well and share that detail.  Q. And when a business takes over like Serco, takes over a new contract rather than in relation to its ongoing contracts, do you look at previous HMIP  A. Yes, yes, from a Home Office perspective, still legacy actions that we pick up that the previous contractor may have not completed, and we will address those as well.  Q. Are you able to say whether, specifically in relation to Brook House, that was done with the new contract there?  A. Yes, yes. Yes. And we are still closing off a number
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. (Witness nods).</li> <li>Q. Sorry, instead of nodding, you have to say "yes" for the transcript.</li> <li>A. Yes. Sorry.</li> <li>Q. Those concerns that you would have been aware of, would they have been shared across the immigration estate, so with other centres?</li> <li>A. The NAO report was published in, I think, June 2016, just a little time before I started as director of Yarl's Wood, because I started in July, 4 July 2016, so I was fully aware of the report and some of the findings and concerns, and there was, at that point in time, an action plan, from a Serco perspective, to address the concerns and the actions as well.</li> <li>Q. What about sharing it with other immigration detention centres across the country</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	perspective, which I managed from Yarl's Wood, and likewise in Gatwick, we have a performance improvement plan, we look at all third party recommendations, and HMIP recommendations, and we will action and go through those and discuss and sit down with the Home Office as well and share that detail.  Q. And when a business takes over like Serco, takes over a new contract rather than in relation to its ongoing contracts, do you look at previous HMIP  A. Yes, yes, from a Home Office perspective, still legacy actions that we pick up that the previous contractor may have not completed, and we will address those as well.  Q. Are you able to say whether, specifically in relation to Brook House, that was done with the new contract there?  A. Yes, yes. Yes. And we are still closing off a number of recommendations still now that were that needed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. (Witness nods).</li> <li>Q. Sorry, instead of nodding, you have to say "yes" for the transcript.</li> <li>A. Yes. Sorry.</li> <li>Q. Those concerns that you would have been aware of, would they have been shared across the immigration estate, so with other centres?</li> <li>A. The NAO report was published in, I think, June 2016, just a little time before I started as director of Yarl's Wood, because I started in July, 4 July 2016, so I was fully aware of the report and some of the findings and concerns, and there was, at that point in time, an action plan, from a Serco perspective, to address the concerns and the actions as well.</li> <li>Q. What about sharing it with other immigration detention centres across the country</li> <li>A. I am not aware the report was shared. The NAO report</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	perspective, which I managed from Yarl's Wood, and likewise in Gatwick, we have a performance improvement plan, we look at all third party recommendations, and HMIP recommendations, and we will action and go through those and discuss and sit down with the Home Office as well and share that detail.  Q. And when a business takes over like Serco, takes over a new contract rather than in relation to its ongoing contracts, do you look at previous HMIP  A. Yes, yes, from a Home Office perspective, still legacy actions that we pick up that the previous contractor may have not completed, and we will address those as well.  Q. Are you able to say whether, specifically in relation to Brook House, that was done with the new contract there?  A. Yes, yes. Yes. And we are still closing off a number of recommendations still now that were that needed closure from the Home Office from their audit team as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. (Witness nods).</li> <li>Q. Sorry, instead of nodding, you have to say "yes" for the transcript.</li> <li>A. Yes. Sorry.</li> <li>Q. Those concerns that you would have been aware of, would they have been shared across the immigration estate, so with other centres?</li> <li>A. The NAO report was published in, I think, June 2016, just a little time before I started as director of Yarl's Wood, because I started in July, 4 July 2016, so I was fully aware of the report and some of the findings and concerns, and there was, at that point in time, an action plan, from a Serco perspective, to address the concerns and the actions as well.</li> <li>Q. What about sharing it with other immigration detention centres across the country</li> <li>A. I am not aware the report was shared. The NAO report was specifically about Yarl's Wood and the findings at</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	perspective, which I managed from Yarl's Wood, and likewise in Gatwick, we have a performance improvement plan, we look at all third party recommendations, and HMIP recommendations, and we will action and go through those and discuss and sit down with the Home Office as well and share that detail.  Q. And when a business takes over like Serco, takes over a new contract rather than in relation to its ongoing contracts, do you look at previous HMIP  A. Yes, yes, from a Home Office perspective, still legacy actions that we pick up that the previous contractor may have not completed, and we will address those as well.  Q. Are you able to say whether, specifically in relation to Brook House, that was done with the new contract there?  A. Yes, yes. Yes. And we are still closing off a number of recommendations still now that were that needed closure from the Home Office from their audit team as well.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. (Witness nods).</li> <li>Q. Sorry, instead of nodding, you have to say "yes" for the transcript.</li> <li>A. Yes. Sorry.</li> <li>Q. Those concerns that you would have been aware of, would they have been shared across the immigration estate, so with other centres?</li> <li>A. The NAO report was published in, I think, June 2016, just a little time before I started as director of Yarl's Wood, because I started in July, 4 July 2016, so I was fully aware of the report and some of the findings and concerns, and there was, at that point in time, an action plan, from a Serco perspective, to address the concerns and the actions as well.</li> <li>Q. What about sharing it with other immigration detention centres across the country</li> <li>A. I am not aware the report was shared. The NAO report was specifically about Yarl's Wood and the findings at Yarl's Wood at that time. Whether that was shared</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	perspective, which I managed from Yarl's Wood, and likewise in Gatwick, we have a performance improvement plan, we look at all third party recommendations, and HMIP recommendations, and we will action and go through those and discuss and sit down with the Home Office as well and share that detail.  Q. And when a business takes over like Serco, takes over a new contract rather than in relation to its ongoing contracts, do you look at previous HMIP  A. Yes, yes, from a Home Office perspective, still legacy actions that we pick up that the previous contractor may have not completed, and we will address those as well.  Q. Are you able to say whether, specifically in relation to Brook House, that was done with the new contract there?  A. Yes, yes. Yes. And we are still closing off a number of recommendations still now that were that needed closure from the Home Office from their audit team as well.  Q. I want to turn, as I said I would, more specifically to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. (Witness nods).</li> <li>Q. Sorry, instead of nodding, you have to say "yes" for the transcript.</li> <li>A. Yes. Sorry.</li> <li>Q. Those concerns that you would have been aware of, would they have been shared across the immigration estate, so with other centres?</li> <li>A. The NAO report was published in, I think, June 2016, just a little time before I started as director of Yarl's Wood, because I started in July, 4 July 2016, so I was fully aware of the report and some of the findings and concerns, and there was, at that point in time, an action plan, from a Serco perspective, to address the concerns and the actions as well.</li> <li>Q. What about sharing it with other immigration detention centres across the country</li> <li>A. I am not aware the report was shared. The NAO report was specifically about Yarl's Wood and the findings at Yarl's Wood at that time. Whether that was shared across the estate, I am not sure of that.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	perspective, which I managed from Yarl's Wood, and likewise in Gatwick, we have a performance improvement plan, we look at all third party recommendations, and HMIP recommendations, and we will action and go through those and discuss and sit down with the Home Office as well and share that detail.  Q. And when a business takes over like Serco, takes over a new contract rather than in relation to its ongoing contracts, do you look at previous HMIP  A. Yes, yes, from a Home Office perspective, still legacy actions that we pick up that the previous contractor may have not completed, and we will address those as well.  Q. Are you able to say whether, specifically in relation to Brook House, that was done with the new contract there?  A. Yes, yes. Yes. And we are still closing off a number of recommendations still now that were that needed closure from the Home Office from their audit team as well.  Q. I want to turn, as I said I would, more specifically to the contract itself. Now, we have looked, for obvious
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. (Witness nods).</li> <li>Q. Sorry, instead of nodding, you have to say "yes" for the transcript.</li> <li>A. Yes. Sorry.</li> <li>Q. Those concerns that you would have been aware of, would they have been shared across the immigration estate, so with other centres?</li> <li>A. The NAO report was published in, I think, June 2016, just a little time before I started as director of Yarl's Wood, because I started in July, 4 July 2016, so I was fully aware of the report and some of the findings and concerns, and there was, at that point in time, an action plan, from a Serco perspective, to address the concerns and the actions as well.</li> <li>Q. What about sharing it with other immigration detention centres across the country</li> <li>A. I am not aware the report was shared. The NAO report was specifically about Yarl's Wood and the findings at Yarl's Wood at that time. Whether that was shared across the estate, I am not sure of that.</li> <li>Q. More specifically, obviously, the inquiry is interested</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	perspective, which I managed from Yarl's Wood, and likewise in Gatwick, we have a performance improvement plan, we look at all third party recommendations, and HMIP recommendations, and we will action and go through those and discuss and sit down with the Home Office as well and share that detail.  Q. And when a business takes over like Serco, takes over a new contract rather than in relation to its ongoing contracts, do you look at previous HMIP  A. Yes, yes, from a Home Office perspective, still legacy actions that we pick up that the previous contractor may have not completed, and we will address those as well.  Q. Are you able to say whether, specifically in relation to Brook House, that was done with the new contract there?  A. Yes, yes. Yes. And we are still closing off a number of recommendations still now that were that needed closure from the Home Office from their audit team as well.  Q. I want to turn, as I said I would, more specifically to the contract itself. Now, we have looked, for obvious reasons, in some detail at the contract between the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. (Witness nods).</li> <li>Q. Sorry, instead of nodding, you have to say "yes" for the transcript.</li> <li>A. Yes. Sorry.</li> <li>Q. Those concerns that you would have been aware of, would they have been shared across the immigration estate, so with other centres?</li> <li>A. The NAO report was published in, I think, June 2016, just a little time before I started as director of Yarl's Wood, because I started in July, 4 July 2016, so I was fully aware of the report and some of the findings and concerns, and there was, at that point in time, an action plan, from a Serco perspective, to address the concerns and the actions as well.</li> <li>Q. What about sharing it with other immigration detention centres across the country</li> <li>A. I am not aware the report was shared. The NAO report was specifically about Yarl's Wood and the findings at Yarl's Wood at that time. Whether that was shared across the estate, I am not sure of that.</li> <li>Q. More specifically, obviously, the inquiry is interested in how, if at all, Serco took into account these issues</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	perspective, which I managed from Yarl's Wood, and likewise in Gatwick, we have a performance improvement plan, we look at all third party recommendations, and HMIP recommendations, and we will action and go through those and discuss and sit down with the Home Office as well and share that detail.  Q. And when a business takes over like Serco, takes over a new contract rather than in relation to its ongoing contracts, do you look at previous HMIP  A. Yes, yes, from a Home Office perspective, still legacy actions that we pick up that the previous contractor may have not completed, and we will address those as well.  Q. Are you able to say whether, specifically in relation to Brook House, that was done with the new contract there?  A. Yes, yes. Yes. And we are still closing off a number of recommendations still now that were that needed closure from the Home Office from their audit team as well.  Q. I want to turn, as I said I would, more specifically to the contract itself. Now, we have looked, for obvious reasons, in some detail at the contract between the Home Office and G4S that was in place during the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. (Witness nods).</li> <li>Q. Sorry, instead of nodding, you have to say "yes" for the transcript.</li> <li>A. Yes. Sorry.</li> <li>Q. Those concerns that you would have been aware of, would they have been shared across the immigration estate, so with other centres?</li> <li>A. The NAO report was published in, I think, June 2016, just a little time before I started as director of Yarl's Wood, because I started in July, 4 July 2016, so I was fully aware of the report and some of the findings and concerns, and there was, at that point in time, an action plan, from a Serco perspective, to address the concerns and the actions as well.</li> <li>Q. What about sharing it with other immigration detention centres across the country</li> <li>A. I am not aware the report was shared. The NAO report was specifically about Yarl's Wood and the findings at Yarl's Wood at that time. Whether that was shared across the estate, I am not sure of that.</li> <li>Q. More specifically, obviously, the inquiry is interested in how, if at all, Serco took into account these issues when it took over Brook House much later in 2020?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	perspective, which I managed from Yarl's Wood, and likewise in Gatwick, we have a performance improvement plan, we look at all third party recommendations, and HMIP recommendations, and we will action and go through those and discuss and sit down with the Home Office as well and share that detail.  Q. And when a business takes over like Serco, takes over a new contract rather than in relation to its ongoing contracts, do you look at previous HMIP  A. Yes, yes, from a Home Office perspective, still legacy actions that we pick up that the previous contractor may have not completed, and we will address those as well.  Q. Are you able to say whether, specifically in relation to Brook House, that was done with the new contract there?  A. Yes, yes. Yes. And we are still closing off a number of recommendations still now that were that needed closure from the Home Office from their audit team as well.  Q. I want to turn, as I said I would, more specifically to the contract itself. Now, we have looked, for obvious reasons, in some detail at the contract between the Home Office and G4S that was in place during the relevant period, but we have also been provided with the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. (Witness nods).</li> <li>Q. Sorry, instead of nodding, you have to say "yes" for the transcript.</li> <li>A. Yes. Sorry.</li> <li>Q. Those concerns that you would have been aware of, would they have been shared across the immigration estate, so with other centres?</li> <li>A. The NAO report was published in, I think, June 2016, just a little time before I started as director of Yarl's Wood, because I started in July, 4 July 2016, so I was fully aware of the report and some of the findings and concerns, and there was, at that point in time, an action plan, from a Serco perspective, to address the concerns and the actions as well.</li> <li>Q. What about sharing it with other immigration detention centres across the country</li> <li>A. I am not aware the report was shared. The NAO report was specifically about Yarl's Wood and the findings at Yarl's Wood at that time. Whether that was shared across the estate, I am not sure of that.</li> <li>Q. More specifically, obviously, the inquiry is interested in how, if at all, Serco took into account these issues</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	perspective, which I managed from Yarl's Wood, and likewise in Gatwick, we have a performance improvement plan, we look at all third party recommendations, and HMIP recommendations, and we will action and go through those and discuss and sit down with the Home Office as well and share that detail.  Q. And when a business takes over like Serco, takes over a new contract rather than in relation to its ongoing contracts, do you look at previous HMIP  A. Yes, yes, from a Home Office perspective, still legacy actions that we pick up that the previous contractor may have not completed, and we will address those as well.  Q. Are you able to say whether, specifically in relation to Brook House, that was done with the new contract there?  A. Yes, yes. Yes. And we are still closing off a number of recommendations still now that were that needed closure from the Home Office from their audit team as well.  Q. I want to turn, as I said I would, more specifically to the contract itself. Now, we have looked, for obvious reasons, in some detail at the contract between the Home Office and G4S that was in place during the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. (Witness nods).</li> <li>Q. Sorry, instead of nodding, you have to say "yes" for the transcript.</li> <li>A. Yes. Sorry.</li> <li>Q. Those concerns that you would have been aware of, would they have been shared across the immigration estate, so with other centres?</li> <li>A. The NAO report was published in, I think, June 2016, just a little time before I started as director of Yarl's Wood, because I started in July, 4 July 2016, so I was fully aware of the report and some of the findings and concerns, and there was, at that point in time, an action plan, from a Serco perspective, to address the concerns and the actions as well.</li> <li>Q. What about sharing it with other immigration detention centres across the country</li> <li>A. I am not aware the report was shared. The NAO report was specifically about Yarl's Wood and the findings at Yarl's Wood at that time. Whether that was shared across the estate, I am not sure of that.</li> <li>Q. More specifically, obviously, the inquiry is interested in how, if at all, Serco took into account these issues when it took over Brook House much later in 2020?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	perspective, which I managed from Yarl's Wood, and likewise in Gatwick, we have a performance improvement plan, we look at all third party recommendations, and HMIP recommendations, and we will action and go through those and discuss and sit down with the Home Office as well and share that detail.  Q. And when a business takes over like Serco, takes over a new contract rather than in relation to its ongoing contracts, do you look at previous HMIP  A. Yes, yes, from a Home Office perspective, still legacy actions that we pick up that the previous contractor may have not completed, and we will address those as well.  Q. Are you able to say whether, specifically in relation to Brook House, that was done with the new contract there?  A. Yes, yes. Yes. And we are still closing off a number of recommendations still now that were that needed closure from the Home Office from their audit team as well.  Q. I want to turn, as I said I would, more specifically to the contract itself. Now, we have looked, for obvious reasons, in some detail at the contract between the Home Office and G4S that was in place during the relevant period, but we have also been provided with the

1	A. Yes.	1	cohorts because of Covid as well through that period.
2	Q. You have helpfully described many of the key features of	2	Q. Was that particular unlock period, 7.00 am until
3	it within your statement, too, and, as I said, your	3	10.00~pm specified in the standards?
4	statement will be adduced in full.	4	A. Yes.
5	In summary, while, as you say and we will go on	5	Q. So everyone who made a bid had to comply?
6	to discuss the content of the contract is very	6	A. Yes, yes.
7	different	7	Q. You mentioned also increased access to activities. Was
8	A. Yes.	8	this, in particular, required in the operational
9	Q it functions, doesn't it, in a similar way to the G4S	9	standards or is it just the result of a longer core day?
10	contract, in that it contains a series of key	10	A. No, there were additional activities also specified and
11	performance indicators, against which are fixed	11	we had to provide additional activities throughout the
12	penalties or points that translate into financial	12	range, and a range of activities and education provision
13	deductions?	13	as well.
14	A. Correct, yes.	14	Q. If you can recall, the operational standards specified
15	Q. I am going to summarise, at this stage, your description	15	which activities, or did it just say you need to provide
16	of the Serco contract and how, in terms of overview, it	16	more activities?
17	differs from the G4S contract. This is from your	17	A. More activities, and then it were up to the bidders to
18	page 2, paragraph 4.	18	have some innovation and provide those as well.
19	We will go on later to discuss the ins and outs, but	19	Q. You mention that an increase in staffing levels was also
20	just by way of overview for now, as you say at	20	prescribed, so mandated staffing levels are those
21	paragraph 4:	21	recorded in the contract. You summarise them, and I'm
22	"When designing the contract, the Home Office made	22	just skipping forward to your page 8, paragraph 27.
23	significant changes to the specification of operational	23	They're drawn from annex B, which is within the
24	standards."	24	contract, but it is easier to set out what you say in
25	You say they were informed from the Shaw, Lampard	25	the statement.
	Page 9		Page 11
1	and related reports. So now we are talking about the	1	A. Yes.
2	reports into Brook House rather than Yarl's Wood?	2	Q. You say at 27:
3	A. Yes.	3	"I can confirm that annex B provides that on
4	Q. So just stopping there, the Home Office, as you say,	4	weekdays (daytime), there should be 10 DCMs and 75 DCOs
5	made changes to the specification of operational		
	made changes to the specification of operational	5	at Brook House, on weekends (daytime), 9 DCMs and
6	standards. So the Home Office, does it specify certain	5 6	at Brook House, on weekends (daytime), 9 DCMs and 76 DCOs, and overnight 2 DCMs and 18 DCOs."
6 7			, <u>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </u>
_	standards. So the Home Office, does it specify certain	6	76 DCOs, and overnight 2 DCMs and 18 DCOs."
7	standards. So the Home Office, does it specify certain standards and all of the bidders have to show that they	6 7	76 DCOs, and overnight 2 DCMs and 18 DCOs."  A. Correct.
7 8	standards. So the Home Office, does it specify certain standards and all of the bidders have to show that they have met them in their bid?	6 7 8	76 DCOs, and overnight 2 DCMs and 18 DCOs."  A. Correct.  Q. You say, "This is a minimum requirement".
7 8 9	standards. So the Home Office, does it specify certain standards and all of the bidders have to show that they have met them in their bid?  A. Correct, yes.	6 7 8 9	76 DCOs, and overnight 2 DCMs and 18 DCOs."  A. Correct.  Q. You say, "This is a minimum requirement".  A. Yes.
7 8 9 10	standards. So the Home Office, does it specify certain standards and all of the bidders have to show that they have met them in their bid?  A. Correct, yes.  Q. And at paragraph 4, to cover some of them, you mention	6 7 8 9 10	76 DCOs, and overnight 2 DCMs and 18 DCOs."  A. Correct.  Q. You say, "This is a minimum requirement".  A. Yes.  Q. Then you say that that doesn't vary with occupancy.
7 8 9 10 11	standards. So the Home Office, does it specify certain standards and all of the bidders have to show that they have met them in their bid?  A. Correct, yes.  Q. And at paragraph 4, to cover some of them, you mention an extended core day; so that's to reduce the amount of	6 7 8 9 10 11	76 DCOs, and overnight 2 DCMs and 18 DCOs."  A. Correct. Q. You say, "This is a minimum requirement".  A. Yes. Q. Then you say that that doesn't vary with occupancy.  A. No.
7 8 9 10 11	standards. So the Home Office, does it specify certain standards and all of the bidders have to show that they have met them in their bid?  A. Correct, yes.  Q. And at paragraph 4, to cover some of them, you mention an extended core day; so that's to reduce the amount of time locked in rooms. I understand the core day, is it	6 7 8 9 10 11 12	76 DCOs, and overnight 2 DCMs and 18 DCOs."  A. Correct. Q. You say, "This is a minimum requirement".  A. Yes. Q. Then you say that that doesn't vary with occupancy.  A. No. Q. We have also received your services description, which
7 8 9 10 11 12 13	standards. So the Home Office, does it specify certain standards and all of the bidders have to show that they have met them in their bid?  A. Correct, yes.  Q. And at paragraph 4, to cover some of them, you mention an extended core day; so that's to reduce the amount of time locked in rooms. I understand the core day, is it now 7.00 am until 10.00 pm?	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>76 DCOs, and overnight 2 DCMs and 18 DCOs."</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. You say, "This is a minimum requirement".</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Then you say that that doesn't vary with occupancy.</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. We have also received your services description, which is mentioned at schedule 2.1 of the contract, but you</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	standards. So the Home Office, does it specify certain standards and all of the bidders have to show that they have met them in their bid?  A. Correct, yes.  Q. And at paragraph 4, to cover some of them, you mention an extended core day; so that's to reduce the amount of time locked in rooms. I understand the core day, is it now 7.00 am until 10.00 pm?  A. That's correct, yes.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	76 DCOs, and overnight 2 DCMs and 18 DCOs."  A. Correct.  Q. You say, "This is a minimum requirement".  A. Yes.  Q. Then you say that that doesn't vary with occupancy.  A. No.  Q. We have also received your services description, which is mentioned at schedule 2.1 of the contract, but you refer to it at page 8, paragraph 31, and it looks like
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	standards. So the Home Office, does it specify certain standards and all of the bidders have to show that they have met them in their bid?  A. Correct, yes.  Q. And at paragraph 4, to cover some of them, you mention an extended core day; so that's to reduce the amount of time locked in rooms. I understand the core day, is it now 7.00 am until 10.00 pm?  A. That's correct, yes.  Q. So between these times, the rooms aren't locked at all?	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>76 DCOs, and overnight 2 DCMs and 18 DCOs."</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. You say, "This is a minimum requirement".</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Then you say that that doesn't vary with occupancy.</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. We have also received your services description, which is mentioned at schedule 2.1 of the contract, but you refer to it at page 8, paragraph 31, and it looks like a spreadsheet which bidders must complete to detail how</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	standards. So the Home Office, does it specify certain standards and all of the bidders have to show that they have met them in their bid?  A. Correct, yes.  Q. And at paragraph 4, to cover some of them, you mention an extended core day; so that's to reduce the amount of time locked in rooms. I understand the core day, is it now 7.00 am until 10.00 pm?  A. That's correct, yes.  Q. So between these times, the rooms aren't locked at all?  A. Other than for mandatory roll counts and checks, that's	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>76 DCOs, and overnight 2 DCMs and 18 DCOs."</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. You say, "This is a minimum requirement".</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Then you say that that doesn't vary with occupancy.</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. We have also received your services description, which is mentioned at schedule 2.1 of the contract, but you refer to it at page 8, paragraph 31, and it looks like a spreadsheet which bidders must complete to detail how many staff Serco would employ in total. So rather than,</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	standards. So the Home Office, does it specify certain standards and all of the bidders have to show that they have met them in their bid?  A. Correct, yes.  Q. And at paragraph 4, to cover some of them, you mention an extended core day; so that's to reduce the amount of time locked in rooms. I understand the core day, is it now 7.00 am until 10.00 pm?  A. That's correct, yes.  Q. So between these times, the rooms aren't locked at all?  A. Other than for mandatory roll counts and checks, that's all, for short periods of time.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	76 DCOs, and overnight 2 DCMs and 18 DCOs."  A. Correct.  Q. You say, "This is a minimum requirement".  A. Yes.  Q. Then you say that that doesn't vary with occupancy.  A. No.  Q. We have also received your services description, which is mentioned at schedule 2.1 of the contract, but you refer to it at page 8, paragraph 31, and it looks like a spreadsheet which bidders must complete to detail how many staff Serco would employ in total. So rather than, who is in the centre, how many people are on the
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	standards. So the Home Office, does it specify certain standards and all of the bidders have to show that they have met them in their bid?  A. Correct, yes.  Q. And at paragraph 4, to cover some of them, you mention an extended core day; so that's to reduce the amount of time locked in rooms. I understand the core day, is it now 7.00 am until 10.00 pm?  A. That's correct, yes.  Q. So between these times, the rooms aren't locked at all?  A. Other than for mandatory roll counts and checks, that's all, for short periods of time.  Q. You may say this depends on Covid, but can the detainees	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>76 DCOs, and overnight 2 DCMs and 18 DCOs."</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. You say, "This is a minimum requirement".</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Then you say that that doesn't vary with occupancy.</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. We have also received your services description, which is mentioned at schedule 2.1 of the contract, but you refer to it at page 8, paragraph 31, and it looks like a spreadsheet which bidders must complete to detail how many staff Serco would employ in total. So rather than, who is in the centre, how many people are on the payroll?</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	standards. So the Home Office, does it specify certain standards and all of the bidders have to show that they have met them in their bid?  A. Correct, yes.  Q. And at paragraph 4, to cover some of them, you mention an extended core day; so that's to reduce the amount of time locked in rooms. I understand the core day, is it now 7.00 am until 10.00 pm?  A. That's correct, yes.  Q. So between these times, the rooms aren't locked at all?  A. Other than for mandatory roll counts and checks, that's all, for short periods of time.  Q. You may say this depends on Covid, but can the detainees leave their wings during this period or just their	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>76 DCOs, and overnight 2 DCMs and 18 DCOs."</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. You say, "This is a minimum requirement".</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Then you say that that doesn't vary with occupancy.</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. We have also received your services description, which is mentioned at schedule 2.1 of the contract, but you refer to it at page 8, paragraph 31, and it looks like a spreadsheet which bidders must complete to detail how many staff Serco would employ in total. So rather than, who is in the centre, how many people are on the payroll?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	standards. So the Home Office, does it specify certain standards and all of the bidders have to show that they have met them in their bid?  A. Correct, yes.  Q. And at paragraph 4, to cover some of them, you mention an extended core day; so that's to reduce the amount of time locked in rooms. I understand the core day, is it now 7.00 am until 10.00 pm?  A. That's correct, yes.  Q. So between these times, the rooms aren't locked at all?  A. Other than for mandatory roll counts and checks, that's all, for short periods of time.  Q. You may say this depends on Covid, but can the detainees leave their wings during this period or just their rooms?	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>76 DCOs, and overnight 2 DCMs and 18 DCOs."</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. You say, "This is a minimum requirement".</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Then you say that that doesn't vary with occupancy.</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. We have also received your services description, which is mentioned at schedule 2.1 of the contract, but you refer to it at page 8, paragraph 31, and it looks like a spreadsheet which bidders must complete to detail how many staff Serco would employ in total. So rather than, who is in the centre, how many people are on the payroll?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And this is across, I understand it, all Gatwick sites</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	standards. So the Home Office, does it specify certain standards and all of the bidders have to show that they have met them in their bid?  A. Correct, yes.  Q. And at paragraph 4, to cover some of them, you mention an extended core day; so that's to reduce the amount of time locked in rooms. I understand the core day, is it now 7.00 am until 10.00 pm?  A. That's correct, yes.  Q. So between these times, the rooms aren't locked at all?  A. Other than for mandatory roll counts and checks, that's all, for short periods of time.  Q. You may say this depends on Covid, but can the detainees leave their wings during this period or just their rooms?  A. Yes.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>76 DCOs, and overnight 2 DCMs and 18 DCOs."</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. You say, "This is a minimum requirement".</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Then you say that that doesn't vary with occupancy.</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. We have also received your services description, which is mentioned at schedule 2.1 of the contract, but you refer to it at page 8, paragraph 31, and it looks like a spreadsheet which bidders must complete to detail how many staff Serco would employ in total. So rather than, who is in the centre, how many people are on the payroll?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And this is across, I understand it, all Gatwick sites and it provides in summary for 7 SMT members?</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	standards. So the Home Office, does it specify certain standards and all of the bidders have to show that they have met them in their bid?  A. Correct, yes.  Q. And at paragraph 4, to cover some of them, you mention an extended core day; so that's to reduce the amount of time locked in rooms. I understand the core day, is it now 7.00 am until 10.00 pm?  A. That's correct, yes.  Q. So between these times, the rooms aren't locked at all?  A. Other than for mandatory roll counts and checks, that's all, for short periods of time.  Q. You may say this depends on Covid, but can the detainees leave their wings during this period or just their rooms?  A. Yes.  Q. So free movement around the detainee parts of the	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>76 DCOs, and overnight 2 DCMs and 18 DCOs."</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. You say, "This is a minimum requirement".</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Then you say that that doesn't vary with occupancy.</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. We have also received your services description, which is mentioned at schedule 2.1 of the contract, but you refer to it at page 8, paragraph 31, and it looks like a spreadsheet which bidders must complete to detail how many staff Serco would employ in total. So rather than, who is in the centre, how many people are on the payroll?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And this is across, I understand it, all Gatwick sites and it provides in summary for 7 SMT members?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	standards. So the Home Office, does it specify certain standards and all of the bidders have to show that they have met them in their bid?  A. Correct, yes.  Q. And at paragraph 4, to cover some of them, you mention an extended core day; so that's to reduce the amount of time locked in rooms. I understand the core day, is it now 7.00 am until 10.00 pm?  A. That's correct, yes.  Q. So between these times, the rooms aren't locked at all?  A. Other than for mandatory roll counts and checks, that's all, for short periods of time.  Q. You may say this depends on Covid, but can the detainees leave their wings during this period or just their rooms?  A. Yes.  Q. So free movement around the detainee parts of the centre?	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>76 DCOs, and overnight 2 DCMs and 18 DCOs."</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. You say, "This is a minimum requirement".</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Then you say that that doesn't vary with occupancy.</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. We have also received your services description, which is mentioned at schedule 2.1 of the contract, but you refer to it at page 8, paragraph 31, and it looks like a spreadsheet which bidders must complete to detail how many staff Serco would employ in total. So rather than, who is in the centre, how many people are on the payroll?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And this is across, I understand it, all Gatwick sites and it provides in summary for 7 SMT members?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. 60.8 DCMs, now called DOMs?</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	standards. So the Home Office, does it specify certain standards and all of the bidders have to show that they have met them in their bid?  A. Correct, yes.  Q. And at paragraph 4, to cover some of them, you mention an extended core day; so that's to reduce the amount of time locked in rooms. I understand the core day, is it now 7.00 am until 10.00 pm?  A. That's correct, yes.  Q. So between these times, the rooms aren't locked at all?  A. Other than for mandatory roll counts and checks, that's all, for short periods of time.  Q. You may say this depends on Covid, but can the detainees leave their wings during this period or just their rooms?  A. Yes.  Q. So free movement around the detainee parts of the centre?  A. Yes, yes. And as you say, there has been some restrictions and where we have had to bubble certain	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>76 DCOs, and overnight 2 DCMs and 18 DCOs."</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. You say, "This is a minimum requirement".</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Then you say that that doesn't vary with occupancy.</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. We have also received your services description, which is mentioned at schedule 2.1 of the contract, but you refer to it at page 8, paragraph 31, and it looks like a spreadsheet which bidders must complete to detail how many staff Serco would employ in total. So rather than, who is in the centre, how many people are on the payroll?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And this is across, I understand it, all Gatwick sites and it provides in summary for 7 SMT members?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. 60.8 DCMs, now called DOMs?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. 406.6 DCOs?</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	standards. So the Home Office, does it specify certain standards and all of the bidders have to show that they have met them in their bid?  A. Correct, yes.  Q. And at paragraph 4, to cover some of them, you mention an extended core day; so that's to reduce the amount of time locked in rooms. I understand the core day, is it now 7.00 am until 10.00 pm?  A. That's correct, yes.  Q. So between these times, the rooms aren't locked at all?  A. Other than for mandatory roll counts and checks, that's all, for short periods of time.  Q. You may say this depends on Covid, but can the detainees leave their wings during this period or just their rooms?  A. Yes.  Q. So free movement around the detainee parts of the centre?  A. Yes, yes. And as you say, there has been some	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>76 DCOs, and overnight 2 DCMs and 18 DCOs."</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. You say, "This is a minimum requirement".</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Then you say that that doesn't vary with occupancy.</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. We have also received your services description, which is mentioned at schedule 2.1 of the contract, but you refer to it at page 8, paragraph 31, and it looks like a spreadsheet which bidders must complete to detail how many staff Serco would employ in total. So rather than, who is in the centre, how many people are on the payroll?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And this is across, I understand it, all Gatwick sites and it provides in summary for 7 SMT members?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. 60.8 DCMs, now called DOMs?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>

1	A. Yes.	1	Q. And who set the £50,000?
2	Q. And then various cleaning, admin and religious and	2	A. Part of the initial bid.
3	maintenance roles?	3	Q. Set by the Home Office?
4	A. Yes.	4	A. Yes, specification by the Home Office.
5	Q. And finally on the specification and bidding process, we	5	Q. Before we move on to the detail, paragraph 2.3 there,
6	have seen details of the bid for the original	6	that I read out, reads that the cost value will be
7	Brook House contract with G4S, although GSL won it and	7	a percentage of the anticipated average monthly service
8	then it transferred. And GSL won that despite not	8	profit margin.
9	receiving the highest marks for the operational	9	So we don't need to know what that figure was, but
10	elements, and that was due, we heard in short, to the	10	the average anticipated, by the sound of it, was
11	cost element. And at the time of the original bid, we	11	something projected at the initiation of the contract?
12	have heard, the financial side was worth 50 per cent of	12	A. That's right.
13	the marks given to the bid and quality was the other 50,	13	Q. Meaning that the penalties are not dynamic, so if your
14	and you explain, at paragraph 2, now, the breakdown is	14	profits are, in fact, lower than projected, the penalty
15	currently at the time that you won the bid,	15	takes a bigger chunk out of the bottom line?
16	65 per cent technical quality versus 35 per cent price?	16	A. Yes.
17	A. Yes.	17	Q. And if your profits are higher than projected, the
18	Q. Is that weighting set by the Home Office?	18	penalty takes a smaller chunk out of the bottom line?
19	A. Yes, it is, or by the competitive tender arrangements	19	A. Yes.
20	with the Home Office, set for all bidders.	20	Q. So turning, then, to the key performance indicators
21	Q. I want to ask now about the contract as it works in	21	themselves, can we turn to 210 where they start.
22	practice.	22	Is that page 210? 211? Sorry. There we go. So we
23	So, first, auditing. As I mentioned, there is	23	have KPI1 and 2. They're the only two critical
24	a series of key performance indicators I will call	24	failures. So that is self-harm resulting in detainee
25	them KPIs which can give rise to penalty points,	25	death, and the second one is an escape, and you have
	are in the same give time to permit, permit,	23	death, and the second one is an escape, and you have
	Page 13		Page 15
1	which works, in effect, as deducting a sum from the	1	told us that these are set by Home Office as critical
2	monthly fee, so it translates into a financial penalty.	2	failures.
3	Can we see on the screen, please, <ser000226>, which is</ser000226>	_	
	can we see on the serech, please, \SLR000220>, which is	3	The performance level for these in the fifth column,
4		3 4	The performance level for these in the fifth column, and indeed for all of them, is set at 100 per cent. Do
	the full contract, and if we go to page 203 of that.		and indeed for all of them, is set at 100 per cent. Do
4	the full contract, and if we go to page 203 of that.  At paragraph 2.3, there is a table which shows that	4	and indeed for all of them, is set at 100 per cent. Do you know what that means?
4 5 6	the full contract, and if we go to page 203 of that.  At paragraph 2.3, there is a table which shows that the cost value listed against the performance failure	4 5 6	<ul><li>and indeed for all of them, is set at 100 per cent. Do you know what that means?</li><li>A. Part of that is performance, so it is a critical level,</li></ul>
4 5	the full contract, and if we go to page 203 of that.  At paragraph 2.3, there is a table which shows that the cost value listed against the performance failure category is a percentage of the anticipated average	4 5	<ul><li>and indeed for all of them, is set at 100 per cent. Do you know what that means?</li><li>A. Part of that is performance, so it is a critical level, so it will be 100 per cent of the profit.</li></ul>
4 5 6 7	the full contract, and if we go to page 203 of that.  At paragraph 2.3, there is a table which shows that the cost value listed against the performance failure category is a percentage of the anticipated average monthly service profit margin, and we see there that,	4 5 6 7	<ul><li>and indeed for all of them, is set at 100 per cent. Do you know what that means?</li><li>A. Part of that is performance, so it is a critical level,</li></ul>
4 5 6 7 8	the full contract, and if we go to page 203 of that.  At paragraph 2.3, there is a table which shows that the cost value listed against the performance failure category is a percentage of the anticipated average	4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>and indeed for all of them, is set at 100 per cent. Do you know what that means?</li> <li>A. Part of that is performance, so it is a critical level, so it will be 100 per cent of the profit.</li> <li>Q. They are all 100 per cent, I think, as we see.</li> </ul>
4 5 6 7 8 9	the full contract, and if we go to page 203 of that.  At paragraph 2.3, there is a table which shows that the cost value listed against the performance failure category is a percentage of the anticipated average monthly service profit margin, and we see there that, for performance failures that are minor, the credit value is 0.25 per cent; serious is 1 per cent; severe is	4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>and indeed for all of them, is set at 100 per cent. Do you know what that means?</li> <li>A. Part of that is performance, so it is a critical level, so it will be 100 per cent of the profit.</li> <li>Q. They are all 100 per cent, I think, as we see.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
4 5 6 7 8 9	the full contract, and if we go to page 203 of that.  At paragraph 2.3, there is a table which shows that the cost value listed against the performance failure category is a percentage of the anticipated average monthly service profit margin, and we see there that, for performance failures that are minor, the credit	4 5 6 7 8 9	and indeed for all of them, is set at 100 per cent. Do you know what that means?  A. Part of that is performance, so it is a critical level, so it will be 100 per cent of the profit.  Q. They are all 100 per cent, I think, as we see.  A. Yes.  Q. So for critical, serious, severe?  A. Yes.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the full contract, and if we go to page 203 of that.  At paragraph 2.3, there is a table which shows that the cost value listed against the performance failure category is a percentage of the anticipated average monthly service profit margin, and we see there that, for performance failures that are minor, the credit value is 0.25 per cent; serious is 1 per cent; severe is 5 per cent; and critical is a fixed rate of £50,000 per	4 5 6 7 8 9 10	and indeed for all of them, is set at 100 per cent. Do you know what that means?  A. Part of that is performance, so it is a critical level, so it will be 100 per cent of the profit.  Q. They are all 100 per cent, I think, as we see.  A. Yes.  Q. So for critical, serious, severe?
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the full contract, and if we go to page 203 of that.  At paragraph 2.3, there is a table which shows that the cost value listed against the performance failure category is a percentage of the anticipated average monthly service profit margin, and we see there that, for performance failures that are minor, the credit value is 0.25 per cent; serious is 1 per cent; severe is 5 per cent; and critical is a fixed rate of £50,000 per critical	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	and indeed for all of them, is set at 100 per cent. Do you know what that means?  A. Part of that is performance, so it is a critical level, so it will be 100 per cent of the profit.  Q. They are all 100 per cent, I think, as we see.  A. Yes.  Q. So for critical, serious, severe?  A. Yes.  Q. If we move to 214 then, so this is the next level down
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the full contract, and if we go to page 203 of that.  At paragraph 2.3, there is a table which shows that the cost value listed against the performance failure category is a percentage of the anticipated average monthly service profit margin, and we see there that, for performance failures that are minor, the credit value is 0.25 per cent; serious is 1 per cent; severe is 5 per cent; and critical is a fixed rate of £50,000 per critical	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	and indeed for all of them, is set at 100 per cent. Do you know what that means?  A. Part of that is performance, so it is a critical level, so it will be 100 per cent of the profit.  Q. They are all 100 per cent, I think, as we see.  A. Yes.  Q. So for critical, serious, severe?  A. Yes.  Q. If we move to 214 then, so this is the next level down in terms of severity, and these are the ones that would
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the full contract, and if we go to page 203 of that.  At paragraph 2.3, there is a table which shows that the cost value listed against the performance failure category is a percentage of the anticipated average monthly service profit margin, and we see there that, for performance failures that are minor, the credit value is 0.25 per cent; serious is 1 per cent; severe is 5 per cent; and critical is a fixed rate of £50,000 per critical  A. Correct.  Q. So the level of severity affects the cost of the	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	and indeed for all of them, is set at 100 per cent. Do you know what that means?  A. Part of that is performance, so it is a critical level, so it will be 100 per cent of the profit.  Q. They are all 100 per cent, I think, as we see.  A. Yes.  Q. So for critical, serious, severe?  A. Yes.  Q. If we move to 214 then, so this is the next level down in terms of severity, and these are the ones that would attract the 5 per cent penalty, we see there KP6, which
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the full contract, and if we go to page 203 of that.  At paragraph 2.3, there is a table which shows that the cost value listed against the performance failure category is a percentage of the anticipated average monthly service profit margin, and we see there that, for performance failures that are minor, the credit value is 0.25 per cent; serious is 1 per cent; severe is 5 per cent; and critical is a fixed rate of £50,000 per critical  A. Correct.  Q. So the level of severity affects the cost of the failure?	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	and indeed for all of them, is set at 100 per cent. Do you know what that means?  A. Part of that is performance, so it is a critical level, so it will be 100 per cent of the profit.  Q. They are all 100 per cent, I think, as we see.  A. Yes.  Q. So for critical, serious, severe?  A. Yes.  Q. If we move to 214 then, so this is the next level down in terms of severity, and these are the ones that would attract the 5 per cent penalty, we see there KP6, which is entitled "Hospitalisation", halfway down, and that is
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the full contract, and if we go to page 203 of that.  At paragraph 2.3, there is a table which shows that the cost value listed against the performance failure category is a percentage of the anticipated average monthly service profit margin, and we see there that, for performance failures that are minor, the credit value is 0.25 per cent; serious is 1 per cent; severe is 5 per cent; and critical is a fixed rate of £50,000 per critical  A. Correct.  Q. So the level of severity affects the cost of the failure?  A. Yes.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	and indeed for all of them, is set at 100 per cent. Do you know what that means?  A. Part of that is performance, so it is a critical level, so it will be 100 per cent of the profit.  Q. They are all 100 per cent, I think, as we see.  A. Yes.  Q. So for critical, serious, severe?  A. Yes.  Q. If we move to 214 then, so this is the next level down in terms of severity, and these are the ones that would attract the 5 per cent penalty, we see there KP6, which is entitled "Hospitalisation", halfway down, and that is defined as:
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the full contract, and if we go to page 203 of that.  At paragraph 2.3, there is a table which shows that the cost value listed against the performance failure category is a percentage of the anticipated average monthly service profit margin, and we see there that, for performance failures that are minor, the credit value is 0.25 per cent; serious is 1 per cent; severe is 5 per cent; and critical is a fixed rate of £50,000 per critical  A. Correct.  Q. So the level of severity affects the cost of the failure?  A. Yes.  Q. Who set these percentages? Was it the Home Office or were they put forward in the bid?	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	and indeed for all of them, is set at 100 per cent. Do you know what that means?  A. Part of that is performance, so it is a critical level, so it will be 100 per cent of the profit.  Q. They are all 100 per cent, I think, as we see.  A. Yes.  Q. So for critical, serious, severe?  A. Yes.  Q. If we move to 214 then, so this is the next level down in terms of severity, and these are the ones that would attract the 5 per cent penalty, we see there KP6, which is entitled "Hospitalisation", halfway down, and that is defined as:  "Failure to comply with any obligation under the
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the full contract, and if we go to page 203 of that.  At paragraph 2.3, there is a table which shows that the cost value listed against the performance failure category is a percentage of the anticipated average monthly service profit margin, and we see there that, for performance failures that are minor, the credit value is 0.25 per cent; serious is 1 per cent; severe is 5 per cent; and critical is a fixed rate of £50,000 per critical  A. Correct.  Q. So the level of severity affects the cost of the failure?  A. Yes.  Q. Who set these percentages? Was it the Home Office or were they put forward in the bid?  A. The Home Office set the percentages.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	and indeed for all of them, is set at 100 per cent. Do you know what that means?  A. Part of that is performance, so it is a critical level, so it will be 100 per cent of the profit.  Q. They are all 100 per cent, I think, as we see.  A. Yes.  Q. So for critical, serious, severe?  A. Yes.  Q. If we move to 214 then, so this is the next level down in terms of severity, and these are the ones that would attract the 5 per cent penalty, we see there KP6, which is entitled "Hospitalisation", halfway down, and that is defined as:  "Failure to comply with any obligation under the agreement that results in an occurrence of injury or
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the full contract, and if we go to page 203 of that.  At paragraph 2.3, there is a table which shows that the cost value listed against the performance failure category is a percentage of the anticipated average monthly service profit margin, and we see there that, for performance failures that are minor, the credit value is 0.25 per cent; serious is 1 per cent; severe is 5 per cent; and critical is a fixed rate of £50,000 per critical  A. Correct.  Q. So the level of severity affects the cost of the failure?  A. Yes.  Q. Who set these percentages? Was it the Home Office or were they put forward in the bid?	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	and indeed for all of them, is set at 100 per cent. Do you know what that means?  A. Part of that is performance, so it is a critical level, so it will be 100 per cent of the profit.  Q. They are all 100 per cent, I think, as we see.  A. Yes.  Q. So for critical, serious, severe?  A. Yes.  Q. If we move to 214 then, so this is the next level down in terms of severity, and these are the ones that would attract the 5 per cent penalty, we see there KP6, which is entitled "Hospitalisation", halfway down, and that is defined as:  "Failure to comply with any obligation under the agreement that results in an occurrence of injury or harm, including incidents of deliberate
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the full contract, and if we go to page 203 of that.  At paragraph 2.3, there is a table which shows that the cost value listed against the performance failure category is a percentage of the anticipated average monthly service profit margin, and we see there that, for performance failures that are minor, the credit value is 0.25 per cent; serious is 1 per cent; severe is 5 per cent; and critical is a fixed rate of £50,000 per critical  A. Correct.  Q. So the level of severity affects the cost of the failure?  A. Yes.  Q. Who set these percentages? Was it the Home Office or were they put forward in the bid?  A. The Home Office set the percentages.  Q. And who determined which failures are classed as minor, which are serious and which are severe?	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	and indeed for all of them, is set at 100 per cent. Do you know what that means?  A. Part of that is performance, so it is a critical level, so it will be 100 per cent of the profit.  Q. They are all 100 per cent, I think, as we see.  A. Yes.  Q. So for critical, serious, severe?  A. Yes.  Q. If we move to 214 then, so this is the next level down in terms of severity, and these are the ones that would attract the 5 per cent penalty, we see there KP6, which is entitled "Hospitalisation", halfway down, and that is defined as:  "Failure to comply with any obligation under the agreement that results in an occurrence of injury or harm, including incidents of deliberate self-harm/physical injury to any person requiring
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the full contract, and if we go to page 203 of that.  At paragraph 2.3, there is a table which shows that the cost value listed against the performance failure category is a percentage of the anticipated average monthly service profit margin, and we see there that, for performance failures that are minor, the credit value is 0.25 per cent; serious is 1 per cent; severe is 5 per cent; and critical is a fixed rate of £50,000 per critical  A. Correct.  Q. So the level of severity affects the cost of the failure?  A. Yes.  Q. Who set these percentages? Was it the Home Office or were they put forward in the bid?  A. The Home Office set the percentages.  Q. And who determined which failures are classed as minor, which are serious and which are severe?  A. The Home Office, as part of the specification.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	and indeed for all of them, is set at 100 per cent. Do you know what that means?  A. Part of that is performance, so it is a critical level, so it will be 100 per cent of the profit.  Q. They are all 100 per cent, I think, as we see.  A. Yes.  Q. So for critical, serious, severe?  A. Yes.  Q. If we move to 214 then, so this is the next level down in terms of severity, and these are the ones that would attract the 5 per cent penalty, we see there KP6, which is entitled "Hospitalisation", halfway down, and that is defined as:  "Failure to comply with any obligation under the agreement that results in an occurrence of injury or harm, including incidents of deliberate self-harm/physical injury to any person requiring hospitalisation."
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the full contract, and if we go to page 203 of that.  At paragraph 2.3, there is a table which shows that the cost value listed against the performance failure category is a percentage of the anticipated average monthly service profit margin, and we see there that, for performance failures that are minor, the credit value is 0.25 per cent; serious is 1 per cent; severe is 5 per cent; and critical is a fixed rate of £50,000 per critical  A. Correct.  Q. So the level of severity affects the cost of the failure?  A. Yes.  Q. Who set these percentages? Was it the Home Office or were they put forward in the bid?  A. The Home Office set the percentages.  Q. And who determined which failures are classed as minor, which are serious and which are severe?	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	and indeed for all of them, is set at 100 per cent. Do you know what that means?  A. Part of that is performance, so it is a critical level, so it will be 100 per cent of the profit.  Q. They are all 100 per cent, I think, as we see.  A. Yes.  Q. So for critical, serious, severe?  A. Yes.  Q. If we move to 214 then, so this is the next level down in terms of severity, and these are the ones that would attract the 5 per cent penalty, we see there KP6, which is entitled "Hospitalisation", halfway down, and that is defined as:  "Failure to comply with any obligation under the agreement that results in an occurrence of injury or harm, including incidents of deliberate self-harm/physical injury to any person requiring hospitalisation."  After KP6, the penalties go down to the serious
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the full contract, and if we go to page 203 of that.  At paragraph 2.3, there is a table which shows that the cost value listed against the performance failure category is a percentage of the anticipated average monthly service profit margin, and we see there that, for performance failures that are minor, the credit value is 0.25 per cent; serious is 1 per cent; severe is 5 per cent; and critical is a fixed rate of £50,000 per critical  A. Correct.  Q. So the level of severity affects the cost of the failure?  A. Yes.  Q. Who set these percentages? Was it the Home Office or were they put forward in the bid?  A. The Home Office set the percentages.  Q. And who determined which failures are classed as minor, which are serious and which are severe?  A. The Home Office, as part of the specification.  Q. And again, it was the Home Office who said which	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	and indeed for all of them, is set at 100 per cent. Do you know what that means?  A. Part of that is performance, so it is a critical level, so it will be 100 per cent of the profit.  Q. They are all 100 per cent, I think, as we see.  A. Yes.  Q. So for critical, serious, severe?  A. Yes.  Q. If we move to 214 then, so this is the next level down in terms of severity, and these are the ones that would attract the 5 per cent penalty, we see there KP6, which is entitled "Hospitalisation", halfway down, and that is defined as:  "Failure to comply with any obligation under the agreement that results in an occurrence of injury or harm, including incidents of deliberate self-harm/physical injury to any person requiring hospitalisation."  After KP6, the penalties go down to the serious level, so these are the ones that attract the 1 per cent
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the full contract, and if we go to page 203 of that.  At paragraph 2.3, there is a table which shows that the cost value listed against the performance failure category is a percentage of the anticipated average monthly service profit margin, and we see there that, for performance failures that are minor, the credit value is 0.25 per cent; serious is 1 per cent; severe is 5 per cent; and critical is a fixed rate of £50,000 per critical  A. Correct.  Q. So the level of severity affects the cost of the failure?  A. Yes.  Q. Who set these percentages? Was it the Home Office or were they put forward in the bid?  A. The Home Office set the percentages.  Q. And who determined which failures are classed as minor, which are serious and which are severe?  A. The Home Office, as part of the specification.  Q. And again, it was the Home Office who said which failures were critical?  A. Yes.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	and indeed for all of them, is set at 100 per cent. Do you know what that means?  A. Part of that is performance, so it is a critical level, so it will be 100 per cent of the profit.  Q. They are all 100 per cent, I think, as we see.  A. Yes.  Q. So for critical, serious, severe?  A. Yes.  Q. If we move to 214 then, so this is the next level down in terms of severity, and these are the ones that would attract the 5 per cent penalty, we see there KP6, which is entitled "Hospitalisation", halfway down, and that is defined as:  "Failure to comply with any obligation under the agreement that results in an occurrence of injury or harm, including incidents of deliberate self-harm/physical injury to any person requiring hospitalisation."  After KP6, the penalties go down to the serious level, so these are the ones that attract the 1 per cent penalty. And if we go to 215, we see KP9,  "Substantiated complaints". So, "Any substantiated, or
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the full contract, and if we go to page 203 of that.  At paragraph 2.3, there is a table which shows that the cost value listed against the performance failure category is a percentage of the anticipated average monthly service profit margin, and we see there that, for performance failures that are minor, the credit value is 0.25 per cent; serious is 1 per cent; severe is 5 per cent; and critical is a fixed rate of £50,000 per critical  A. Correct.  Q. So the level of severity affects the cost of the failure?  A. Yes.  Q. Who set these percentages? Was it the Home Office or were they put forward in the bid?  A. The Home Office set the percentages.  Q. And who determined which failures are classed as minor, which are serious and which are severe?  A. The Home Office, as part of the specification.  Q. And again, it was the Home Office who said which failures were critical?	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	and indeed for all of them, is set at 100 per cent. Do you know what that means?  A. Part of that is performance, so it is a critical level, so it will be 100 per cent of the profit.  Q. They are all 100 per cent, I think, as we see.  A. Yes.  Q. So for critical, serious, severe?  A. Yes.  Q. If we move to 214 then, so this is the next level down in terms of severity, and these are the ones that would attract the 5 per cent penalty, we see there KP6, which is entitled "Hospitalisation", halfway down, and that is defined as:  "Failure to comply with any obligation under the agreement that results in an occurrence of injury or harm, including incidents of deliberate self-harm/physical injury to any person requiring hospitalisation."  After KP6, the penalties go down to the serious level, so these are the ones that attract the 1 per cent penalty. And if we go to 215, we see KP9,

1	partially substantiated, complaint against a member of	1	Q. So it is called "Healthcare intervention", but actually,
2	staff (whether [they are] specifically identified or	2	it is that is the product of what happens?
3	not) in respect of any allegation that if upheld	3	A. That is the product, yes.
4	would be considered serious misconduct", is a serious	4	Q. Not the issue, fine. So the hypothetical
5	failure, and that is, as it says, per occurrence.	5	A. If we fail to meet any of their needs, et cetera, the
6	And KP10 so we know from evidence in the inquiry	6	residents' needs.
7	that, under the G4S contract, there was no penalty	7	Q. Or any part of schedule 2.1?
8	related to improper use of force. But we see here as	8	A. Yes.
9	I understand it, we see here at KPI10:	9	Q. So this hypothetical person who has been injured, how
10	"Failure to comply with obligations under the	10	does his injury come to the attention of the people who
11	agreement "	11	have to assess contractual performance KPI?
12	And the schedule is given:	12	A. All the injuries, or any incident, shall I say, is fully
13	" relating to appropriateness of use of force	13	reported to the Home Office and to and discussed at
14	techniques, recording, reporting and scrutiny of use of	14	our morning briefings, morning meetings, and it would be
15	force incidents, care of staff and detainee following	15	fully investigated by an onsite team and discussed at
16	a use of force incident and the availability of	16	the Adults at Risk meeting and our suicide self-harm
17	an advanced control & restraint team."	17	meetings as well, which we have on a monthly basis, so
18	A. Yes.	18	there will be and reviewed, possibly, by our
19	Q. To break that down, there is a number of different	19	safeguarding manager as well, the lead, but that is
20	things that could go wrong and any of those, it seems	20	there is a full incident report and actions that will go
21	from here would give rise to a serious failing?	21	from that as well.
22	A. Yes.	22	And if the risk was too great and the self-harm,
23	Q. KP11, again refers to injury or harm, it is called	23	obviously we would look at ACDT reviews as well and
24	"Healthcare intervention", and it looks like it doesn't	24	contra reviews if as required.
25	have to be self-inflicted, just an injury that requires	25	Q. So does every injury then, by whichever of those
	D 47		D 40
	Page 17		Page 19
1	healthcare intervention and that would give rise to	1	processes, come under review to see, also, if it was
2	a serious failing. So it reads here:	2	a breach of the KPI?
3	"Failure to comply with any obligation under the	3	A. Yes, everything, yes. That would be full transparency
4	agreement that results in an occurrence of injury"	4	from our side of it as well, and the Home Office may
5	So it can be any obligation under the whole	5	the complaints team may look at that part of it as well,
6	agreement and, while the outcome is different in KPIs 1,	6	
U		0	to see if there was any failure or complaints issue, as
7	death; 6, hospitalisations; and 11, healthcare	7	to see if there was any failure or complaints issue, as well, from Serco.
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
7	intervention, the wording is similar as the requirement	7	well, from Serco.
7 8	intervention, the wording is similar as the requirement is "failure to comply with any obligation" before it	7 8	well, from Serco.  Q. You mentioned that the event would come to be discussed
7 8 9 10	intervention, the wording is similar as the requirement is "failure to comply with any obligation" before it applies?	7 8 9	<ul><li>well, from Serco.</li><li>Q. You mentioned that the event would come to be discussed at the weekly operations review meeting, so the WORM?</li><li>A. Yes.</li></ul>
7 8 9	intervention, the wording is similar as the requirement is "failure to comply with any obligation" before it	7 8 9 10	well, from Serco.  Q. You mentioned that the event would come to be discussed at the weekly operations review meeting, so the WORM?
7 8 9 10 11 12	intervention, the wording is similar as the requirement is "failure to comply with any obligation" before it applies?  A. Yes, yes.  Q. I will ask you, if you can, to help me with how this	7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>well, from Serco.</li> <li>Q. You mentioned that the event would come to be discussed at the weekly operations review meeting, so the WORM?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And who attends that meeting?</li> <li>A. That is attended by one of my assistant directors for</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11	intervention, the wording is similar as the requirement is "failure to comply with any obligation" before it applies?  A. Yes, yes.  Q. I will ask you, if you can, to help me with how this works now. Let's take a completely hypothetical example	7 8 9 10 11	<ul><li>well, from Serco.</li><li>Q. You mentioned that the event would come to be discussed at the weekly operations review meeting, so the WORM?</li><li>A. Yes.</li><li>Q. And who attends that meeting?</li></ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	intervention, the wording is similar as the requirement is "failure to comply with any obligation" before it applies?  A. Yes, yes.  Q. I will ask you, if you can, to help me with how this works now. Let's take a completely hypothetical example and a detained man on E wing has bruises to his neck as	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>well, from Serco.</li> <li>Q. You mentioned that the event would come to be discussed at the weekly operations review meeting, so the WORM?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And who attends that meeting?</li> <li>A. That is attended by one of my assistant directors for governance and services and the compliance area manager for the Home Office as well.</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	intervention, the wording is similar as the requirement is "failure to comply with any obligation" before it applies?  A. Yes, yes.  Q. I will ask you, if you can, to help me with how this works now. Let's take a completely hypothetical example and a detained man on E wing has bruises to his neck as a result of self-inflicted ligature injury. So even if	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>well, from Serco.</li> <li>Q. You mentioned that the event would come to be discussed at the weekly operations review meeting, so the WORM?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And who attends that meeting?</li> <li>A. That is attended by one of my assistant directors for governance and services and the compliance area manager for the Home Office as well.</li> <li>Q. Who is the assistant director for governance and</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	intervention, the wording is similar as the requirement is "failure to comply with any obligation" before it applies?  A. Yes, yes.  Q. I will ask you, if you can, to help me with how this works now. Let's take a completely hypothetical example and a detained man on E wing has bruises to his neck as	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>well, from Serco.</li> <li>Q. You mentioned that the event would come to be discussed at the weekly operations review meeting, so the WORM?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And who attends that meeting?</li> <li>A. That is attended by one of my assistant directors for governance and services and the compliance area manager for the Home Office as well.</li> <li>Q. Who is the assistant director for governance and services?</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	intervention, the wording is similar as the requirement is "failure to comply with any obligation" before it applies?  A. Yes, yes.  Q. I will ask you, if you can, to help me with how this works now. Let's take a completely hypothetical example and a detained man on E wing has bruises to his neck as a result of self-inflicted ligature injury. So even if he didn't need treatment, would this require healthcare	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>well, from Serco.</li> <li>Q. You mentioned that the event would come to be discussed at the weekly operations review meeting, so the WORM?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And who attends that meeting?</li> <li>A. That is attended by one of my assistant directors for governance and services and the compliance area manager for the Home Office as well.</li> <li>Q. Who is the assistant director for governance and services?</li> <li>A. Currently, it is a chap called Chris Barford(?),</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	intervention, the wording is similar as the requirement is "failure to comply with any obligation" before it applies?  A. Yes, yes.  Q. I will ask you, if you can, to help me with how this works now. Let's take a completely hypothetical example and a detained man on E wing has bruises to his neck as a result of self-inflicted ligature injury. So even if he didn't need treatment, would this require healthcare intervention on the face of it?  A. Yes.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>well, from Serco.</li> <li>Q. You mentioned that the event would come to be discussed at the weekly operations review meeting, so the WORM?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And who attends that meeting?</li> <li>A. That is attended by one of my assistant directors for governance and services and the compliance area manager for the Home Office as well.</li> <li>Q. Who is the assistant director for governance and services?</li> <li>A. Currently, it is a chap called Chris Barford(?), currently, and previously Mark Demian.</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	intervention, the wording is similar as the requirement is "failure to comply with any obligation" before it applies?  A. Yes, yes.  Q. I will ask you, if you can, to help me with how this works now. Let's take a completely hypothetical example and a detained man on E wing has bruises to his neck as a result of self-inflicted ligature injury. So even if he didn't need treatment, would this require healthcare intervention on the face of it?  A. Yes.  Q. Presumably, healthcare would attend?	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>well, from Serco.</li> <li>Q. You mentioned that the event would come to be discussed at the weekly operations review meeting, so the WORM?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And who attends that meeting?</li> <li>A. That is attended by one of my assistant directors for governance and services and the compliance area manager for the Home Office as well.</li> <li>Q. Who is the assistant director for governance and services?</li> <li>A. Currently, it is a chap called Chris Barford(?), currently, and previously Mark Demian.</li> <li>Q. And someone from the Home Office compliance team?</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	intervention, the wording is similar as the requirement is "failure to comply with any obligation" before it applies?  A. Yes, yes.  Q. I will ask you, if you can, to help me with how this works now. Let's take a completely hypothetical example and a detained man on E wing has bruises to his neck as a result of self-inflicted ligature injury. So even if he didn't need treatment, would this require healthcare intervention on the face of it?  A. Yes.  Q. Presumably, healthcare would attend?  A. Yes, but, I mean, the failure offence if you look at	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>well, from Serco.</li> <li>Q. You mentioned that the event would come to be discussed at the weekly operations review meeting, so the WORM?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And who attends that meeting?</li> <li>A. That is attended by one of my assistant directors for governance and services and the compliance area manager for the Home Office as well.</li> <li>Q. Who is the assistant director for governance and services?</li> <li>A. Currently, it is a chap called Chris Barford(?), currently, and previously Mark Demian.</li> <li>Q. And someone from the Home Office compliance team?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	intervention, the wording is similar as the requirement is "failure to comply with any obligation" before it applies?  A. Yes, yes.  Q. I will ask you, if you can, to help me with how this works now. Let's take a completely hypothetical example and a detained man on E wing has bruises to his neck as a result of self-inflicted ligature injury. So even if he didn't need treatment, would this require healthcare intervention on the face of it?  A. Yes.  Q. Presumably, healthcare would attend?  A. Yes, but, I mean, the failure offence if you look at the schedule clause, it is 2.1, that is the full	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>well, from Serco.</li> <li>Q. You mentioned that the event would come to be discussed at the weekly operations review meeting, so the WORM?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And who attends that meeting?</li> <li>A. That is attended by one of my assistant directors for governance and services and the compliance area manager for the Home Office as well.</li> <li>Q. Who is the assistant director for governance and services?</li> <li>A. Currently, it is a chap called Chris Barford(?), currently, and previously Mark Demian.</li> <li>Q. And someone from the Home Office compliance team?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are healthcare involved with this meeting?</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	intervention, the wording is similar as the requirement is "failure to comply with any obligation" before it applies?  A. Yes, yes.  Q. I will ask you, if you can, to help me with how this works now. Let's take a completely hypothetical example and a detained man on E wing has bruises to his neck as a result of self-inflicted ligature injury. So even if he didn't need treatment, would this require healthcare intervention on the face of it?  A. Yes.  Q. Presumably, healthcare would attend?  A. Yes, but, I mean, the failure offence if you look at the schedule clause, it is 2.1, that is the full schedule of 2.1. So it is any failure to meet not	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	well, from Serco.  Q. You mentioned that the event would come to be discussed at the weekly operations review meeting, so the WORM?  A. Yes.  Q. And who attends that meeting?  A. That is attended by one of my assistant directors for governance and services and the compliance area manager for the Home Office as well.  Q. Who is the assistant director for governance and services?  A. Currently, it is a chap called Chris Barford(?), currently, and previously Mark Demian.  Q. And someone from the Home Office compliance team?  A. Yes.  Q. Are healthcare involved with this meeting?  A. Not the WORM meeting, no, but they would be part of the
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	intervention, the wording is similar as the requirement is "failure to comply with any obligation" before it applies?  A. Yes, yes.  Q. I will ask you, if you can, to help me with how this works now. Let's take a completely hypothetical example and a detained man on E wing has bruises to his neck as a result of self-inflicted ligature injury. So even if he didn't need treatment, would this require healthcare intervention on the face of it?  A. Yes.  Q. Presumably, healthcare would attend?  A. Yes, but, I mean, the failure offence if you look at the schedule clause, it is 2.1, that is the full schedule of 2.1. So it is any failure to meet not particularly the treatment or any it is any part of	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>well, from Serco.</li> <li>Q. You mentioned that the event would come to be discussed at the weekly operations review meeting, so the WORM?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And who attends that meeting?</li> <li>A. That is attended by one of my assistant directors for governance and services and the compliance area manager for the Home Office as well.</li> <li>Q. Who is the assistant director for governance and services?</li> <li>A. Currently, it is a chap called Chris Barford(?), currently, and previously Mark Demian.</li> <li>Q. And someone from the Home Office compliance team?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are healthcare involved with this meeting?</li> <li>A. Not the WORM meeting, no, but they would be part of the Adults at Risk meeting, where we discuss all cases of</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	intervention, the wording is similar as the requirement is "failure to comply with any obligation" before it applies?  A. Yes, yes.  Q. I will ask you, if you can, to help me with how this works now. Let's take a completely hypothetical example and a detained man on E wing has bruises to his neck as a result of self-inflicted ligature injury. So even if he didn't need treatment, would this require healthcare intervention on the face of it?  A. Yes.  Q. Presumably, healthcare would attend?  A. Yes, but, I mean, the failure offence if you look at the schedule clause, it is 2.1, that is the full schedule of 2.1. So it is any failure to meet not particularly the treatment or any it is any part of 2.1, if we fail to meet that obligation to deliver that	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>well, from Serco.</li> <li>Q. You mentioned that the event would come to be discussed at the weekly operations review meeting, so the WORM?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And who attends that meeting?</li> <li>A. That is attended by one of my assistant directors for governance and services and the compliance area manager for the Home Office as well.</li> <li>Q. Who is the assistant director for governance and services?</li> <li>A. Currently, it is a chap called Chris Barford(?), currently, and previously Mark Demian.</li> <li>Q. And someone from the Home Office compliance team?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are healthcare involved with this meeting?</li> <li>A. Not the WORM meeting, no, but they would be part of the Adults at Risk meeting, where we discuss all cases of self-harm on a weekly basis.</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	intervention, the wording is similar as the requirement is "failure to comply with any obligation" before it applies?  A. Yes, yes.  Q. I will ask you, if you can, to help me with how this works now. Let's take a completely hypothetical example and a detained man on E wing has bruises to his neck as a result of self-inflicted ligature injury. So even if he didn't need treatment, would this require healthcare intervention on the face of it?  A. Yes.  Q. Presumably, healthcare would attend?  A. Yes, but, I mean, the failure offence if you look at the schedule clause, it is 2.1, that is the full schedule of 2.1. So it is any failure to meet not particularly the treatment or any it is any part of	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>well, from Serco.</li> <li>Q. You mentioned that the event would come to be discussed at the weekly operations review meeting, so the WORM?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And who attends that meeting?</li> <li>A. That is attended by one of my assistant directors for governance and services and the compliance area manager for the Home Office as well.</li> <li>Q. Who is the assistant director for governance and services?</li> <li>A. Currently, it is a chap called Chris Barford(?), currently, and previously Mark Demian.</li> <li>Q. And someone from the Home Office compliance team?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are healthcare involved with this meeting?</li> <li>A. Not the WORM meeting, no, but they would be part of the Adults at Risk meeting, where we discuss all cases of</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	intervention, the wording is similar as the requirement is "failure to comply with any obligation" before it applies?  A. Yes, yes.  Q. I will ask you, if you can, to help me with how this works now. Let's take a completely hypothetical example and a detained man on E wing has bruises to his neck as a result of self-inflicted ligature injury. So even if he didn't need treatment, would this require healthcare intervention on the face of it?  A. Yes.  Q. Presumably, healthcare would attend?  A. Yes, but, I mean, the failure offence if you look at the schedule clause, it is 2.1, that is the full schedule of 2.1. So it is any failure to meet not particularly the treatment or any it is any part of 2.1, if we fail to meet that obligation to deliver that	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>well, from Serco.</li> <li>Q. You mentioned that the event would come to be discussed at the weekly operations review meeting, so the WORM?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And who attends that meeting?</li> <li>A. That is attended by one of my assistant directors for governance and services and the compliance area manager for the Home Office as well.</li> <li>Q. Who is the assistant director for governance and services?</li> <li>A. Currently, it is a chap called Chris Barford(?), currently, and previously Mark Demian.</li> <li>Q. And someone from the Home Office compliance team?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are healthcare involved with this meeting?</li> <li>A. Not the WORM meeting, no, but they would be part of the Adults at Risk meeting, where we discuss all cases of self-harm on a weekly basis.</li> </ul>

1	caused, so whether it was somebody who self-harmed who	1	happened, that would still give rise to a penalty?
2	did this, whether it was caused by an underlying	2	A. It could do, yes. Yes.
3	condition, some change in their treatment for example,	3	Q. And is that because the reason why ACDT matters, is
4	that would all require the input of healthcare somewhere	4	that because it is incorporated into the agreement under
5	along the way, wouldn't it?	5	schedule 2.1?
6	A. Yes.	6	A. Yes.
7	Q. Let's say, in this hypothetical case, that it is	7	Q. So we will not turn it up, but paragraph 1 of
8	determined that the person was trying to kill	8	schedule 2.1 says that the agreement incorporates,
9	themselves, the next step, I suppose, then, is to look	9	amongst other things, all Detention Centre Rules and all
10	at whether it was due to a failure. You have told us	10	DSOs as well, which would include the ACDT policy?
11	about the meetings where this would be discussed. What	11	A. Which also comes under KPI25 as well.
12	sort of documentation do you look at to determine	12	Q. That's correct.
13	whether it was due to a failure?	13	If an injury was the result of an improper or
14	A. We would have a full incident report, there would be	14	unnecessary use of force so if that is the reason why
15	a review if there is any CCTV footage or any body cam	15	someone is injured as well as being a failure under
16	footage, and to share all that relevant information to	16	KPI10, the use of force KPI, would it be a separate
17	look at the actions, the actions of staff, the actions	17	failure as well under KPI11?
18	of the healthcare, and there would be a full healthcare	18	A. It could be, it depends on the circumstances. We would
19	report into the injury as well.	19	carry out a full investigation on that, and possible it
20	Q. So that is documentation that already exists at the	20	would be referred to the Professional Standards Unit as
21	time.	21	well for a full investigation, independent investigation
22	A. Yes.	22	as well. And we just ensure full transparency with the
23	Q. What about looking at gathering new information; for	23	Home Office to share that detail.
24	example, speaking to people involved, including the	24	Q. So again, in my hypothetical example, if, looking back
25	detained person?	25	through this man's documentation, it comes to light that
	D 21		D 22
	Page 21		Page 23
1	A. Yes, that would all be part of the full investigation of	1	there was a failure to comply with the provisions of
2	the matter. If you required that full investigation,	2	rule 35 so let's say, a month ago, his ACDT
3	that is. It depends on the seriousness of the injury as	3	continuous notes or his healthcare notes or maybe even
4	well.	4	his own account that he said to somebody show that he
5	Q. Let's say you looked at all the information and you now	5	had suicidal intentions a month ago, so rule 35(2) was
6	know, in my hypothetical example, that the man was	6	engaged and should have led to a report being sent to
7	a level 2 Adult at Risk and he was on ACDT hourly	7	the Home Office and, when you looked at the records,
8	observations but they hadn't been done for three hours	8	this was never done, would that be a failure under the
9	when he self-harmed. Is that enough to say it was due	9	agreement?
10	to a failure or do you have to show that more regular	10	A. It could be, may well be, yes, but, again, we would have
11	observations would have prevented it?	11	to have further discussions and look at if there is any
12	A. Hypothetically, I would be very concerned if the	12	further mitigation to discuss that with the Home Office.
13	observations and the ACDT observations were not done in	13	Q. So there is two stages, aren't there, we will come to,
14	time, so that would relate to a failure in 2.1, if that,	14	there's the reporting the failure, and then there's
15	hypothetically, was the case, so	15	potentially mitigating it once it is reported check?
16	THE CHAIR: Mr Hewer, I'm so sorry to interrupt, and it	16	A. Yes.
17	might just be me, but do you mind just slowing the pace	17	Q. Leaving aside that hypothetical example and thank you
18	of your answers very slightly?	18	for your assistance with that you have given us the
19	A. Okay, sorry.	19	KPI data, in fact, and we can see that from when you
20	THE CHAIR: I am struggling to keep up with you. Thank you	20	took over to October 2021, which I think is the latest
21	very much.	21	data we have, there were no KPI11 failures, so no
22	A. Okay.	22	injuries requiring healthcare which was due to a failure
23	MS MOORE: You were telling us that an ACDT failure, is	23	under the agreement and also none requiring
24	that, potentially, even if, with more regular	24	hospitalisation
		1	÷
25	observations, you don't know whether it would have still	25	A. Yes.
25	·	25	
25	observations, you don't know whether it would have still $Page\ 22$	25	A. Yes. Page 24

1	Q and also, happily, no deaths. We know for example,	1	A and I think we have also shared the full KPI
2	and you can open it, if you wish, but you have provided	2	dashboard, et cetera, so from a process of, if you are
3	to us, and it is at your tab 23, that in the last	3	talking about mitigation wise, and looking at the KPIs,
4	six months of 2020, there were 162 self-harm or	4	on a as I said, we would discuss each failure
5	attempted suicide incidents. So 162 incidents in the	5	throughout the previous week at the weekly operational
6	last six months of 2020; 27 a month that works out, so	6	review meeting and that is with one of my senior
7	almost one a day.	7	managers, the assistant director and the Home Office as
8	According to the KPI data you have given us, none of	8	well. So there is full transparency and openness to
9	those almost daily incidents was the result of a failure	9	what our failures are. So we disclose our failures and,
10	to comply with an obligation under the agreement.	10	if there are any failures they identify as well, from an
11	Does that include obligations provided by the Adults	11	Home Office perspective as well, they will also put them
12	at Risk policy for example?	12	on the table and then we would have that discussion and
13	A. Yes.	13	look at mitigation of if we're looking to introduce
14	Q. And ACDT and, as you have told us, also, potentially,	14	new procedures or there's certain things that are
15	rule 35?	15	outside our control as well, for mitigation as well.
16	A. Yes.	16	They are the two main areas.
17	Q. When it was one person a day who was nearly either	17	Q. Reporting a failure, whether under KPI11 or any other
18	with self-harm or attempted suicide incidents, was there	18	one of the KPIs, means noticing the issue has happened,
19	time to properly check all of those to ensure that they	19	acknowledging it is a failure, officially reporting it
20	complied?	20	and potentially losing profit unless it is mitigated?
21	A. Yes, I mean some of those cases were you were	21	A. Correct.
22	averaging at one a day, but some were multiple people	22	Q. Would you agree, as a general principle, that it is not
23	multiple self-harm from one particular resident as well.	23	in Serco's financial interest to report or record such
24	Q. But you still need to investigate each one?	24	failures then?
25	A. Yes, yes. So every case would have been reviewed, fully	25	A. No, I wouldn't agree. We have to be open, honest and
	Page 25		Page 27
1	parioused the singumetaness and looking at the injury	1	transparent and that is not I mean from the
1	reviewed, the circumstances and looking at the injury,	1 2	transparent, and that is not I mean, from the
2	if there is looking at policy and procedure, we	2	provider perspective, that is not in line with our core
2 3	if there is — looking at policy and procedure, we followed the policies and procedures that we have laid	2 3	provider perspective, that is not in line with our core values within Serco, about trust and pride and
2 3 4	if there is — looking at policy and procedure, we followed the policies and procedures that we have laid out and ACDT policies as well.	2 3 4	provider perspective, that is not in line with our core values within Serco, about trust and pride and innovation and care of what we do as well, so that is
2 3 4 5	if there is looking at policy and procedure, we followed the policies and procedures that we have laid out and ACDT policies as well.  Q. Was it quite a heavy workload to review all of those to	2 3 4 5	provider perspective, that is not in line with our core values within Serco, about trust and pride and innovation and care of what we do as well, so that is totally against what we would do. So, ethically, it is
2 3 4 5 6	if there is — looking at policy and procedure, we followed the policies and procedures that we have laid out and ACDT policies as well.  Q. Was it quite a heavy workload to review all of those to that level?	2 3 4 5 6	provider perspective, that is not in line with our core values within Serco, about trust and pride and innovation and care of what we do as well, so that is totally against what we would do. So, ethically, it is not the right behaviour, so it's not something I would
2 3 4 5 6 7	if there is — looking at policy and procedure, we followed the policies and procedures that we have laid out and ACDT policies as well.  Q. Was it quite a heavy workload to review all of those to that level?  A. The resource we have now within the centre, so we have	2 3 4 5 6 7	provider perspective, that is not in line with our core values within Serco, about trust and pride and innovation and care of what we do as well, so that is totally against what we would do. So, ethically, it is not the right behaviour, so it's not something I would actually prescribe to or do in any way.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	if there is — looking at policy and procedure, we followed the policies and procedures that we have laid out and ACDT policies as well.  Q. Was it quite a heavy workload to review all of those to that level?  A. The resource we have now within the centre, so we have a full team monitoring that part of it, the safeguarding	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	provider perspective, that is not in line with our core values within Serco, about trust and pride and innovation and care of what we do as well, so that is totally against what we would do. So, ethically, it is not the right behaviour, so it's not something I would actually prescribe to or do in any way.  Q. Would you, nevertheless, agree that, despite the ethical
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	if there is — looking at policy and procedure, we followed the policies and procedures that we have laid out and ACDT policies as well.  Q. Was it quite a heavy workload to review all of those to that level?  A. The resource we have now within the centre, so we have a full team monitoring that part of it, the safeguarding team as well and support of the welfare team as well.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	provider perspective, that is not in line with our core values within Serco, about trust and pride and innovation and care of what we do as well, so that is totally against what we would do. So, ethically, it is not the right behaviour, so it's not something I would actually prescribe to or do in any way.  Q. Would you, nevertheless, agree that, despite the ethical implications, it is still necessary and important for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	if there is — looking at policy and procedure, we followed the policies and procedures that we have laid out and ACDT policies as well.  Q. Was it quite a heavy workload to review all of those to that level?  A. The resource we have now within the centre, so we have a full team monitoring that part of it, the safeguarding team as well and support of the welfare team as well.  So the Safer Custody Team would have investigated that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	provider perspective, that is not in line with our core values within Serco, about trust and pride and innovation and care of what we do as well, so that is totally against what we would do. So, ethically, it is not the right behaviour, so it's not something I would actually prescribe to or do in any way.  Q. Would you, nevertheless, agree that, despite the ethical implications, it is still necessary and important for bodies that don't have a financial interest to be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	if there is — looking at policy and procedure, we followed the policies and procedures that we have laid out and ACDT policies as well.  Q. Was it quite a heavy workload to review all of those to that level?  A. The resource we have now within the centre, so we have a full team monitoring that part of it, the safeguarding team as well and support of the welfare team as well. So the Safer Custody Team would have investigated that and looked at the circumstances and reported back on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	provider perspective, that is not in line with our core values within Serco, about trust and pride and innovation and care of what we do as well, so that is totally against what we would do. So, ethically, it is not the right behaviour, so it's not something I would actually prescribe to or do in any way.  Q. Would you, nevertheless, agree that, despite the ethical implications, it is still necessary and important for bodies that don't have a financial interest to be involved in the scrutiny of the contract? So, for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	if there is — looking at policy and procedure, we followed the policies and procedures that we have laid out and ACDT policies as well.  Q. Was it quite a heavy workload to review all of those to that level?  A. The resource we have now within the centre, so we have a full team monitoring that part of it, the safeguarding team as well and support of the welfare team as well. So the Safer Custody Team would have investigated that and looked at the circumstances and reported back on that, so these further resources are within the contract	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	provider perspective, that is not in line with our core values within Serco, about trust and pride and innovation and care of what we do as well, so that is totally against what we would do. So, ethically, it is not the right behaviour, so it's not something I would actually prescribe to or do in any way.  Q. Would you, nevertheless, agree that, despite the ethical implications, it is still necessary and important for bodies that don't have a financial interest to be involved in the scrutiny of the contract? So, for example, the Home Office, which isn't going to be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	if there is — looking at policy and procedure, we followed the policies and procedures that we have laid out and ACDT policies as well.  Q. Was it quite a heavy workload to review all of those to that level?  A. The resource we have now within the centre, so we have a full team monitoring that part of it, the safeguarding team as well and support of the welfare team as well. So the Safer Custody Team would have investigated that and looked at the circumstances and reported back on that, so these further resources are within the contract now to do that part of the work as well.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	provider perspective, that is not in line with our core values within Serco, about trust and pride and innovation and care of what we do as well, so that is totally against what we would do. So, ethically, it is not the right behaviour, so it's not something I would actually prescribe to or do in any way.  Q. Would you, nevertheless, agree that, despite the ethical implications, it is still necessary and important for bodies that don't have a financial interest to be involved in the scrutiny of the contract? So, for example, the Home Office, which isn't going to be financially impacted?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	if there is — looking at policy and procedure, we followed the policies and procedures that we have laid out and ACDT policies as well.  Q. Was it quite a heavy workload to review all of those to that level?  A. The resource we have now within the centre, so we have a full team monitoring that part of it, the safeguarding team as well and support of the welfare team as well.  So the Safer Custody Team would have investigated that and looked at the circumstances and reported back on that, so these further resources are within the contract now to do that part of the work as well.  Q. You have discussed the contractual compliance mechanism	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	provider perspective, that is not in line with our core values within Serco, about trust and pride and innovation and care of what we do as well, so that is totally against what we would do. So, ethically, it is not the right behaviour, so it's not something I would actually prescribe to or do in any way.  Q. Would you, nevertheless, agree that, despite the ethical implications, it is still necessary and important for bodies that don't have a financial interest to be involved in the scrutiny of the contract? So, for example, the Home Office, which isn't going to be financially impacted?  A. I mean, the Home Office monitor the contract. From my
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	if there is — looking at policy and procedure, we followed the policies and procedures that we have laid out and ACDT policies as well.  Q. Was it quite a heavy workload to review all of those to that level?  A. The resource we have now within the centre, so we have a full team monitoring that part of it, the safeguarding team as well and support of the welfare team as well. So the Safer Custody Team would have investigated that and looked at the circumstances and reported back on that, so these further resources are within the contract now to do that part of the work as well.  Q. You have discussed the contractual compliance mechanism there. Is it, the way that it is investigated, a set	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	provider perspective, that is not in line with our core values within Serco, about trust and pride and innovation and care of what we do as well, so that is totally against what we would do. So, ethically, it is not the right behaviour, so it's not something I would actually prescribe to or do in any way.  Q. Would you, nevertheless, agree that, despite the ethical implications, it is still necessary and important for bodies that don't have a financial interest to be involved in the scrutiny of the contract? So, for example, the Home Office, which isn't going to be financially impacted?  A. I mean, the Home Office monitor the contract. From my perspective, as I've just said, it is more about
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	if there is — looking at policy and procedure, we followed the policies and procedures that we have laid out and ACDT policies as well.  Q. Was it quite a heavy workload to review all of those to that level?  A. The resource we have now within the centre, so we have a full team monitoring that part of it, the safeguarding team as well and support of the welfare team as well. So the Safer Custody Team would have investigated that and looked at the circumstances and reported back on that, so these further resources are within the contract now to do that part of the work as well.  Q. You have discussed the contractual compliance mechanism there. Is it, the way that it is investigated, a set process or does it depend on the KPI? I think you have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	provider perspective, that is not in line with our core values within Serco, about trust and pride and innovation and care of what we do as well, so that is totally against what we would do. So, ethically, it is not the right behaviour, so it's not something I would actually prescribe to or do in any way.  Q. Would you, nevertheless, agree that, despite the ethical implications, it is still necessary and important for bodies that don't have a financial interest to be involved in the scrutiny of the contract? So, for example, the Home Office, which isn't going to be financially impacted?  A. I mean, the Home Office monitor the contract. From my perspective, as I've just said, it is more about openness and transparency with the Home Office too. If
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	if there is — looking at policy and procedure, we followed the policies and procedures that we have laid out and ACDT policies as well.  Q. Was it quite a heavy workload to review all of those to that level?  A. The resource we have now within the centre, so we have a full team monitoring that part of it, the safeguarding team as well and support of the welfare team as well. So the Safer Custody Team would have investigated that and looked at the circumstances and reported back on that, so these further resources are within the contract now to do that part of the work as well.  Q. You have discussed the contractual compliance mechanism there. Is it, the way that it is investigated, a set process or does it depend on the KPI? I think you have said that with injuries, for example, healthcare would	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	provider perspective, that is not in line with our core values within Serco, about trust and pride and innovation and care of what we do as well, so that is totally against what we would do. So, ethically, it is not the right behaviour, so it's not something I would actually prescribe to or do in any way.  Q. Would you, nevertheless, agree that, despite the ethical implications, it is still necessary and important for bodies that don't have a financial interest to be involved in the scrutiny of the contract? So, for example, the Home Office, which isn't going to be financially impacted?  A. I mean, the Home Office monitor the contract. From my perspective, as I've just said, it is more about openness and transparency with the Home Office too. If there are any failures, we will share those failures
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	if there is — looking at policy and procedure, we followed the policies and procedures that we have laid out and ACDT policies as well.  Q. Was it quite a heavy workload to review all of those to that level?  A. The resource we have now within the centre, so we have a full team monitoring that part of it, the safeguarding team as well and support of the welfare team as well. So the Safer Custody Team would have investigated that and looked at the circumstances and reported back on that, so these further resources are within the contract now to do that part of the work as well.  Q. You have discussed the contractual compliance mechanism there. Is it, the way that it is investigated, a set process or does it depend on the KPI? I think you have said that with injuries, for example, healthcare would be involved —	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	provider perspective, that is not in line with our core values within Serco, about trust and pride and innovation and care of what we do as well, so that is totally against what we would do. So, ethically, it is not the right behaviour, so it's not something I would actually prescribe to or do in any way.  Q. Would you, nevertheless, agree that, despite the ethical implications, it is still necessary and important for bodies that don't have a financial interest to be involved in the scrutiny of the contract? So, for example, the Home Office, which isn't going to be financially impacted?  A. I mean, the Home Office monitor the contract. From my perspective, as I've just said, it is more about openness and transparency with the Home Office too. If there are any failures, we will share those failures and, likewise, they will do the same and indicate any
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	if there is — looking at policy and procedure, we followed the policies and procedures that we have laid out and ACDT policies as well.  Q. Was it quite a heavy workload to review all of those to that level?  A. The resource we have now within the centre, so we have a full team monitoring that part of it, the safeguarding team as well and support of the welfare team as well.  So the Safer Custody Team would have investigated that and looked at the circumstances and reported back on that, so these further resources are within the contract now to do that part of the work as well.  Q. You have discussed the contractual compliance mechanism there. Is it, the way that it is investigated, a set process or does it depend on the KPI? I think you have said that with injuries, for example, healthcare would be involved —  A. Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	provider perspective, that is not in line with our core values within Serco, about trust and pride and innovation and care of what we do as well, so that is totally against what we would do. So, ethically, it is not the right behaviour, so it's not something I would actually prescribe to or do in any way.  Q. Would you, nevertheless, agree that, despite the ethical implications, it is still necessary and important for bodies that don't have a financial interest to be involved in the scrutiny of the contract? So, for example, the Home Office, which isn't going to be financially impacted?  A. I mean, the Home Office monitor the contract. From my perspective, as I've just said, it is more about openness and transparency with the Home Office too. If there are any failures, we will share those failures and, likewise, they will do the same and indicate any failures as well.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	if there is — looking at policy and procedure, we followed the policies and procedures that we have laid out and ACDT policies as well.  Q. Was it quite a heavy workload to review all of those to that level?  A. The resource we have now within the centre, so we have a full team monitoring that part of it, the safeguarding team as well and support of the welfare team as well.  So the Safer Custody Team would have investigated that and looked at the circumstances and reported back on that, so these further resources are within the contract now to do that part of the work as well.  Q. You have discussed the contractual compliance mechanism there. Is it, the way that it is investigated, a set process or does it depend on the KPI? I think you have said that with injuries, for example, healthcare would be involved —  A. Yes.  Q. — and obviously with use of force?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	provider perspective, that is not in line with our core values within Serco, about trust and pride and innovation and care of what we do as well, so that is totally against what we would do. So, ethically, it is not the right behaviour, so it's not something I would actually prescribe to or do in any way.  Q. Would you, nevertheless, agree that, despite the ethical implications, it is still necessary and important for bodies that don't have a financial interest to be involved in the scrutiny of the contract? So, for example, the Home Office, which isn't going to be financially impacted?  A. I mean, the Home Office monitor the contract. From my perspective, as I've just said, it is more about openness and transparency with the Home Office too. If there are any failures, we will share those failures and, likewise, they will do the same and indicate any failures as well.  Q. You will, of course, be aware that in 2019, Serco was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	if there is — looking at policy and procedure, we followed the policies and procedures that we have laid out and ACDT policies as well.  Q. Was it quite a heavy workload to review all of those to that level?  A. The resource we have now within the centre, so we have a full team monitoring that part of it, the safeguarding team as well and support of the welfare team as well.  So the Safer Custody Team would have investigated that and looked at the circumstances and reported back on that, so these further resources are within the contract now to do that part of the work as well.  Q. You have discussed the contractual compliance mechanism there. Is it, the way that it is investigated, a set process or does it depend on the KPI? I think you have said that with injuries, for example, healthcare would be involved —  A. Yes.  Q. — and obviously with use of force?  A. Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	provider perspective, that is not in line with our core values within Serco, about trust and pride and innovation and care of what we do as well, so that is totally against what we would do. So, ethically, it is not the right behaviour, so it's not something I would actually prescribe to or do in any way.  Q. Would you, nevertheless, agree that, despite the ethical implications, it is still necessary and important for bodies that don't have a financial interest to be involved in the scrutiny of the contract? So, for example, the Home Office, which isn't going to be financially impacted?  A. I mean, the Home Office monitor the contract. From my perspective, as I've just said, it is more about openness and transparency with the Home Office too. If there are any failures, we will share those failures and, likewise, they will do the same and indicate any failures as well.  Q. You will, of course, be aware that in 2019, Serco was fined over £19 million plus costs as part of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	if there is — looking at policy and procedure, we followed the policies and procedures that we have laid out and ACDT policies as well.  Q. Was it quite a heavy workload to review all of those to that level?  A. The resource we have now within the centre, so we have a full team monitoring that part of it, the safeguarding team as well and support of the welfare team as well. So the Safer Custody Team would have investigated that and looked at the circumstances and reported back on that, so these further resources are within the contract now to do that part of the work as well.  Q. You have discussed the contractual compliance mechanism there. Is it, the way that it is investigated, a set process or does it depend on the KPI? I think you have said that with injuries, for example, healthcare would be involved —  A. Yes.  Q. — and obviously with use of force?  A. Yes.  Q. So the KPI contract monitoring depends on the nature of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	provider perspective, that is not in line with our core values within Serco, about trust and pride and innovation and care of what we do as well, so that is totally against what we would do. So, ethically, it is not the right behaviour, so it's not something I would actually prescribe to or do in any way.  Q. Would you, nevertheless, agree that, despite the ethical implications, it is still necessary and important for bodies that don't have a financial interest to be involved in the scrutiny of the contract? So, for example, the Home Office, which isn't going to be financially impacted?  A. I mean, the Home Office monitor the contract. From my perspective, as I've just said, it is more about openness and transparency with the Home Office too. If there are any failures, we will share those failures and, likewise, they will do the same and indicate any failures as well.  Q. You will, of course, be aware that in 2019, Serco was fined over £19 million plus costs as part of a settlement with the Serious Fraud Office, one of its
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	if there is — looking at policy and procedure, we followed the policies and procedures that we have laid out and ACDT policies as well.  Q. Was it quite a heavy workload to review all of those to that level?  A. The resource we have now within the centre, so we have a full team monitoring that part of it, the safeguarding team as well and support of the welfare team as well.  So the Safer Custody Team would have investigated that and looked at the circumstances and reported back on that, so these further resources are within the contract now to do that part of the work as well.  Q. You have discussed the contractual compliance mechanism there. Is it, the way that it is investigated, a set process or does it depend on the KPI? I think you have said that with injuries, for example, healthcare would be involved —  A. Yes.  Q. — and obviously with use of force?  A. Yes.  Q. So the KPI contract monitoring depends on the nature of the —	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	provider perspective, that is not in line with our core values within Serco, about trust and pride and innovation and care of what we do as well, so that is totally against what we would do. So, ethically, it is not the right behaviour, so it's not something I would actually prescribe to or do in any way.  Q. Would you, nevertheless, agree that, despite the ethical implications, it is still necessary and important for bodies that don't have a financial interest to be involved in the scrutiny of the contract? So, for example, the Home Office, which isn't going to be financially impacted?  A. I mean, the Home Office monitor the contract. From my perspective, as I've just said, it is more about openness and transparency with the Home Office too. If there are any failures, we will share those failures and, likewise, they will do the same and indicate any failures as well.  Q. You will, of course, be aware that in 2019, Serco was fined over £19 million plus costs as part of a settlement with the Serious Fraud Office, one of its subsidiaries, having taken responsibility for three
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	if there is — looking at policy and procedure, we followed the policies and procedures that we have laid out and ACDT policies as well.  Q. Was it quite a heavy workload to review all of those to that level?  A. The resource we have now within the centre, so we have a full team monitoring that part of it, the safeguarding team as well and support of the welfare team as well.  So the Safer Custody Team would have investigated that and looked at the circumstances and reported back on that, so these further resources are within the contract now to do that part of the work as well.  Q. You have discussed the contractual compliance mechanism there. Is it, the way that it is investigated, a set process or does it depend on the KPI? I think you have said that with injuries, for example, healthcare would be involved —  A. Yes.  Q. — and obviously with use of force?  A. Yes.  Q. So the KPI contract monitoring depends on the nature of the —  A. Yes.—	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	provider perspective, that is not in line with our core values within Serco, about trust and pride and innovation and care of what we do as well, so that is totally against what we would do. So, ethically, it is not the right behaviour, so it's not something I would actually prescribe to or do in any way.  Q. Would you, nevertheless, agree that, despite the ethical implications, it is still necessary and important for bodies that don't have a financial interest to be involved in the scrutiny of the contract? So, for example, the Home Office, which isn't going to be financially impacted?  A. I mean, the Home Office monitor the contract. From my perspective, as I've just said, it is more about openness and transparency with the Home Office too. If there are any failures, we will share those failures and, likewise, they will do the same and indicate any failures as well.  Q. You will, of course, be aware that in 2019, Serco was fined over £19 million plus costs as part of a settlement with the Serious Fraud Office, one of its subsidiaries, having taken responsibility for three offences of fraud and two of false accounting between
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	if there is — looking at policy and procedure, we followed the policies and procedures that we have laid out and ACDT policies as well.  Q. Was it quite a heavy workload to review all of those to that level?  A. The resource we have now within the centre, so we have a full team monitoring that part of it, the safeguarding team as well and support of the welfare team as well.  So the Safer Custody Team would have investigated that and looked at the circumstances and reported back on that, so these further resources are within the contract now to do that part of the work as well.  Q. You have discussed the contractual compliance mechanism there. Is it, the way that it is investigated, a set process or does it depend on the KPI? I think you have said that with injuries, for example, healthcare would be involved —  A. Yes.  Q. — and obviously with use of force?  A. Yes.  Q. So the KPI contract monitoring depends on the nature of the —	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	provider perspective, that is not in line with our core values within Serco, about trust and pride and innovation and care of what we do as well, so that is totally against what we would do. So, ethically, it is not the right behaviour, so it's not something I would actually prescribe to or do in any way.  Q. Would you, nevertheless, agree that, despite the ethical implications, it is still necessary and important for bodies that don't have a financial interest to be involved in the scrutiny of the contract? So, for example, the Home Office, which isn't going to be financially impacted?  A. I mean, the Home Office monitor the contract. From my perspective, as I've just said, it is more about openness and transparency with the Home Office too. If there are any failures, we will share those failures and, likewise, they will do the same and indicate any failures as well.  Q. You will, of course, be aware that in 2019, Serco was fined over £19 million plus costs as part of a settlement with the Serious Fraud Office, one of its subsidiaries, having taken responsibility for three
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	if there is — looking at policy and procedure, we followed the policies and procedures that we have laid out and ACDT policies as well.  Q. Was it quite a heavy workload to review all of those to that level?  A. The resource we have now within the centre, so we have a full team monitoring that part of it, the safeguarding team as well and support of the welfare team as well.  So the Safer Custody Team would have investigated that and looked at the circumstances and reported back on that, so these further resources are within the contract now to do that part of the work as well.  Q. You have discussed the contractual compliance mechanism there. Is it, the way that it is investigated, a set process or does it depend on the KPI? I think you have said that with injuries, for example, healthcare would be involved —  A. Yes.  Q. — and obviously with use of force?  A. Yes.  Q. So the KPI contract monitoring depends on the nature of the —  A. Yes.—	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	provider perspective, that is not in line with our core values within Serco, about trust and pride and innovation and care of what we do as well, so that is totally against what we would do. So, ethically, it is not the right behaviour, so it's not something I would actually prescribe to or do in any way.  Q. Would you, nevertheless, agree that, despite the ethical implications, it is still necessary and important for bodies that don't have a financial interest to be involved in the scrutiny of the contract? So, for example, the Home Office, which isn't going to be financially impacted?  A. I mean, the Home Office monitor the contract. From my perspective, as I've just said, it is more about openness and transparency with the Home Office too. If there are any failures, we will share those failures and, likewise, they will do the same and indicate any failures as well.  Q. You will, of course, be aware that in 2019, Serco was fined over £19 million plus costs as part of a settlement with the Serious Fraud Office, one of its subsidiaries, having taken responsibility for three offences of fraud and two of false accounting between

1	electronic monitoring contracts with the	1	must require a proactive approach?
2	Ministry of Justice. Now, Serco has publicly said that	2	A. Yes, we do do a lot of self-reporting. I can give
3	company reform followed these events.	3	examples, you will see examples on some of the data we
4	A. That's correct.	4	have shared where somebody has not correctly locked
5	Q. Do we see that in this process?	5	a door, et cetera, somebody will report that. So it is
6	A. Yes, I mean, I am obviously aware of those issues that	6	all about culture. So we have a culture of reporting
7	were raised, that has been addressed by our CEO	7	failures and the purpose of that is to improve our
8	Rupert Soames and there's lots of statements been	8	operational efficiency and the operation and the service
9	submitted by our CEO on that matter.	9	we give.
10	They've had, since that point in time, a full root	10	Q. But the failure I mentioned there is a failure to report
11	and branch action across Serco on ethics, basically, so	11	a serious incident, so a serious incident has happened
12	ethically positive behaviour and there has also been	12	and someone has failed to report it?
13	a hell of a lot of training in respect of that, and	13	A. I would have to see the context of that report, if you
14	mandatory training, on a yearly basis, for all Serco	14	could put that on screen
15	staff and managers in respect of ethically responsible	15	Q. How do you go about it is just the data that you
16	behaviour as well.	16	provided us.
17	Q. Have you received that training?	17	A. Right, okay.
18	A. Yes, I do it on a yearly basis.	18	Q. But how do you go about, for example, ensuring that
19	Q. Before we move away from the contract, you mentioned one	19	people are reporting serious incidents?
20	of the KPIs, I think KPI25, which is failure to comply	20	A. Again, as I said, it is really about that ethical
21	with the requirements set out in the Detention Centre	21	behaviour, and we will ensure that people report
22	Rules, Detention Centre Operating Standards,	22	incidents. So everything within the centre, every
23	pre-departure, accommodation operating standards or any	23	incidence that occurs within the centre is reported on
24	of the DSOs so that in itself, regardless of whether it	24	a daily basis, and we will maintain that. And part of
25	falls within one of the others, is also a failure, isn't	25	the training of the managers and the SMTs is to ensure
23	talls within one of the others, is also a failure, isn't	23	the training of the managers and the 514118 is to clisure
	Page 29		Page 31
1	it	1	that we wone at all information. And these are
		1	that we report all information. And these are
2	A. Correct.	2	obviously, now, monitoring of the contract more, and by
	<ul><li>A. Correct.</li><li>Q and that is a minor failure?</li></ul>	2 3	obviously, now, monitoring of the contract more, and by the onsite team from the Home Office as well, they
2	<ul><li>A. Correct.</li><li>Q and that is a minor failure?</li><li>A. Yes.</li></ul>	2 3 4	obviously, now, monitoring of the contract more, and by the onsite team from the Home Office as well, they report everything and they will share any positive and
2 3 4 5	<ul><li>A. Correct.</li><li>Q and that is a minor failure?</li><li>A. Yes.</li><li>Q. And you say that is also designated and set by the</li></ul>	2 3 4 5	obviously, now, monitoring of the contract more, and by the onsite team from the Home Office as well, they report everything and they will share any positive and negative work as well, throughout the contract.
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q and that is a minor failure?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you say that is also designated and set by the Home Office as a failure and as a minor failure?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	obviously, now, monitoring of the contract more, and by the onsite team from the Home Office as well, they report everything and they will share any positive and negative work as well, throughout the contract.  Q. We were just on mitigation, you discuss this at page 4
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q and that is a minor failure?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you say that is also designated and set by the Home Office as a failure and as a minor failure?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	obviously, now, monitoring of the contract more, and by the onsite team from the Home Office as well, they report everything and they will share any positive and negative work as well, throughout the contract.  Q. We were just on mitigation, you discuss this at page 4 of your statement, paragraph 11, where you address the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q and that is a minor failure?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you say that is also designated and set by the Home Office as a failure and as a minor failure?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. We've mentioned this already in brief, but the next step</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	obviously, now, monitoring of the contract more, and by the onsite team from the Home Office as well, they report everything and they will share any positive and negative work as well, throughout the contract.  Q. We were just on mitigation, you discuss this at page 4 of your statement, paragraph 11, where you address the meaning of mitigation. And you say that it is based on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q and that is a minor failure?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you say that is also designated and set by the Home Office as a failure and as a minor failure?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. We've mentioned this already in brief, but the next step in the process is mitigation. So we have heard about</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	obviously, now, monitoring of the contract more, and by the onsite team from the Home Office as well, they report everything and they will share any positive and negative work as well, throughout the contract.  Q. We were just on mitigation, you discuss this at page 4 of your statement, paragraph 11, where you address the meaning of mitigation. And you say that it is based on two factors: extraordinary situations, outside of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q and that is a minor failure?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you say that is also designated and set by the Home Office as a failure and as a minor failure?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. We've mentioned this already in brief, but the next step in the process is mitigation. So we have heard about this from the G4S's contract's perspective. If</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	obviously, now, monitoring of the contract more, and by the onsite team from the Home Office as well, they report everything and they will share any positive and negative work as well, throughout the contract.  Q. We were just on mitigation, you discuss this at page 4 of your statement, paragraph 11, where you address the meaning of mitigation. And you say that it is based on two factors: extraordinary situations, outside of Serco's control that significantly impact the ability to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q and that is a minor failure?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you say that is also designated and set by the Home Office as a failure and as a minor failure?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. We've mentioned this already in brief, but the next step in the process is mitigation. So we have heard about this from the G4S's contract's perspective. If a failure is mitigated, it still gets reported but it</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	obviously, now, monitoring of the contract more, and by the onsite team from the Home Office as well, they report everything and they will share any positive and negative work as well, throughout the contract.  Q. We were just on mitigation, you discuss this at page 4 of your statement, paragraph 11, where you address the meaning of mitigation. And you say that it is based on two factors: extraordinary situations, outside of Serco's control that significantly impact the ability to deliver; or where Serco have introduced new systems or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q and that is a minor failure?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you say that is also designated and set by the Home Office as a failure and as a minor failure?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. We've mentioned this already in brief, but the next step in the process is mitigation. So we have heard about this from the G4S's contract's perspective. If a failure is mitigated, it still gets reported but it doesn't give rise to a financial penalty?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	obviously, now, monitoring of the contract more, and by the onsite team from the Home Office as well, they report everything and they will share any positive and negative work as well, throughout the contract.  Q. We were just on mitigation, you discuss this at page 4 of your statement, paragraph 11, where you address the meaning of mitigation. And you say that it is based on two factors: extraordinary situations, outside of Serco's control that significantly impact the ability to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q and that is a minor failure?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you say that is also designated and set by the Home Office as a failure and as a minor failure?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. We've mentioned this already in brief, but the next step in the process is mitigation. So we have heard about this from the G4S's contract's perspective. If a failure is mitigated, it still gets reported but it doesn't give rise to a financial penalty?</li> <li>A. Correct, yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	obviously, now, monitoring of the contract more, and by the onsite team from the Home Office as well, they report everything and they will share any positive and negative work as well, throughout the contract.  Q. We were just on mitigation, you discuss this at page 4 of your statement, paragraph 11, where you address the meaning of mitigation. And you say that it is based on two factors: extraordinary situations, outside of Serco's control that significantly impact the ability to deliver; or where Serco have introduced new systems or processes that will stop the failure from happening again.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q and that is a minor failure?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you say that is also designated and set by the Home Office as a failure and as a minor failure?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. We've mentioned this already in brief, but the next step in the process is mitigation. So we have heard about this from the G4S's contract's perspective. If a failure is mitigated, it still gets reported but it doesn't give rise to a financial penalty?</li> <li>A. Correct, yes.</li> <li>Q. You have provided a full log of KPIs to us, including</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	obviously, now, monitoring of the contract more, and by the onsite team from the Home Office as well, they report everything and they will share any positive and negative work as well, throughout the contract.  Q. We were just on mitigation, you discuss this at page 4 of your statement, paragraph 11, where you address the meaning of mitigation. And you say that it is based on two factors: extraordinary situations, outside of Serco's control that significantly impact the ability to deliver; or where Serco have introduced new systems or processes that will stop the failure from happening again.  A. Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q and that is a minor failure?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you say that is also designated and set by the Home Office as a failure and as a minor failure?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. We've mentioned this already in brief, but the next step in the process is mitigation. So we have heard about this from the G4S's contract's perspective. If a failure is mitigated, it still gets reported but it doesn't give rise to a financial penalty?</li> <li>A. Correct, yes.</li> <li>Q. You have provided a full log of KPIs to us, including the number of mitigations, and I don't need to bring</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	obviously, now, monitoring of the contract more, and by the onsite team from the Home Office as well, they report everything and they will share any positive and negative work as well, throughout the contract.  Q. We were just on mitigation, you discuss this at page 4 of your statement, paragraph 11, where you address the meaning of mitigation. And you say that it is based on two factors: extraordinary situations, outside of Serco's control that significantly impact the ability to deliver; or where Serco have introduced new systems or processes that will stop the failure from happening again.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q and that is a minor failure?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you say that is also designated and set by the Home Office as a failure and as a minor failure?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. We've mentioned this already in brief, but the next step in the process is mitigation. So we have heard about this from the G4S's contract's perspective. If a failure is mitigated, it still gets reported but it doesn't give rise to a financial penalty?</li> <li>A. Correct, yes.</li> <li>Q. You have provided a full log of KPIs to us, including the number of mitigations, and I don't need to bring them up now, but by way of an example, they show that,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	obviously, now, monitoring of the contract more, and by the onsite team from the Home Office as well, they report everything and they will share any positive and negative work as well, throughout the contract.  Q. We were just on mitigation, you discuss this at page 4 of your statement, paragraph 11, where you address the meaning of mitigation. And you say that it is based on two factors: extraordinary situations, outside of Serco's control that significantly impact the ability to deliver; or where Serco have introduced new systems or processes that will stop the failure from happening again.  A. Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q and that is a minor failure?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you say that is also designated and set by the Home Office as a failure and as a minor failure?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. We've mentioned this already in brief, but the next step in the process is mitigation. So we have heard about this from the G4S's contract's perspective. If a failure is mitigated, it still gets reported but it doesn't give rise to a financial penalty?</li> <li>A. Correct, yes.</li> <li>Q. You have provided a full log of KPIs to us, including the number of mitigations, and I don't need to bring them up now, but by way of an example, they show that, in September 2020, there were two failures to report</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	obviously, now, monitoring of the contract more, and by the onsite team from the Home Office as well, they report everything and they will share any positive and negative work as well, throughout the contract.  Q. We were just on mitigation, you discuss this at page 4 of your statement, paragraph 11, where you address the meaning of mitigation. And you say that it is based on two factors: extraordinary situations, outside of Serco's control that significantly impact the ability to deliver; or where Serco have introduced new systems or processes that will stop the failure from happening again.  A. Yes.  Q. That second part, does it mean, where there is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q and that is a minor failure?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you say that is also designated and set by the Home Office as a failure and as a minor failure?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. We've mentioned this already in brief, but the next step in the process is mitigation. So we have heard about this from the G4S's contract's perspective. If a failure is mitigated, it still gets reported but it doesn't give rise to a financial penalty?</li> <li>A. Correct, yes.</li> <li>Q. You have provided a full log of KPIs to us, including the number of mitigations, and I don't need to bring them up now, but by way of an example, they show that, in September 2020, there were two failures to report a serious incident recorded, in accordance with the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	obviously, now, monitoring of the contract more, and by the onsite team from the Home Office as well, they report everything and they will share any positive and negative work as well, throughout the contract.  Q. We were just on mitigation, you discuss this at page 4 of your statement, paragraph 11, where you address the meaning of mitigation. And you say that it is based on two factors: extraordinary situations, outside of Serco's control that significantly impact the ability to deliver; or where Serco have introduced new systems or processes that will stop the failure from happening again.  A. Yes.  Q. That second part, does it mean, where there is an actual, contractual failure, you can still get mitigation, ie incur no penalty if you can show that new systems have been introduced?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q and that is a minor failure?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you say that is also designated and set by the Home Office as a failure and as a minor failure?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. We've mentioned this already in brief, but the next step in the process is mitigation. So we have heard about this from the G4S's contract's perspective. If a failure is mitigated, it still gets reported but it doesn't give rise to a financial penalty?</li> <li>A. Correct, yes.</li> <li>Q. You have provided a full log of KPIs to us, including the number of mitigations, and I don't need to bring them up now, but by way of an example, they show that, in September 2020, there were two failures to report a serious incident recorded, in accordance with the policy; one was mitigated and one was not. So half</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	obviously, now, monitoring of the contract more, and by the onsite team from the Home Office as well, they report everything and they will share any positive and negative work as well, throughout the contract.  Q. We were just on mitigation, you discuss this at page 4 of your statement, paragraph 11, where you address the meaning of mitigation. And you say that it is based on two factors: extraordinary situations, outside of Serco's control that significantly impact the ability to deliver; or where Serco have introduced new systems or processes that will stop the failure from happening again.  A. Yes.  Q. That second part, does it mean, where there is an actual, contractual failure, you can still get mitigation, ie incur no penalty if you can show that new systems have been introduced?  A. That's correct, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q and that is a minor failure?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you say that is also designated and set by the Home Office as a failure and as a minor failure?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. We've mentioned this already in brief, but the next step in the process is mitigation. So we have heard about this from the G4S's contract's perspective. If a failure is mitigated, it still gets reported but it doesn't give rise to a financial penalty?</li> <li>A. Correct, yes.</li> <li>Q. You have provided a full log of KPIs to us, including the number of mitigations, and I don't need to bring them up now, but by way of an example, they show that, in September 2020, there were two failures to report a serious incident recorded, in accordance with the policy; one was mitigated and one was not. So half the penalty attaches to one and not to the other?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	obviously, now, monitoring of the contract more, and by the onsite team from the Home Office as well, they report everything and they will share any positive and negative work as well, throughout the contract.  Q. We were just on mitigation, you discuss this at page 4 of your statement, paragraph 11, where you address the meaning of mitigation. And you say that it is based on two factors: extraordinary situations, outside of Serco's control that significantly impact the ability to deliver; or where Serco have introduced new systems or processes that will stop the failure from happening again.  A. Yes.  Q. That second part, does it mean, where there is an actual, contractual failure, you can still get mitigation, ie incur no penalty if you can show that new systems have been introduced?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q and that is a minor failure?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you say that is also designated and set by the Home Office as a failure and as a minor failure?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. We've mentioned this already in brief, but the next step in the process is mitigation. So we have heard about this from the G4S's contract's perspective. If a failure is mitigated, it still gets reported but it doesn't give rise to a financial penalty?</li> <li>A. Correct, yes.</li> <li>Q. You have provided a full log of KPIs to us, including the number of mitigations, and I don't need to bring them up now, but by way of an example, they show that, in September 2020, there were two failures to report a serious incident recorded, in accordance with the policy; one was mitigated and one was not. So half the penalty attaches to one and not to the other?</li> <li>A. Correct, yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	obviously, now, monitoring of the contract more, and by the onsite team from the Home Office as well, they report everything and they will share any positive and negative work as well, throughout the contract.  Q. We were just on mitigation, you discuss this at page 4 of your statement, paragraph 11, where you address the meaning of mitigation. And you say that it is based on two factors: extraordinary situations, outside of Serco's control that significantly impact the ability to deliver; or where Serco have introduced new systems or processes that will stop the failure from happening again.  A. Yes.  Q. That second part, does it mean, where there is an actual, contractual failure, you can still get mitigation, ie incur no penalty if you can show that new systems have been introduced?  A. That's correct, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q and that is a minor failure?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you say that is also designated and set by the Home Office as a failure and as a minor failure?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. We've mentioned this already in brief, but the next step in the process is mitigation. So we have heard about this from the G4S's contract's perspective. If a failure is mitigated, it still gets reported but it doesn't give rise to a financial penalty?</li> <li>A. Correct, yes.</li> <li>Q. You have provided a full log of KPIs to us, including the number of mitigations, and I don't need to bring them up now, but by way of an example, they show that, in September 2020, there were two failures to report a serious incident recorded, in accordance with the policy; one was mitigated and one was not. So half the penalty attaches to one and not to the other?</li> <li>A. Correct, yes.</li> <li>Q. Just before we go on, that was, as I said, a failure to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	obviously, now, monitoring of the contract more, and by the onsite team from the Home Office as well, they report everything and they will share any positive and negative work as well, throughout the contract.  Q. We were just on mitigation, you discuss this at page 4 of your statement, paragraph 11, where you address the meaning of mitigation. And you say that it is based on two factors: extraordinary situations, outside of Serco's control that significantly impact the ability to deliver; or where Serco have introduced new systems or processes that will stop the failure from happening again.  A. Yes.  Q. That second part, does it mean, where there is an actual, contractual failure, you can still get mitigation, ie incur no penalty if you can show that new systems have been introduced?  A. That's correct, yes.  Q. Who came up with that, is it Serco or the Home Office?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q and that is a minor failure?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you say that is also designated and set by the Home Office as a failure and as a minor failure?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. We've mentioned this already in brief, but the next step in the process is mitigation. So we have heard about this from the G4S's contract's perspective. If a failure is mitigated, it still gets reported but it doesn't give rise to a financial penalty?</li> <li>A. Correct, yes.</li> <li>Q. You have provided a full log of KPIs to us, including the number of mitigations, and I don't need to bring them up now, but by way of an example, they show that, in September 2020, there were two failures to report a serious incident recorded, in accordance with the policy; one was mitigated and one was not. So half the penalty attaches to one and not to the other?</li> <li>A. Correct, yes.</li> <li>Q. Just before we go on, that was, as I said, a failure to report a serious incident. People don't report</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	obviously, now, monitoring of the contract more, and by the onsite team from the Home Office as well, they report everything and they will share any positive and negative work as well, throughout the contract.  Q. We were just on mitigation, you discuss this at page 4 of your statement, paragraph 11, where you address the meaning of mitigation. And you say that it is based on two factors: extraordinary situations, outside of Serco's control that significantly impact the ability to deliver; or where Serco have introduced new systems or processes that will stop the failure from happening again.  A. Yes.  Q. That second part, does it mean, where there is an actual, contractual failure, you can still get mitigation, ie incur no penalty if you can show that new systems have been introduced?  A. That's correct, yes.  Q. Who came up with that, is it Serco or the Home Office?  A. That is in agreement with the Home Office, so any system
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q and that is a minor failure?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you say that is also designated and set by the Home Office as a failure and as a minor failure?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. We've mentioned this already in brief, but the next step in the process is mitigation. So we have heard about this from the G4S's contract's perspective. If a failure is mitigated, it still gets reported but it doesn't give rise to a financial penalty?</li> <li>A. Correct, yes.</li> <li>Q. You have provided a full log of KPIs to us, including the number of mitigations, and I don't need to bring them up now, but by way of an example, they show that, in September 2020, there were two failures to report a serious incident recorded, in accordance with the policy; one was mitigated and one was not. So half the penalty attaches to one and not to the other?</li> <li>A. Correct, yes.</li> <li>Q. Just before we go on, that was, as I said, a failure to report a serious incident. People don't report a failure to report necessarily, so how do you go about</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	obviously, now, monitoring of the contract more, and by the onsite team from the Home Office as well, they report everything and they will share any positive and negative work as well, throughout the contract.  Q. We were just on mitigation, you discuss this at page 4 of your statement, paragraph 11, where you address the meaning of mitigation. And you say that it is based on two factors: extraordinary situations, outside of Serco's control that significantly impact the ability to deliver; or where Serco have introduced new systems or processes that will stop the failure from happening again.  A. Yes.  Q. That second part, does it mean, where there is an actual, contractual failure, you can still get mitigation, ie incur no penalty if you can show that new systems have been introduced?  A. That's correct, yes.  Q. Who came up with that, is it Serco or the Home Office?  A. That is in agreement with the Home Office, so any system that we feel — if we can improve that, we will do it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q and that is a minor failure?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you say that is also designated and set by the Home Office as a failure and as a minor failure?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. We've mentioned this already in brief, but the next step in the process is mitigation. So we have heard about this from the G4S's contract's perspective. If a failure is mitigated, it still gets reported but it doesn't give rise to a financial penalty?</li> <li>A. Correct, yes.</li> <li>Q. You have provided a full log of KPIs to us, including the number of mitigations, and I don't need to bring them up now, but by way of an example, they show that, in September 2020, there were two failures to report a serious incident recorded, in accordance with the policy; one was mitigated and one was not. So half the penalty attaches to one and not to the other?</li> <li>A. Correct, yes.</li> <li>Q. Just before we go on, that was, as I said, a failure to report a serious incident. People don't report</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	obviously, now, monitoring of the contract more, and by the onsite team from the Home Office as well, they report everything and they will share any positive and negative work as well, throughout the contract.  Q. We were just on mitigation, you discuss this at page 4 of your statement, paragraph 11, where you address the meaning of mitigation. And you say that it is based on two factors: extraordinary situations, outside of Serco's control that significantly impact the ability to deliver; or where Serco have introduced new systems or processes that will stop the failure from happening again.  A. Yes.  Q. That second part, does it mean, where there is an actual, contractual failure, you can still get mitigation, ie incur no penalty if you can show that new systems have been introduced?  A. That's correct, yes.  Q. Who came up with that, is it Serco or the Home Office?  A. That is in agreement with the Home Office, so any system that we feel — if we can improve that, we will do it. A root cause analysis on that particular part of it is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q and that is a minor failure?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you say that is also designated and set by the Home Office as a failure and as a minor failure?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. We've mentioned this already in brief, but the next step in the process is mitigation. So we have heard about this from the G4S's contract's perspective. If a failure is mitigated, it still gets reported but it doesn't give rise to a financial penalty?</li> <li>A. Correct, yes.</li> <li>Q. You have provided a full log of KPIs to us, including the number of mitigations, and I don't need to bring them up now, but by way of an example, they show that, in September 2020, there were two failures to report a serious incident recorded, in accordance with the policy; one was mitigated and one was not. So half—the penalty attaches to one and not to the other?</li> <li>A. Correct, yes.</li> <li>Q. Just before we go on, that was, as I said, a failure to report a serious incident. People don't report a failure to report necessarily, so how do you go about finding out that there has been a failure like that? It</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	obviously, now, monitoring of the contract more, and by the onsite team from the Home Office as well, they report everything and they will share any positive and negative work as well, throughout the contract.  Q. We were just on mitigation, you discuss this at page 4 of your statement, paragraph 11, where you address the meaning of mitigation. And you say that it is based on two factors: extraordinary situations, outside of Serco's control that significantly impact the ability to deliver; or where Serco have introduced new systems or processes that will stop the failure from happening again.  A. Yes.  Q. That second part, does it mean, where there is an actual, contractual failure, you can still get mitigation, ie incur no penalty if you can show that new systems have been introduced?  A. That's correct, yes.  Q. Who came up with that, is it Serco or the Home Office?  A. That is in agreement with the Home Office, so any system that we feel — if we can improve that, we will do it.  A root cause analysis on that particular part of it is we will improve the system or the operation or procedure and we can then mitigate that as a failure if we have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q and that is a minor failure?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you say that is also designated and set by the Home Office as a failure and as a minor failure?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. We've mentioned this already in brief, but the next step in the process is mitigation. So we have heard about this from the G4S's contract's perspective. If a failure is mitigated, it still gets reported but it doesn't give rise to a financial penalty?</li> <li>A. Correct, yes.</li> <li>Q. You have provided a full log of KPIs to us, including the number of mitigations, and I don't need to bring them up now, but by way of an example, they show that, in September 2020, there were two failures to report a serious incident recorded, in accordance with the policy; one was mitigated and one was not. So half the penalty attaches to one and not to the other?</li> <li>A. Correct, yes.</li> <li>Q. Just before we go on, that was, as I said, a failure to report a serious incident. People don't report a failure to report necessarily, so how do you go about</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	obviously, now, monitoring of the contract more, and by the onsite team from the Home Office as well, they report everything and they will share any positive and negative work as well, throughout the contract.  Q. We were just on mitigation, you discuss this at page 4 of your statement, paragraph 11, where you address the meaning of mitigation. And you say that it is based on two factors: extraordinary situations, outside of Serco's control that significantly impact the ability to deliver; or where Serco have introduced new systems or processes that will stop the failure from happening again.  A. Yes.  Q. That second part, does it mean, where there is an actual, contractual failure, you can still get mitigation, ie incur no penalty if you can show that new systems have been introduced?  A. That's correct, yes.  Q. Who came up with that, is it Serco or the Home Office?  A. That is in agreement with the Home Office, so any system that we feel — if we can improve that, we will do it.  A root cause analysis on that particular part of it is we will improve the system or the operation or procedure

1	improved that so there is no reoccurrence of that	1	A. July 2021.
2	failure.	2	Q. And what additional services did the Home Office request
3	Q. So it means it's no different, then, in outcome between	3	Serco to provide in July 2021?
4	avoiding failures in the first place and failing but	4	A. We were requested to offer support and staffing in to
5	changing something afterwards, in terms of financial	5	immigration asylum hotels, which were located near to
6	penalty?	6	Gatwick area.
7	A. Yes.	7	Q. I see. So along with continuing to manage Brook House,
8	Q. How is that of benefit to the compliance with the	8	Tinsley House and pre-departure accommodation, you were
9	contract? Doesn't it remove incentive to avoid failures	9	working outside of that in those three areas?
10	and making errors?	10	A. Yes.
11	A. No, it — the purpose of that is to improve the delivery	11	Q. And offering support and staffing, so DCOs, DCMs?
12	of the contract and for the customer and for the	12	A. Correct, yes.
13	Home Office.	13	Q. Why did that mean that there would be any change to the
14	Q. But contractual failings should encourage you to change	14	KPI monitoring?
15	your processes anyway, shouldn't they, with or without	15	A. Because we had moved staff out of the centre to to
16	going back and reducing the previous failure?	16	support the staffing numbers at the asylum hotel
17	A. That is in agreement with the Home Office; the	17	accommodation. We could not meet the mandated numbers
18	Home Office would agree that. It is not like every case	18	on the model, for that reason, and that is why relief
19	it is agreed. So depending on the level of failure and	19	was given by the Home Office, at their request, to do
20	the amount of failure in a particular KPI or process,	20	this. It is not something we requested initially, but
21	where we can show we can improve that process, and we	21	we supported we were flexible in our approach to
22	will do that, they will accept mitigation.	22	support the numbers coming over the channel, et cetera,
23	Q. You say, at 13 and 14 of your statement, that whether or	23	and things like that, and into the asylum accommodation.
24	not mitigation is accepted, you always investigate the	24	And it was local to Gatwick.
25	issue and implement a plan to improve?	25	Q. When you were asked to do that by the Home Office, who
23	isode and implement a plan to improve.	23	Q. When you were asked to do that by the Home Office, who
	Page 33		Page 35
1	A. Yes, yes.	1	was it who suggested that that be also met with
2	Q. And lastly, on the general contract, can we have on the	2	a derogation from the KPI? Did you suggest it and the
3	screen, please, <ser000451>. This is your statement as</ser000451>	3	Home Office accepted it?
4	well, so you have it in front of you. It is page 7.	4	A. It was a joint discussion that we would request relief
5	If we turn to page 7 and paragraph 23, you say	5	because we obviously couldn't meet that requirement.
6	here sorry, page 7, paragraph 23, yes. At the top,	6	O Treat to be also about the acquirements that were most
7			Q. Just to be clear about the requirements that were part
7	you say here that from May 2020 to August 2020:	7	of that negotiation, as you say, in this paragraph, that
8	you say here that from May 2020 to August 2020: "There was a three-month KPI relief period."	7 8	•
			of that negotiation, as you say, in this paragraph, that
8	"There was a three-month KPI relief period."	8	of that negotiation, as you say, in this paragraph, that involved KPI12, which relates to the number of DCOs and
8 9	"There was a three-month KPI relief period." So no financial penalties, that is just when you	8 9	of that negotiation, as you say, in this paragraph, that involved KPI12, which relates to the number of DCOs and DCMs, part of the agreement?
8 9 10	"There was a three-month KPI relief period." So no financial penalties, that is just when you first had the contract, when you first joined?	8 9 10	of that negotiation, as you say, in this paragraph, that involved KPI12, which relates to the number of DCOs and DCMs, part of the agreement?  A. Yes.
8 9 10 11	"There was a three-month KPI relief period."  So no financial penalties, that is just when you first had the contract, when you first joined?  A. Yes, that was when we took over the contract, so from	8 9 10 11	of that negotiation, as you say, in this paragraph, that involved KPI12, which relates to the number of DCOs and DCMs, part of the agreement?  A. Yes.  Q. 13, required staffing levels; 14, recruitment processes;
8 9 10 11 12	"There was a three-month KPI relief period."  So no financial penalties, that is just when you first had the contract, when you first joined?  A. Yes, that was when we took over the contract, so from a Serco perspective, we took over a new contract and	8 9 10 11 12	of that negotiation, as you say, in this paragraph, that involved KPI12, which relates to the number of DCOs and DCMs, part of the agreement?  A. Yes.  Q. 13, required staffing levels; 14, recruitment processes; 15, staff culture and conduct; and 16, ensuring staff's
8 9 10 11 12 13	"There was a three-month KPI relief period."  So no financial penalties, that is just when you first had the contract, when you first joined?  A. Yes, that was when we took over the contract, so from a Serco perspective, we took over a new contract and took over new staff from G4S to Serco, so there was	8 9 10 11 12 13	of that negotiation, as you say, in this paragraph, that involved KPI12, which relates to the number of DCOs and DCMs, part of the agreement?  A. Yes.  Q. 13, required staffing levels; 14, recruitment processes; 15, staff culture and conduct; and 16, ensuring staff's training, induction and mentoring.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14	"There was a three-month KPI relief period."  So no financial penalties, that is just when you first had the contract, when you first joined?  A. Yes, that was when we took over the contract, so from a Serco perspective, we took over a new contract and took over new staff from G4S to Serco, so there was a certain bedding-in period where new staff had to	8 9 10 11 12 13 14	of that negotiation, as you say, in this paragraph, that involved KPI12, which relates to the number of DCOs and DCMs, part of the agreement?  A. Yes.  Q. 13, required staffing levels; 14, recruitment processes; 15, staff culture and conduct; and 16, ensuring staff's training, induction and mentoring.  Why not, instead of just derogating from all of
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	"There was a three-month KPI relief period." So no financial penalties, that is just when you first had the contract, when you first joined?  A. Yes, that was when we took over the contract, so from a Serco perspective, we took over a new contract and took over new staff from G4S to Serco, so there was a certain bedding-in period where new staff had to understand new policies, procedures, et cetera, and that	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	of that negotiation, as you say, in this paragraph, that involved KPI12, which relates to the number of DCOs and DCMs, part of the agreement?  A. Yes.  Q. 13, required staffing levels; 14, recruitment processes; 15, staff culture and conduct; and 16, ensuring staff's training, induction and mentoring.  Why not, instead of just derogating from all of these requirements, adjust the contract to account for
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	"There was a three-month KPI relief period." So no financial penalties, that is just when you first had the contract, when you first joined?  A. Yes, that was when we took over the contract, so from a Serco perspective, we took over a new contract and took over new staff from G4S to Serco, so there was a certain bedding-in period where new staff had to understand new policies, procedures, et cetera, and that is why there was a three-month period of accepting	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	of that negotiation, as you say, in this paragraph, that involved KPI12, which relates to the number of DCOs and DCMs, part of the agreement?  A. Yes.  Q. 13, required staffing levels; 14, recruitment processes; 15, staff culture and conduct; and 16, ensuring staff's training, induction and mentoring.  Why not, instead of just derogating from all of these requirements, adjust the contract to account for the need to provide the additional services?
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	"There was a three-month KPI relief period."  So no financial penalties, that is just when you first had the contract, when you first joined?  A. Yes, that was when we took over the contract, so from a Serco perspective, we took over a new contract and took over new staff from G4S to Serco, so there was a certain bedding-in period where new staff had to understand new policies, procedures, et cetera, and that is why there was a three-month period of accepting mitigation and no penalties applying.	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	of that negotiation, as you say, in this paragraph, that involved KPI12, which relates to the number of DCOs and DCMs, part of the agreement?  A. Yes.  Q. 13, required staffing levels; 14, recruitment processes; 15, staff culture and conduct; and 16, ensuring staff's training, induction and mentoring.  Why not, instead of just derogating from all of these requirements, adjust the contract to account for the need to provide the additional services?  A. Because this were a temporary arrangement and that is
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	"There was a three-month KPI relief period."  So no financial penalties, that is just when you first had the contract, when you first joined?  A. Yes, that was when we took over the contract, so from a Serco perspective, we took over a new contract and took over new staff from G4S to Serco, so there was a certain bedding-in period where new staff had to understand new policies, procedures, et cetera, and that is why there was a three-month period of accepting mitigation and no penalties applying.  Q. Did you still have to report the failures?	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	of that negotiation, as you say, in this paragraph, that involved KPI12, which relates to the number of DCOs and DCMs, part of the agreement?  A. Yes.  Q. 13, required staffing levels; 14, recruitment processes; 15, staff culture and conduct; and 16, ensuring staff's training, induction and mentoring.  Why not, instead of just derogating from all of these requirements, adjust the contract to account for the need to provide the additional services?  A. Because this were a temporary arrangement and that is the only reason it were a temporary and this were
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	"There was a three-month KPI relief period." So no financial penalties, that is just when you first had the contract, when you first joined?  A. Yes, that was when we took over the contract, so from a Serco perspective, we took over a new contract and took over new staff from G4S to Serco, so there was a certain bedding-in period where new staff had to understand new policies, procedures, et cetera, and that is why there was a three-month period of accepting mitigation and no penalties applying.  Q. Did you still have to report the failures?  A. Everything was still reported, yes. There was	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	of that negotiation, as you say, in this paragraph, that involved KPI12, which relates to the number of DCOs and DCMs, part of the agreement?  A. Yes.  Q. 13, required staffing levels; 14, recruitment processes; 15, staff culture and conduct; and 16, ensuring staff's training, induction and mentoring.  Why not, instead of just derogating from all of these requirements, adjust the contract to account for the need to provide the additional services?  A. Because this were a temporary arrangement and that is the only reason it were a temporary and this were covered by an agreement shared by the Home Office and
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	"There was a three-month KPI relief period." So no financial penalties, that is just when you first had the contract, when you first joined?  A. Yes, that was when we took over the contract, so from a Serco perspective, we took over a new contract and took over new staff from G4S to Serco, so there was a certain bedding-in period where new staff had to understand new policies, procedures, et cetera, and that is why there was a three-month period of accepting mitigation and no penalties applying.  Q. Did you still have to report the failures?  A. Everything was still reported, yes. There was 100 per cent mitigation, yes.	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	of that negotiation, as you say, in this paragraph, that involved KPI12, which relates to the number of DCOs and DCMs, part of the agreement?  A. Yes.  Q. 13, required staffing levels; 14, recruitment processes; 15, staff culture and conduct; and 16, ensuring staff's training, induction and mentoring.  Why not, instead of just derogating from all of these requirements, adjust the contract to account for the need to provide the additional services?  A. Because this were a temporary arrangement and that is the only reason it were a temporary and this were covered by an agreement shared by the Home Office and a temporary then what they call a contract amendment
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	"There was a three-month KPI relief period." So no financial penalties, that is just when you first had the contract, when you first joined?  A. Yes, that was when we took over the contract, so from a Serco perspective, we took over a new contract and took over new staff from G4S to Serco, so there was a certain bedding-in period where new staff had to understand new policies, procedures, et cetera, and that is why there was a three-month period of accepting mitigation and no penalties applying.  Q. Did you still have to report the failures?  A. Everything was still reported, yes. There was 100 per cent mitigation, yes.  Q. I see. And then you say, still at 23, sort of halfway	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	of that negotiation, as you say, in this paragraph, that involved KPI12, which relates to the number of DCOs and DCMs, part of the agreement?  A. Yes.  Q. 13, required staffing levels; 14, recruitment processes; 15, staff culture and conduct; and 16, ensuring staff's training, induction and mentoring.  Why not, instead of just derogating from all of these requirements, adjust the contract to account for the need to provide the additional services?  A. Because this were a temporary arrangement and that is the only reason it were a temporary and this were covered by an agreement shared by the Home Office and a temporary then what they call a contract amendment notice, which is 031 I think it has been shared as
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	"There was a three-month KPI relief period." So no financial penalties, that is just when you first had the contract, when you first joined?  A. Yes, that was when we took over the contract, so from a Serco perspective, we took over a new contract and took over new staff from G4S to Serco, so there was a certain bedding-in period where new staff had to understand new policies, procedures, et cetera, and that is why there was a three-month period of accepting mitigation and no penalties applying.  Q. Did you still have to report the failures?  A. Everything was still reported, yes. There was 100 per cent mitigation, yes.  Q. I see. And then you say, still at 23, sort of halfway down the paragraph:	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	of that negotiation, as you say, in this paragraph, that involved KPI12, which relates to the number of DCOs and DCMs, part of the agreement?  A. Yes.  Q. 13, required staffing levels; 14, recruitment processes; 15, staff culture and conduct; and 16, ensuring staff's training, induction and mentoring.  Why not, instead of just derogating from all of these requirements, adjust the contract to account for the need to provide the additional services?  A. Because this were a temporary arrangement and that is the only reason it were a temporary and this were covered by an agreement shared by the Home Office and a temporary then what they call a contract amendment notice, which is 031 I think it has been shared as well. We agreed that and that was signed up by us to
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	"There was a three-month KPI relief period." So no financial penalties, that is just when you first had the contract, when you first joined?  A. Yes, that was when we took over the contract, so from a Serco perspective, we took over a new contract and took over new staff from G4S to Serco, so there was a certain bedding-in period where new staff had to understand new policies, procedures, et cetera, and that is why there was a three-month period of accepting mitigation and no penalties applying.  Q. Did you still have to report the failures?  A. Everything was still reported, yes. There was 100 per cent mitigation, yes.  Q. I see. And then you say, still at 23, sort of halfway down the paragraph:  "From July 2021, the Home Office requested Serco to	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	of that negotiation, as you say, in this paragraph, that involved KPI12, which relates to the number of DCOs and DCMs, part of the agreement?  A. Yes.  Q. 13, required staffing levels; 14, recruitment processes; 15, staff culture and conduct; and 16, ensuring staff's training, induction and mentoring.  Why not, instead of just derogating from all of these requirements, adjust the contract to account for the need to provide the additional services?  A. Because this were a temporary arrangement and that is the only reason it were a temporary and this were covered by an agreement shared by the Home Office and a temporary then what they call a contract amendment notice, which is 031 I think it has been shared as well. We agreed that and that was signed up by us to agree this temporary arrangement. This arrangement was
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	"There was a three-month KPI relief period." So no financial penalties, that is just when you first had the contract, when you first joined?  A. Yes, that was when we took over the contract, so from a Serco perspective, we took over a new contract and took over new staff from G4S to Serco, so there was a certain bedding-in period where new staff had to understand new policies, procedures, et cetera, and that is why there was a three-month period of accepting mitigation and no penalties applying.  Q. Did you still have to report the failures?  A. Everything was still reported, yes. There was 100 per cent mitigation, yes.  Q. I see. And then you say, still at 23, sort of halfway down the paragraph:  "From July 2021, the Home Office requested Serco to provide additional services."	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	of that negotiation, as you say, in this paragraph, that involved KPI12, which relates to the number of DCOs and DCMs, part of the agreement?  A. Yes.  Q. 13, required staffing levels; 14, recruitment processes; 15, staff culture and conduct; and 16, ensuring staff's training, induction and mentoring.  Why not, instead of just derogating from all of these requirements, adjust the contract to account for the need to provide the additional services?  A. Because this were a temporary arrangement and that is the only reason it were a temporary and this were covered by an agreement shared by the Home Office and a temporary then what they call a contract amendment notice, which is 031 I think it has been shared as well. We agreed that and that was signed up by us to agree this temporary arrangement. This arrangement was only in place while we were still operating the asylum

1	Q. When did you stop operating the asylum hotels?	1	Q or per
2	A. It is still continuing. It has been extended currently	2	A. In total. In total, yes, with a obviously, there'll
3	until the end of June 2021.	3	be a relief factor on, on a rota'd basis.
4	Q. We see there, when you wrote your statement, it was to	4	Q. We will shortly come to a derogation by the Home Office
5	finish "yesterday"?	5	in respect of use of force training during Covid to
6	A. Correct. It has been extended since then.	6	allow those who are out of ticket to continue to use
7	Q. Till when, sorry, June?	7	force.
8	A. Currently, until the end of June.	8	Have there been, apart from that and the derogating
9	Q. And the result of that is that none of these KPIs can	9	that you set out here, any other derogations agreed
10	give rise to a penalty?	10	during the time of the contract?
11	A. Correct, yes.	11	A. Not to my knowledge, no.
12	Q. This has now been it will be about a year, nearly	12	Q. So the result then is, from May to August 2020, there
13	a year, July 2021 until the end of June?	13	were no KPI penalties at all when you took over and,
14	A. Yes.	14	from July 2021 to the issue in the end of June this
15	Q. You say it is temporary, but it is quite a fundamental	15	year, unless it is extended again, no penalties could
16	derogation from some key provisions of your contract,	16	have applied to any of these areas which include
17	isn't it?	17	culture, training and staffing requirements.
18	A. Yes.	18	Staying, then, with the topic of staffing and staff
19	Q. Do you think it would be better to have an amendment to	19	training that can be taken down now, thank you
20	the KPIs, rather than just derogating from them	20	I asked you, when we were discussing the bid, about the
21	entirely?	21	contractual operational staffing levels?
22	A. I think part of the issue here, the length of the	22	A. Yes.
23	support has gone a bit longer than anticipated, from	23	Q. You helped me with the levels of staff who should be at
24	an Home Office perspective, while they decide on the	24	the centre at particular times. So you said 10 DCMs and
25	next strategy on well, accommodation wise. So	25	75 DCOs on weekdays, for example?
	90		
	Page 37		Page 39
1	a number of factors have influenced this, I suppose,	1	A. Yes.
		_	71. 103.
2	that's happened in society as well.	2	Q. And you also helped me with the number of employed staff
2 3			
	that's happened in society as well.	2	Q. And you also helped me with the number of employed staff
3	that's happened in society as well.  Q. When were you made aware that it would be until the end	2 3	Q. And you also helped me with the number of employed staff you should have overall.
3	that's happened in society as well.  Q. When were you made aware that it would be until the end of June, approximately?	2 3 4	<ul><li>Q. And you also helped me with the number of employed staff you should have overall.</li><li>Now, this is under the contract, but can you help</li></ul>
3 4 5	that's happened in society as well.  Q. When were you made aware that it would be until the end of June, approximately?  A. Approximately, before the I think probably	2 3 4 5	<ul><li>Q. And you also helped me with the number of employed staff you should have overall.</li><li>Now, this is under the contract, but can you help with the situation as it is now at the centre. For</li></ul>
3 4 5 6	that's happened in society as well.  Q. When were you made aware that it would be until the end of June, approximately?  A. Approximately, before the — I think probably early March.	2 3 4 5 6	Q. And you also helped me with the number of employed staff you should have overall.  Now, this is under the contract, but can you help with the situation as it is now at the centre. For example, how many members of staff per residential wing
3 4 5 6 7	that's happened in society as well.  Q. When were you made aware that it would be until the end of June, approximately?  A. Approximately, before the I think probably early March.  Q. If you can help us just give us rough figures, if you	2 3 4 5 6 7	Q. And you also helped me with the number of employed staff you should have overall.  Now, this is under the contract, but can you help with the situation as it is now at the centre. For example, how many members of staff per residential wing are there during the daytime now?
3 4 5 6 7 8	that's happened in society as well.  Q. When were you made aware that it would be until the end of June, approximately?  A. Approximately, before the I think probably early March.  Q. If you can help us just give us rough figures, if you can't, but what sort of percentage of your workforce is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. And you also helped me with the number of employed staff you should have overall.</li> <li>Now, this is under the contract, but can you help with the situation as it is now at the centre. For example, how many members of staff per residential wing are there during the daytime now?</li> <li>A. Per wing? Mandated-wise, there would be three DCOs as</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	that's happened in society as well.  Q. When were you made aware that it would be until the end of June, approximately?  A. Approximately, before the I think probably early March.  Q. If you can help us just give us rough figures, if you can't, but what sort of percentage of your workforce is used to support that service?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. And you also helped me with the number of employed staff you should have overall.</li> <li>Now, this is under the contract, but can you help with the situation as it is now at the centre. For example, how many members of staff per residential wing are there during the daytime now?</li> <li>A. Per wing? Mandated-wise, there would be three DCOs as a minimum and one DOM as a minimum.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	that's happened in society as well.  Q. When were you made aware that it would be until the end of June, approximately?  A. Approximately, before the I think probably early March.  Q. If you can help us just give us rough figures, if you can't, but what sort of percentage of your workforce is used to support that service?  A. We currently manage one hotel currently now. There was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. And you also helped me with the number of employed staff you should have overall.</li> <li>Now, this is under the contract, but can you help with the situation as it is now at the centre. For example, how many members of staff per residential wing are there during the daytime now?</li> <li>A. Per wing? Mandated-wise, there would be three DCOs as a minimum and one DOM as a minimum.</li> <li>Q. And during the night state, how many operational staff</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	that's happened in society as well.  Q. When were you made aware that it would be until the end of June, approximately?  A. Approximately, before the I think probably early March.  Q. If you can help us just give us rough figures, if you can't, but what sort of percentage of your workforce is used to support that service?  A. We currently manage one hotel currently now. There was two hotels, initially. One hotel which is situated near	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q. And you also helped me with the number of employed staff you should have overall.</li> <li>Now, this is under the contract, but can you help with the situation as it is now at the centre. For example, how many members of staff per residential wing are there during the daytime now?</li> <li>A. Per wing? Mandated-wise, there would be three DCOs as a minimum and one DOM as a minimum.</li> <li>Q. And during the night state, how many operational staff are in site in total?</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	that's happened in society as well.  Q. When were you made aware that it would be until the end of June, approximately?  A. Approximately, before the I think probably early March.  Q. If you can help us just give us rough figures, if you can't, but what sort of percentage of your workforce is used to support that service?  A. We currently manage one hotel currently now. There was two hotels, initially. One hotel which is situated near Gatwick and, usually, we have supporting that, we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. And you also helped me with the number of employed staff you should have overall. Now, this is under the contract, but can you help with the situation as it is now at the centre. For example, how many members of staff per residential wing are there during the daytime now? </li> <li>A. Per wing? Mandated-wise, there would be three DCOs as a minimum and one DOM as a minimum.</li> <li>Q. And during the night state, how many operational staff are in site in total?</li> <li>A. As per I believe it is 18 in total and two</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	that's happened in society as well.  Q. When were you made aware that it would be until the end of June, approximately?  A. Approximately, before the — I think probably early March.  Q. If you can help us — just give us rough figures, if you can't, but what sort of percentage of your workforce is used to support that service?  A. We currently manage one hotel currently now. There was two hotels, initially. One hotel which is situated near Gatwick and, usually, we have — supporting that, we have 20 DCOs and 4 DOMs. Predominantly, they are taken	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. And you also helped me with the number of employed staff you should have overall.</li> <li>Now, this is under the contract, but can you help with the situation as it is now at the centre. For example, how many members of staff per residential wing are there during the daytime now?</li> <li>A. Per wing? Mandated-wise, there would be three DCOs as a minimum and one DOM as a minimum.</li> <li>Q. And during the night state, how many operational staff are in site in total?</li> <li>A. As per I believe it is 18 in total and two</li> <li>Q. 18 DCOs and two DCMs DOMs?</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	that's happened in society as well.  Q. When were you made aware that it would be until the end of June, approximately?  A. Approximately, before the I think probably early March.  Q. If you can help us just give us rough figures, if you can't, but what sort of percentage of your workforce is used to support that service?  A. We currently manage one hotel currently now. There was two hotels, initially. One hotel which is situated near Gatwick and, usually, we have supporting that, we have 20 DCOs and 4 DOMs. Predominantly, they are taken from our staff group from Tinsley House because the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. And you also helped me with the number of employed staff you should have overall. Now, this is under the contract, but can you help with the situation as it is now at the centre. For example, how many members of staff per residential wing are there during the daytime now? </li> <li>A. Per wing? Mandated-wise, there would be three DCOs as a minimum and one DOM as a minimum.</li> <li>Q. And during the night state, how many operational staff are in site in total?</li> <li>A. As per I believe it is 18 in total and two</li> <li>Q. 18 DCOs and two DCMs DOMs?</li> <li>A. DOMs, yes.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	that's happened in society as well.  Q. When were you made aware that it would be until the end of June, approximately?  A. Approximately, before the I think probably early March.  Q. If you can help us just give us rough figures, if you can't, but what sort of percentage of your workforce is used to support that service?  A. We currently manage one hotel currently now. There was two hotels, initially. One hotel which is situated near Gatwick and, usually, we have supporting that, we have 20 DCOs and 4 DOMs. Predominantly, they are taken from our staff group from Tinsley House because the hotel these are staff that are trained working with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. And you also helped me with the number of employed staff you should have overall. Now, this is under the contract, but can you help with the situation as it is now at the centre. For example, how many members of staff per residential wing are there during the daytime now? </li> <li>A. Per wing? Mandated-wise, there would be three DCOs as a minimum and one DOM as a minimum.</li> <li>Q. And during the night state, how many operational staff are in site in total?</li> <li>A. As per I believe it is 18 in total and two</li> <li>Q. 18 DCOs and two DCMs DOMs?</li> <li>A. DOMs, yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you know how many people would be on E wing at night?</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	that's happened in society as well.  Q. When were you made aware that it would be until the end of June, approximately?  A. Approximately, before the I think probably early March.  Q. If you can help us just give us rough figures, if you can't, but what sort of percentage of your workforce is used to support that service?  A. We currently manage one hotel currently now. There was two hotels, initially. One hotel which is situated near Gatwick and, usually, we have supporting that, we have 20 DCOs and 4 DOMs. Predominantly, they are taken from our staff group from Tinsley House because the hotel these are staff that are trained working with children and have the acquired skills, and that is why	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. And you also helped me with the number of employed staff you should have overall. Now, this is under the contract, but can you help with the situation as it is now at the centre. For example, how many members of staff per residential wing are there during the daytime now? </li> <li>A. Per wing? Mandated-wise, there would be three DCOs as a minimum and one DOM as a minimum.</li> <li>Q. And during the night state, how many operational staff are in site in total?</li> <li>A. As per I believe it is 18 in total and two</li> <li>Q. 18 DCOs and two DCMs DOMs?</li> <li>A. DOMs, yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you know how many people would be on E wing at night?</li> <li>A. I wouldn't off the top of my head, I presume it would be</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	that's happened in society as well.  Q. When were you made aware that it would be until the end of June, approximately?  A. Approximately, before the I think probably early March.  Q. If you can help us just give us rough figures, if you can't, but what sort of percentage of your workforce is used to support that service?  A. We currently manage one hotel currently now. There was two hotels, initially. One hotel which is situated near Gatwick and, usually, we have supporting that, we have 20 DCOs and 4 DOMs. Predominantly, they are taken from our staff group from Tinsley House because the hotel these are staff that are trained working with children and have the acquired skills, and that is why we chose that number of staff. So they are associated,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. And you also helped me with the number of employed staff you should have overall. Now, this is under the contract, but can you help with the situation as it is now at the centre. For example, how many members of staff per residential wing are there during the daytime now? </li> <li>A. Per wing? Mandated-wise, there would be three DCOs as a minimum and one DOM as a minimum.</li> <li>Q. And during the night state, how many operational staff are in site in total?</li> <li>A. As per I believe it is 18 in total and two</li> <li>Q. 18 DCOs and two DCMs DOMs?</li> <li>A. DOMs, yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you know how many people would be on E wing at night?</li> <li>A. I wouldn't off the top of my head, I presume it would be one on each area, but</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	that's happened in society as well.  Q. When were you made aware that it would be until the end of June, approximately?  A. Approximately, before the I think probably early March.  Q. If you can help us just give us rough figures, if you can't, but what sort of percentage of your workforce is used to support that service?  A. We currently manage one hotel currently now. There was two hotels, initially. One hotel which is situated near Gatwick and, usually, we have supporting that, we have 20 DCOs and 4 DOMs. Predominantly, they are taken from our staff group from Tinsley House because the hotel these are staff that are trained working with children and have the acquired skills, and that is why we chose that number of staff. So they are associated, generally, from the PDA area in Tinsley House	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. And you also helped me with the number of employed staff you should have overall. Now, this is under the contract, but can you help with the situation as it is now at the centre. For example, how many members of staff per residential wing are there during the daytime now? </li> <li>A. Per wing? Mandated-wise, there would be three DCOs as a minimum and one DOM as a minimum.</li> <li>Q. And during the night state, how many operational staff are in site in total?</li> <li>A. As per I believe it is 18 in total and two</li> <li>Q. 18 DCOs and two DCMs DOMs?</li> <li>A. DOMs, yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you know how many people would be on E wing at night?</li> <li>A. I wouldn't off the top of my head, I presume it would be one on each area, but</li> <li>Q. And, the chair, when Mr Haughton gave evidence to the</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	that's happened in society as well.  Q. When were you made aware that it would be until the end of June, approximately?  A. Approximately, before the I think probably early March.  Q. If you can help us just give us rough figures, if you can't, but what sort of percentage of your workforce is used to support that service?  A. We currently manage one hotel currently now. There was two hotels, initially. One hotel which is situated near Gatwick and, usually, we have supporting that, we have 20 DCOs and 4 DOMs. Predominantly, they are taken from our staff group from Tinsley House because the hotel these are staff that are trained working with children and have the acquired skills, and that is why we chose that number of staff. So they are associated, generally, from the PDA area in Tinsley House pre-departure accommodation so they are working with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. And you also helped me with the number of employed staff you should have overall.  Now, this is under the contract, but can you help with the situation as it is now at the centre. For example, how many members of staff per residential wing are there during the daytime now?</li> <li>A. Per wing? Mandated-wise, there would be three DCOs as a minimum and one DOM as a minimum.</li> <li>Q. And during the night state, how many operational staff are in site in total?</li> <li>A. As per I believe it is 18 in total and two</li> <li>Q. 18 DCOs and two DCMs DOMs?</li> <li>A. DOMs, yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you know how many people would be on E wing at night?</li> <li>A. I wouldn't off the top of my head, I presume it would be one on each area, but</li> <li>Q. And, the chair, when Mr Haughton gave evidence to the inquiry, asked him about staffing now and whether there</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	that's happened in society as well.  Q. When were you made aware that it would be until the end of June, approximately?  A. Approximately, before the I think probably early March.  Q. If you can help us just give us rough figures, if you can't, but what sort of percentage of your workforce is used to support that service?  A. We currently manage one hotel currently now. There was two hotels, initially. One hotel which is situated near Gatwick and, usually, we have supporting that, we have 20 DCOs and 4 DOMs. Predominantly, they are taken from our staff group from Tinsley House because the hotel these are staff that are trained working with children and have the acquired skills, and that is why we chose that number of staff. So they are associated, generally, from the PDA area in Tinsley House pre-departure accommodation so they are working with families and children, and the hotel currently that they	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. And you also helped me with the number of employed staff you should have overall.  Now, this is under the contract, but can you help with the situation as it is now at the centre. For example, how many members of staff per residential wing are there during the daytime now?</li> <li>A. Per wing? Mandated-wise, there would be three DCOs as a minimum and one DOM as a minimum.</li> <li>Q. And during the night state, how many operational staff are in site in total?</li> <li>A. As per I believe it is 18 in total and two</li> <li>Q. 18 DCOs and two DCMs DOMs?</li> <li>A. DOMs, yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you know how many people would be on E wing at night?</li> <li>A. I wouldn't off the top of my head, I presume it would be one on each area, but</li> <li>Q. And, the chair, when Mr Haughton gave evidence to the inquiry, asked him about staffing now and whether there were staffing shortages, and he confirmed that this was</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	that's happened in society as well.  Q. When were you made aware that it would be until the end of June, approximately?  A. Approximately, before the I think probably early March.  Q. If you can help us just give us rough figures, if you can't, but what sort of percentage of your workforce is used to support that service?  A. We currently manage one hotel currently now. There was two hotels, initially. One hotel which is situated near Gatwick and, usually, we have supporting that, we have 20 DCOs and 4 DOMs. Predominantly, they are taken from our staff group from Tinsley House because the hotel these are staff that are trained working with children and have the acquired skills, and that is why we chose that number of staff. So they are associated, generally, from the PDA area in Tinsley House pre-departure accommodation so they are working with families and children, and the hotel currently that they are managing and supporting is for families and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. And you also helped me with the number of employed staff you should have overall. Now, this is under the contract, but can you help with the situation as it is now at the centre. For example, how many members of staff per residential wing are there during the daytime now? </li> <li>A. Per wing? Mandated-wise, there would be three DCOs as a minimum and one DOM as a minimum.</li> <li>Q. And during the night state, how many operational staff are in site in total?</li> <li>A. As per I believe it is 18 in total and two</li> <li>Q. 18 DCOs and two DCMs DOMs?</li> <li>A. DOMs, yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you know how many people would be on E wing at night?</li> <li>A. I wouldn't off the top of my head, I presume it would be one on each area, but</li> <li>Q. And, the chair, when Mr Haughton gave evidence to the inquiry, asked him about staffing now and whether there were staffing shortages, and he confirmed that this was still an issue. He said that it was difficult to</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	that's happened in society as well.  Q. When were you made aware that it would be until the end of June, approximately?  A. Approximately, before the I think probably early March.  Q. If you can help us just give us rough figures, if you can't, but what sort of percentage of your workforce is used to support that service?  A. We currently manage one hotel currently now. There was two hotels, initially. One hotel which is situated near Gatwick and, usually, we have supporting that, we have 20 DCOs and 4 DOMs. Predominantly, they are taken from our staff group from Tinsley House because the hotel these are staff that are trained working with children and have the acquired skills, and that is why we chose that number of staff. So they are associated, generally, from the PDA area in Tinsley House pre-departure accommodation so they are working with families and children, and the hotel currently that they are managing and supporting is for families and children.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. And you also helped me with the number of employed staff you should have overall. Now, this is under the contract, but can you help with the situation as it is now at the centre. For example, how many members of staff per residential wing are there during the daytime now? </li> <li>A. Per wing? Mandated-wise, there would be three DCOs as a minimum and one DOM as a minimum.</li> <li>Q. And during the night state, how many operational staff are in site in total?</li> <li>A. As per I believe it is 18 in total and two</li> <li>Q. 18 DCOs and two DCMs DOMs?</li> <li>A. DOMs, yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you know how many people would be on E wing at night?</li> <li>A. I wouldn't off the top of my head, I presume it would be one on each area, but</li> <li>Q. And, the chair, when Mr Haughton gave evidence to the inquiry, asked him about staffing now and whether there were staffing shortages, and he confirmed that this was still an issue. He said that it was difficult to recruit, that there is a competitive labour market,</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	that's happened in society as well.  Q. When were you made aware that it would be until the end of June, approximately?  A. Approximately, before the I think probably early March.  Q. If you can help us just give us rough figures, if you can't, but what sort of percentage of your workforce is used to support that service?  A. We currently manage one hotel currently now. There was two hotels, initially. One hotel which is situated near Gatwick and, usually, we have supporting that, we have 20 DCOs and 4 DOMs. Predominantly, they are taken from our staff group from Tinsley House because the hotel these are staff that are trained working with children and have the acquired skills, and that is why we chose that number of staff. So they are associated, generally, from the PDA area in Tinsley House pre-departure accommodation so they are working with families and children, and the hotel currently that they are managing and supporting is for families and children.  Q. So 20 DCOs and four DOMs. Is that the amount of people	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. And you also helped me with the number of employed staff you should have overall.  Now, this is under the contract, but can you help with the situation as it is now at the centre. For example, how many members of staff per residential wing are there during the daytime now?</li> <li>A. Per wing? Mandated-wise, there would be three DCOs as a minimum and one DOM as a minimum.</li> <li>Q. And during the night state, how many operational staff are in site in total?</li> <li>A. As per I believe it is 18 in total and two</li> <li>Q. 18 DCOs and two DCMs DOMs?</li> <li>A. DOMs, yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you know how many people would be on E wing at night?</li> <li>A. I wouldn't off the top of my head, I presume it would be one on each area, but</li> <li>Q. And, the chair, when Mr Haughton gave evidence to the inquiry, asked him about staffing now and whether there were staffing shortages, and he confirmed that this was still an issue. He said that it was difficult to recruit, that there is a competitive labour market, especially with things opening up again post Covid, he</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	that's happened in society as well.  Q. When were you made aware that it would be until the end of June, approximately?  A. Approximately, before the I think probably early March.  Q. If you can help us just give us rough figures, if you can't, but what sort of percentage of your workforce is used to support that service?  A. We currently manage one hotel currently now. There was two hotels, initially. One hotel which is situated near Gatwick and, usually, we have supporting that, we have 20 DCOs and 4 DOMs. Predominantly, they are taken from our staff group from Tinsley House because the hotel these are staff that are trained working with children and have the acquired skills, and that is why we chose that number of staff. So they are associated, generally, from the PDA area in Tinsley House pre-departure accommodation so they are working with families and children, and the hotel currently that they are managing and supporting is for families and children.  Q. So 20 DCOs and four DOMs. Is that the amount of people working in the hotel in total  A. Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. And you also helped me with the number of employed staff you should have overall.  Now, this is under the contract, but can you help with the situation as it is now at the centre. For example, how many members of staff per residential wing are there during the daytime now?</li> <li>A. Per wing? Mandated-wise, there would be three DCOs as a minimum and one DOM as a minimum.</li> <li>Q. And during the night state, how many operational staff are in site in total?</li> <li>A. As per I believe it is 18 in total and two</li> <li>Q. 18 DCOs and two DCMs DOMs?</li> <li>A. DOMs, yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you know how many people would be on E wing at night?</li> <li>A. I wouldn't off the top of my head, I presume it would be one on each area, but</li> <li>Q. And, the chair, when Mr Haughton gave evidence to the inquiry, asked him about staffing now and whether there were staffing shortages, and he confirmed that this was still an issue. He said that it was difficult to recruit, that there is a competitive labour market, especially with things opening up again post Covid, he said it was a tough place to work, some people start and, soon after, find it is not for them. And while, in</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	that's happened in society as well.  Q. When were you made aware that it would be until the end of June, approximately?  A. Approximately, before the I think probably early March.  Q. If you can help us just give us rough figures, if you can't, but what sort of percentage of your workforce is used to support that service?  A. We currently manage one hotel currently now. There was two hotels, initially. One hotel which is situated near Gatwick and, usually, we have supporting that, we have 20 DCOs and 4 DOMs. Predominantly, they are taken from our staff group from Tinsley House because the hotel these are staff that are trained working with children and have the acquired skills, and that is why we chose that number of staff. So they are associated, generally, from the PDA area in Tinsley House pre-departure accommodation so they are working with families and children, and the hotel currently that they are managing and supporting is for families and children.  Q. So 20 DCOs and four DOMs. Is that the amount of people working in the hotel in total	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. And you also helped me with the number of employed staff you should have overall.  Now, this is under the contract, but can you help with the situation as it is now at the centre. For example, how many members of staff per residential wing are there during the daytime now?</li> <li>A. Per wing? Mandated-wise, there would be three DCOs as a minimum and one DOM as a minimum.</li> <li>Q. And during the night state, how many operational staff are in site in total?</li> <li>A. As per I believe it is 18 in total and two</li> <li>Q. 18 DCOs and two DCMs DOMs?</li> <li>A. DOMs, yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you know how many people would be on E wing at night?</li> <li>A. I wouldn't off the top of my head, I presume it would be one on each area, but</li> <li>Q. And, the chair, when Mr Haughton gave evidence to the inquiry, asked him about staffing now and whether there were staffing shortages, and he confirmed that this was still an issue. He said that it was difficult to recruit, that there is a competitive labour market, especially with things opening up again post Covid, he said it was a tough place to work, some people start</li> </ul>

1	his view, Serco have improved conditions for staff, he	1	A. Yeah, we have just started a new course or gone on to
2	says there is always pay issues and you can get paid	2	it, so I think we've been as much as the highest
3	more in less pressurised roles. And he said that those	3	point we've been since reviewing the contract, it's
4	factors drive both recruitment and retention issues.	4	around about 30 vacancies.
5	Now, you were nodding, is there anything there that	5	Q. So you have just started a new course. Do you mean you
6	you disagree with?	6	have just had a new ITC?
7	A. Yes, I would probably disagree with a lot of what was	7	A. An new ITC started, yes. And then we've ITCs planned
8	said there, to be honest.	8	out for the remainder of the year to, you know, refresh
9	Q. What do you disagree with?	9	and replace any leavers from the contract.
10	A. From a recruitment perspective, we still have a healthy	10	Q. We have heard a little about the ITC, the training
11	pool of recruits coming through. Part of what we are	11	during the relevant period, and I understand there is
12	developing is a culture to maintain the staff within the	12	a new training programme in place and you have provided
13	centre. It is fair to say that, at the point when we	13	us with some materials that are drawn from that.
14	took over the contract, that we were we had a ramp-up	14	The inquiry has heard significant evidence about the
15	period. So we have increased the staffing quite	15	lack of adequate training and repeat training,
16	dramatically over circa over 250 new staff within the	16	particularly relating to mental illness and PTSD and
17	centre, across all disciplines as well. We have lost	17	torture for detention operational staff. We have heard
18	a number of staff going back to previous roles, because	18	multiple times from staff members, including
19	that was in the middle of Covid, so but, you know,	19	Mr Loughton, Mr Farrell, Mr Dix and Mr Povey-Meier
20	I have recently introduced a new salary rise for the	20	I understand they all still work there that they
21	DCOs as well, so it is fair to say they are the highest	21	couldn't distinguish behavioural issues with underlying
22	paid DCOs across any other IRC as well, so	22	mental health reasons from, let's just say, detainees
23	Q. What is the salary now for a DCO?	23	who were just being disruptive and difficult.
24	A. The current salary for a DCO is 27,441, which is quite	24	Obviously, they are not mental health
25	competitive and is above any other IRC salary.	25	professionals
	Page 41		Page 43
	O. Donaldation and all accommodated and influence	1	A N
1	Q. Does that increase the longer you work there, is there	1	A. No.
2	an annual increment?	2	Q would you expect them to have that difficulty in
3	A. It is an annual percentage, and annual percentages rise,	3	distinguishing?
4	so, yes. That was introduced as of today, the new	4	A. I would say, as part of the contract and as part of the
5	salary rise. So I have just negotiated a new salary	5	initial training course, that we deliver to staff and
6	over the last which was a two-year period with	6	refresher as well; so we have a yearly staff refresher
7	Q. What was the reason for introducing the new salary?	7	as well for all staff that has been introduced as
8	A. Part of the annual pay review.	8	well there is a focus more on safeguarding mental
9	Q. So Mr Haughton said there were still staffing shortages.	9	health, as part of that training.
10	Do you disagree with that in general?	10	That level of training packages also been agreed
11	A. At this point in time, there are no staff shortages in	11	with the Home Office as well, to what we deliver, but
12	any way, shape or form. We continue to recruit and we	12	you're right, they are not clinicians, and part of the
13	have been meeting our staffing obligations, regarding	13	new you have probably heard from PPG, the Practice
14	staff numbers. I think, at this point in time, we are	14	Plus Group, they have part of their contract is now
15	probably around about 15 staff short, so there has been	15	heavily weighted and they are delivering more on mental
16	peaks and attrition rises depending on months. We have	16	health as well, so they have increased their staffing
17	been averaging possibly around about ten leavers a month	17	complement. So we would signpost and refer to the
18	and we have been filling those vacancies up.	18	Registered Senior Mental Health Nurses and the
19	Q. So you are 15 staff short now of the total complement of	19	psychologists and psychiatrists as well.
20	people that need to be on the payroll, rather than in	20	Q. So you have mentioned that there's training on
21	the centre?	21	safeguarding mental health?
22	A. Yes.	22	A. Yes.
23	Q. How long has that relatively low level of vacancies been	23	Q. Is there any training for the custodial staff on the
24	the case? Was there a time, a few months ago, when it	24	particular mental health issues or vulnerabilities
25	was much higher, for example?	25	A. Yes.
1	was mach ingher, for example.		
	Page 42		Page 44

1	Q that you see in the IRC demographic; for example,	1	what extent have detained, or formerly detained, people
2	PTSD?	2	been involved in developing your cultural strategy?
3	A. Not particularly PTSD, but it is generalising as	3	A. I mean, as part of the work of developing all the PDC,
4	I say, they are not clinicians and we can only give them	4	or Positive Detention Culture, there was discussions
5	the certain skills, what they can absorb, and identify	5	with all stakeholders, including residents, at the time
6	it and refer and pass the information on and signpost.	6	as well. So initial analysis and initial survey of what
7	Q. I want to ask you now about staff culture.	7	we call an health check was done prior to Serco taking
8	A. Yes.	8	over and it was still largely G4S running the contract
9	Q. Obviously, you have seen Panorama and, as you recognise	9	and that involved a number of residents and their
10	at paragraph 44, culture doesn't change overnight. It	10	opinions as well and the staff group at that time.
11	needed to change, obviously, in light of what you saw on	11	So they did have a voice and they would use a voice
12	Panorama, didn't it?	12	to have the last health check we did, which was last
13	A. Yes.	13	year, last September, again, the current resident
14	Q. And when you knew you were going to become director of	14	population we had were surveyed as well, at that point
15	Brook House, I assume that what was shown on Panorama	15	in time, as well as all the staff, so we had 75 per cent
16	wasn't too far from your mind.	16	representation of the staff to understand where we
17	You discuss, at paragraph 44, the Positive Detention	17	which direction we were going in from our culture
18	Culture Programme now in place, which is led by	18	development.
19	an external academic, Dr Lavis, through a company called	19	Q. What percentage representation of the detainees?
20	The Appreciative Partnership, which you describe as	20	A. I think there were about 40 per cent of them engaged
21	being designed to assess the culture and conduct of the	21	with that discussion.
22	centres, and you also note it is linked to a KPI, so	22	Q. Can we move to page 15, please. So on page 15, at the
23	it's linked to KPI15, which gives rise to a failure if	23	top, under "D5 Emotional Load" this under the
24	you fail to ensure that staff adhere to that.	24	subheading "Motivating and influencing others" it
25	Could I ask for, on screen, to be <ser000023>. Now</ser000023>	25	says:
	Page 45		Page 47
1	this is the Positive Detainee sorry, Positive	1	"Understanding and developing strategies to reduce
2	Detention Culture proposal, so it is a 21-page document	2	emotional load [and self and others] ( Being able to
3	including a series of workshops and an action plan and	3	authentically be myself at work and Feeling safe and
4	it is dated November 2020. Is this proposal now in	4	maintaining wellbeing at work)."
5	force?	5	The inquiry has heard recommendations on staff and
6	A. It is fully in force, yes.	6	culture made by Professor Bosworth. Have you read her
7	Q. We see that there's products and services offered to	7	reports?
8	Serco by this company, there is development of the SMT	8	A. Yes, I am aware of her reports, and previous reports,
9	and other levels through workshops and assessments. And	9	in I think it's in detention and managing, some of
10	if we go to page 14, for example so it looks like	10	the reports she published in 2019 as well, managing
11	a sort of review of what was going on was done at the	11	quality of life in detention, which she has previously
12	time and red, amber and green ratings were given. So	12	reported on as well.
13	page 14, for example, is about DCMs. So we see at the	13	Q. And you have read the ones to the inquiry as well?
14	top the title "Detention Custody Managers and	14	A. Yes, and some of the recommendations of that as well,
15	Non-operational Managers".	15	yes.
16	The first entry there, in green, "D4 Detainee	16	Q. She notes the impact of immigration detention on mental
17	Focus", it says:	17	health and adds that it would be naive to assume that
18	" try to understand what is prompting task	18	such matters do not also have a collateral impact on
19	focused rather than person focused approach to ensure	19	staff.
20	consistent approach across the sites."	20	A. Yes.
21	D9, there, the second one down, says, in terms of	21	Q. You would agree, would you, that working in this
22	enhancing team effectiveness you should "include key	22	environment can have an impact on staff's mental
23	stakeholders to get their views."	23	wellbeing?
24	Now, this may or may not be particularly related to	24	A. It can, it can, yes, unless we have to ensure we have
25	this, but in terms of including key stakeholders, to	25	got the right safeguards in place and support for staff,
	- ·		7
	Page 46		Page 48
			12 (Pages 45 to 48)

1	which we have a number of things in within that we	1	Q. Is the care team specifically there for staff or is
2	deliver within the contracts. So I have a number of	2	it
3	staff that are Mental Health First Aid trained, that	3	A. For staff, I'm talking staff only on this point
4	deliver a lot of support; I have a care team that	4	Q. Professor Bosworth also recommended, as I just read,
5	obviously offers support to staff; and, within Serco, we	5	a graduate programme, and she also says this in her
6	have employee assistance programmes as well, where we	6	report at 59 to sorry, 5.9 to 5.11, saying that,
7	can get support.	7	"Creating a graduate pathway would acknowledge some of
8	Q. You may have heard a former Home Office employee,	8	complexities of this job and potentially assist in
9	Mr Castle, tell the inquiry he was talking there	9	professionalising it". Is that something you have
10	about detainees "I am sure there would have been	10	looked at?
11	a number of occasions where the men would have been	11	A. Not particularly, long term. We have graduate schemes
12	suffering from mental health issues. I think, if you	12	within Serco. And I have had graduates allocated, was
13	spend more than 24 hours in Brook House, you are going	13	within Gatwick as well, but looking at more an
14	to develop mental health issues. It is not a nice place	14	higher-level perspective of it than anything else.
15	to be."	15	Q. While we are on those recommendations and culture
16	Would you agree with that?	16	issues, Professor Bosworth notes at 2.25 of her report:
17	A. I am not sure there is a direct correlation between	17	"Another suggestion that has been made multiple
18	being in Brook House and mental health at this point in	18	times and has been trialled in some forms at various
19	time. No, I don't fully agree with that.	19	times would be to create a system of personal officers."
20	Q. But you would say it could give rise to an impact on	20	She says:
21	A. It could give rise, it could give rise, yes.	21	"Currently, IRCs like Brook House rely either on
22	Q. An impact on	22	individuals who are particularly motivated or on their
23	A. I never said	23	welfare staff to offer additional assistance to people
24	Q. For both staff and detainees, people's mental wellbeing	24	in need in detention. Such arrangements put a lot of
25	generally?	25	pressure on a small number of individuals."
	Page 49		Page 51
	1 age +7		1 age 31
1	Professor Bosworth adds and this is 2.24 of her	1	Have you looked at personal officers?
2	first report, but I'll just read it out:	2	A. No.
3	"For some years now, I have been advocating training	3	Q. Why not?
4	and secondary trauma for staff. In 2018, Stephen Shaw	4	A. From a personal perspective, the time that some of our
5	noticed the absence of a graduate programme as well for	5	residents spend within I mean, personal officers are
6	immigration custodial staff."	6	designed specifically to look at relationships and where
7	And she says that both of these provisions could	7	a particular group or a number of residents has been
8	assist in building resilience and professionalism	8	allocated to that particular officer. With the movement
9	amongst the staff group.	9	of locations and the movement of wings at this point in
10	So, first, secondary trauma training, is that	10	time, if it is a more stable number of residents within
11	something that has ever been explored?	11	the centre, there is a possibility then it could work
12	A. It has not been particularly explored. I think, post	12	a little bit better. But the time they spend with us in
13	the inquiry, it is something that will be explored and	13	general in Brook House, and it could be anything from
14	it is something I would support, yes.	14	25 to 35 days with us, is it's hard to develop
15	Q. And more generally about the development of, say, coping	15	meaning relationships with the residents from a personal
16	mechanisms for staff members who witness traumatic	16	officer perspective.
17	things like detainees who have self-harmed or in severe	17	Q. 25 to 35 days, is that the current average length of
18	mental distress, is there anything in place more	18	detention?
19	generally there?	19	A. In between, yes, on average. The average is 35
20	A. I mean, generally-wise, we have any incident that	20	currently. Although we have one particular resident who
21	occurs within the centre, we refer, for support-wise, to	21	has been with us longer. That is in my report.
22	our care team that is led by a social worker, onsite	22	Q. You mentioned in your statement someone who had been
		23	there at the time of your statement just under a year?
23	social worker, at this point in time, and we are	23	anere at the time of your statement just under a year.
23 24	social worker, at this point in time, and we are supportive in that nature and see what other support we	24	A. Just over a year now, yes.
	•		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
24	supportive in that nature and see what other support we can signpost them to as well.	24	A. Just over a year now, yes. Q. Just over a year now?
24	supportive in that nature and see what other support we	24	A. Just over a year now, yes.

1	A. Yes.	1	A. Just this example. It could be myself, it could be
2	Q. I understand from your statement there are further	2	another senior manager as well.
3	measures to promote healthy culture. If we could open,	3	Q. And the investigator there is Steve Loughton
4	please, <ser000041>, and this, Mr Hewer, is the healthy</ser000041>	4	A. As an example.
5	staff culture SOP. We see, on the front page there, it	5	Q head of operations. Does he always investigate it or
6	is issued on 15 January 2021. If we go to page 2, it	6	could it be someone else?
7	says, at 1.1:	7	A. It could be allocated to any senior manager who has the
8	"The purpose of the healthy staff culture policy is	8	skills to do this.
9	to ensure we have consistency in the investigation of	9	Q. The sources of evidence there are listed: use of force
10	allegations made against Serco employees regardless of	10	log; complaints; healthy staff culture, HR; and CCTV.
11	the origin of the investigation made."	11	And the process of the investigation, which is written
12	So is healthy staff culture here just about	12	out there at the bottom, might include, it says,
13	investigating allegations or is it more broadly about	13	a statement from the detained person, which you helped
14	cultural change?	14	us with in relation to the KPI.
15	A. This is well, they go hand in hand. It is about	15	A. Yes.
16	investigation and also about culture as well, and this	16	Q. Overleaf, there are further investigative methods set
17	obviously ties in with our code of conduct as well,	17	out, so it could include documentary evidence, reviewing
18	which we shared with the inquiry.	18	footage, checking various records.
19	Q. So this is one of the mechanisms by which	19	And then there is a space there for persons
20	A. Yes, one of many that relate to 16.4.1 of the contract.	20	interviewed, and then, underneath, findings, and
21	Q. Yes, and also to the KPI on healthy staff culture, 15?	21	finally, on the next page, conclusions, facts
22	A. Correct, yes.	22	established, mitigating factors, conclusions,
23	Q. We see at 1.2 how the policy works, it says it provides	23	recommendations and, at the bottom, whether any action
24	a standard framework to investigate any instances where	24	or no action is required.
25	there have been three instances of misconduct, or	25	Then it says, I think, on the last page, that it is
	D 52		D
	Page 53		Page 55
1	alleged misconduct, within a three-month period:	1	to be submitted in brackets at the bottom there to
2	"This process will allow Serco to monitor and record	2	the APCM without delay.
3	patterns of behaviour, identify trends and, more	3	What is the APCM, do you know, or just tell me who
4	importantly, ensure early intervention is applied, where	4	it is submitted to if you don't know what the acronym
5	needed, to maintain a healthy staff culture."	5	is?
6	A. Yes.	6	A. I am not sure what the acronym is.
7	Q. What if there are, say, seven instances of misconduct in	7	Q. Who gets a copy of this then?
8	a year but no more than two in any three-month period,	8	A. It is shared with the Home Office.
9	will that still be picked up?	9	Q. Yes.
10	A. Everything would be picked up, yes.	10	A. And, obviously, the senior Serco team as well are all on
11	Q. So you continue to monitor instances?	11	site, the Gatwick team.
12	A. Yes, and we have a log of every we keep a log of	12	Q. Yes. What about the IMB?
13	every since we operated the contract, of every	13	A. They would I don't think they get a copy of this.
14	instance, and our historic cases or historic issues with	14	This is just part of the investigation. So this is
15	staff as well.	15	probably some of the detail that is added to the
16	Q. And you have provided us with that?	16	spreadsheet, which, again, we have not put on screen,
17	A. I think it has all been provided, yes.	17	but we have seen. And it it feeds into that
18	Q. If we turn to annex C, which is page 7, we perhaps get	18	particular document.
19	an overview of how an investigation into this might	19	Q. Do the
20	work. I will ask you about it, just in brief because	20	A. I mean, the IMB are made fully aware of any
21	you can sort of see it from annex C?	21	investigations or incidents as well, so they are part of
22	A. Yes.	22	it, as are the Home Office.
23	Q. It looks like, here, investigation authorised by	23	Q. And if they wanted to see it, they would be entitled to?
24	Sarah Newland, deputy director. Does she always	24	A. Yes, yes. I have a policy of total transparency, so if
25	authorise it or just this example?	25	they wish to see any documents of that nature, anything
	Page 54		Page 56

1	related to staff issues, anything they they are quite	1	what you saw on Panorama?
2	entitled to see that.	2	A. It is part of the contract. It is part of 2.1 of the
3	Q. Would the detainee who made the complaint be entitled to	3	contract, and the healthy staff culture. It is written
4	see a copy of it?	4	into the contract, so that is why we monitor that.
5	A. The detainee they wouldn't see the investigation but	5	Q. Finally, there is a use of force log which lists use of
6	they would have a full and response of it depends	6	force events, gives a brief description and lists
7	if they put a complaint in about the officer as well.	7	everyone involved?
8	So	8	A. Yes.
9	Q. Why wouldn't they see the investigation?	9	Q. That is how you get the data for who has been
10	A. Depending on what the context is of the investigation.	10	A. Yes, and just clear up, the spreadsheet is a high-level
11	Q. You have also provided us, as we have alluded to that	11	spreadsheet and sat behind that is lots of other
12	can come off the screen now, thank you, with	12	information and data that feeds into that.
13	a spreadsheet. I don't need to bring it up now, but the	13	Q. Yes. So that is how you monitor culture, with some of
14	reference for the note is <ser000464> and it relates to</ser000464>	14	documents that you use to do that.
15	the SOP and if tracks misconduct issues, so both ongoing	15	A. Yes, as part of that.
16	and then, in a separate tab, historic?	16	Q. I mentioned KPI15, which provides a penalty for failures
17	A. Correct.	17	and healthy staff culture.
18	Q. Staff-related complaints which includes the name of the	18	A. Yes.
19	complainant, the nationality, obviously, if they are	19	Q. But, as you say, and according to your paragraph 23,
20	a detainee, a bit of detail, and it says whether the	20	that is currently not being enforced by the Home Office,
21	complaint is ongoing or concluded?	21	as we have previously discussed?
22	A. Yes.	22	A. No.
23	Q. Is data retained, even if a misconduct or a complaint is	23	Q. So there is currently no contractual onus on Serco
24	concluded and not substantiated?	24	to comply with
25	A. It is all yes all the data is on the spreadsheet.	25	A. No. On a fortnightly basis we go through all the
	Page 57		Page 59
1	Q. Because a string of complaints, even if unsubstantiated,	1	spreadsheets with the Home Office. So it is
2	might start to give rise to a concern, mightn't it?	2	transparency that they see (inaudible) afterwards and it
3	A. Yes. Whether substantiated or not substantiated, it	3	is updated and shared with all the SMT and Home Office
4	would be on the log and retained on the log at all	4	senior managers as well. So there is full visibility of
5	times.	5	any issues within the centre and the spreadsheet.
6	Q. There is a list of leavers and their leaving reasons?	6	Q. Are they still monitored but always mitigated, or are
7	A. Yes.	7	they not recorded within the KPI log, any failures
8	Q. Then there is a tab that is called "UOF 3in3", so that's	8	within KPI15?
9	people who have done three use of force in three months?	9	A. Everything is recorded in the KPI log, yes.
10	A. Yes, correct.	10	Q. But it is 100 per cent mitigation?
11	Q. Why is that relevant to record?	11	A. Yes.
12	A. To see if there is any pattern of behaviour where they	12	Q. I see.
13	are involved, as we are aware historically people get	13	KPI aside, are you satisfied that these processes,
14	involved in a number of use of forces so every if	14	so the learning plus the monitoring, properly address
15	somebody has been involved in a use of force, we keep	15	the need to change the cultural issues we saw on
16		16	Panorama?
10	a record of that and then we will sit down and address	10	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
17	a record of that and then we will sit down and address and look at the circumstances and address if there are	17	A. It is work in progress. Lots of our policies and
			A. It is work in progress. Lots of our policies and procedures are meeting the requirements of what
17	and look at the circumstances and address if there are	17	
17 18	and look at the circumstances and address if there are any issues regarding their involvement in the use of	17 18	procedures are meeting the requirements of what
17 18 19	and look at the circumstances and address if there are any issues regarding their involvement in the use of force, any patterns of behaviour or concerns or issues.	17 18 19	procedures are meeting the requirements of what I expect. I think the key piece of work for me is the
17 18 19 20	and look at the circumstances and address if there are any issues regarding their involvement in the use of force, any patterns of behaviour or concerns or issues.  Q. What happens next if there are?	17 18 19 20	procedures are meeting the requirements of what I expect. I think the key piece of work for me is the positive detention culture. I think that will drive
17 18 19 20 21	and look at the circumstances and address if there are any issues regarding their involvement in the use of force, any patterns of behaviour or concerns or issues.  Q. What happens next if there are?  A. We will address that if there is any disciplinary action	17 18 19 20 21	procedures are meeting the requirements of what I expect. I think the key piece of work for me is the positive detention culture. I think that will drive further cultural change throughout the centre and that
17 18 19 20 21 22	and look at the circumstances and address if there are any issues regarding their involvement in the use of force, any patterns of behaviour or concerns or issues.  Q. What happens next if there are?  A. We will address that if there is any disciplinary action or any actions or retraining or anything we need to do	17 18 19 20 21 22	procedures are meeting the requirements of what I expect. I think the key piece of work for me is the positive detention culture. I think that will drive further cultural change throughout the centre and that is one of the key things for me, key drivers. That has
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	and look at the circumstances and address if there are any issues regarding their involvement in the use of force, any patterns of behaviour or concerns or issues.  Q. What happens next if there are?  A. We will address that if there is any disciplinary action or any actions or retraining or anything we need to do in that; it is keeping an understanding and a record of	17 18 19 20 21 22 23	procedures are meeting the requirements of what I expect. I think the key piece of work for me is the positive detention culture. I think that will drive further cultural change throughout the centre and that is one of the key things for me, key drivers. That has been developed, as I say, prior to us taking over the
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>and look at the circumstances and address if there are any issues regarding their involvement in the use of force, any patterns of behaviour or concerns or issues.</li> <li>Q. What happens next if there are?</li> <li>A. We will address that if there is any disciplinary action or any actions or retraining or anything we need to do in that; it is keeping an understanding and a record of it.</li> </ul>	17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	procedures are meeting the requirements of what I expect. I think the key piece of work for me is the positive detention culture. I think that will drive further cultural change throughout the centre and that is one of the key things for me, key drivers. That has been developed, as I say, prior to us taking over the contract, with a lot of academical work by

1	done quite a lot of training, we have done SMT have	1	A. Yes, they would.
2	carried out, as part of PDC, a lot of training and	2	Q. Because it is completely unacceptable.
3	development on strategy of development and leadership.	3	You were of course nothing to do with Brook House at
4	That has now moved down all our detention	4	this time; if it happened in front of you, you would act
5	operational managers have completed that training as	5	now, wouldn't you?
6	well, with workshops as well. It is now rolling out	6	A. Obviously, yes. I would hope the staff had the
7	through all the staff group as well now, so to date we	7	encouragement and ability that they could that there
8	have trained up to in the past four weeks, another	8	would be other channels where they could report things,
9	294 staff have been trained in culture workshops. So it	9	via Speak Up or where we could take action as well,
10	is rolling out through the staff group altogether.	10	which as I would expect them to do.
11	So it is a process and it will take time to move	11	Q. As you have heard officers, as we've seen in some other
12	forward.	12	footage in a planned use of force, briefly speaking
13	Q. So it requires a sort of grassroots upwards approach,	13	about a man with cardiac conditions, and saying "If he
14	doesn't it?	14	dies, he dies", you would presumably do something about
15	A. Yes.	15	that as well?
16	Q. Culture is all pervasive.	16	A. Yes.
17	Would you agree that the most important things to	17	Q. And if you didn't hear or see these things but they
18	address first were the really obvious examples of poor	18	happened at Brook House under your watch, you would want
19	culture and then you need to have a more background	19	them investigated and dealt with?
20	check?	20	A. Yes.
21	A. Yes, as I say	21	Q. The inquiry has heard about a number of events at
22	Q. So sorry, go on?	22	Brook House during the relevant period, some of which
23	A. And part of this, obviously, developing this, we would	23	were shown on Panorama, one was the planned removal of
24	have another health check, so we will look at progress.	24	D1914 this is a detainee with a cardiac condition.
25	In Serco we have done one health check. The next one is	25	He had a heart attack and a triple bypass. He had been
	Page 61		Page 63
1	in May; we will do the full health check, we will be	1	recently been to hospital and he was awaiting further
2	questioning all the staff group and they will have	2	surgery. Force was used on him, Mr Loughton briefed the
3	a view on whether the culture, the leadership, looking	3	use of force team about his heart condition and his
4	at the 14 dimensions we put on screen are moving in the	4	triple bypass and undercover recording, obviously done
5	right direction in the cultural change programme we are	5	by Mr Tulley, shows that Mr Tulley, who had heard that
6	developing.	6	he had a medical background and was being prepared to be
7	Q. So the most kind of extreme examples that we have seen	7	involved, said:
8	and we have discussed in relation to Panorama, like	8	"Now you have got me nervous for slightly different
9	using abusive or mocking language to detainees, would	9	reasons now."
10	you hope that that had now been addressed?	10	Yan Paschali said:
11	A. Yes, most definitely. We will not tolerate that	11	"Relax, man, you'll be fine."
12	behaviour in any way, shape or form and I think some of	12	Then the transcript shows Dave Webb said:
13	the evidence we have submitted shows that we have	13	"If he dies, he dies."
14	addressed some actions of that.	14	Yan said:
15	Q. Inappropriate or unjustified use of force and physical	15	"Yeah, exactly."
16	assaults is not tolerated also in any way, shape or	16	Dave Webb said:
17	form?	17	"It's nothing on us."
18	A. No. Well, every one is fully investigated and we will	18	Shortly after Callum says:
19	take it from there.	19	"I suppose Dave Webb is actually on the restraints,
20	Q. Where potentially physical assaults so we have heard	20	isn't he?"
21	many times during the inquiry from D1527 about	21	Dan Lake said:
22	Mr Paschali hands around neck, saying "Don't move you	22	"Yeah."
23	fucking piece of shit, I'm going to put you to fucking	23	Callum Tulley said:
24	sleep", and anyone watching that would be horrified	24	"We will see what happens."
25	obviously, Mr Hewer?	25	Dan Lake says:
	•		·
	Page 62		Page 64
			16 (Pages 61 to 64)

1	"If he dies, he dies."	1	that were said, that you have quoted, obviously, are
2	Callum Tulley says:	2	totally unacceptable in the context of any use of force
3	"I hope well, obviously, I hope not."	3	or anything of that nature. I would not expect any of
4	How do you feel, Mr Hewer, hearing people say that	4	my staff or any of the managers to agree with that
5	in relation to the imminent use of force on a detainee?	5	statement, because it is obviously totally wrong.
6	A. It is just totally unacceptable. It is not the	6	Q. You say that was then and this is now, but I only asked
7	behaviour we would expect or condone in any way, shape	7	him about it a couple of weeks ago and he refused to
8	or form.	8	accept that they were using that in the middle of
9	Q. Mr Loughton gave evidence on 1 March. Did you watch his	9	a planned use of force?
10	evidence?	10	A. I mean it is hard for me to understand. Obviously,
11	A. Some of it, yes.	11	I wasn't there at that point in time and obviously
12	Q. We have provided you with excerpts from his transcript	12	Mr Loughton was at that point in time. So it's his
13	and, like all live evidence in the inquiries, it is	13	understanding of the question, I'm not sure. So it's,
14	available online as well.	14	contextually-wise, I haven't got a reply to that one.
15	A. Yes.	15	Q. Could it be seen by him as a denial of the seriousness
16	Q. I asked him about this event, for which he did the	16	of what was happening and a refusal to learn from
17	briefing, as I mentioned, although he wasn't in the room	17	mistakes at the time?
18	when these comments were made by the looks of it but	18	A. Knowing Mr Loughton, I wouldn't think or see it as being
19	they were made by his team and I read them to him, as	19	a denial in any shape or form but probably not
20	I just did to you now. I asked him about "If he dies,	20	understanding the questioning at that point in time.
21	he dies", and, just as I asked you, I said:	21	Q. Do you think if he didn't understand my question?
22	"How do you feel listening to people saying in	22	A. I am not sure, to be honest.
23	relation to use of force, this planned use of force on	23	Q. Do you know whether anything relating to his evidence
24	someone?"	24	has been taken up with him before, after he gave
25	And he said:	25	evidence?
	D 45		D 47
	Page 65		Page 67
		I	
1	"I don't think they did."	1	A. Not that I am aware of, no.
1 2	"I don't think they did."  I reread it to him and I showed him the transcript	1 2	<ul><li>A. Not that I am aware of, no.</li><li>Q. I won't go through other examples in detail but I also</li></ul>
	•		
2	I reread it to him and I showed him the transcript	2	Q. I won't go through other examples in detail but I also
2 3	I reread it to him and I showed him the transcript and the comment coming right in the middle of the	2 3	Q. I won't go through other examples in detail but I also asked Mr Loughton about the language he used in front of
2 3 4	I reread it to him and I showed him the transcript and the comment coming right in the middle of the conversation about force and D1914's heart condition,	2 3 4	Q. I won't go through other examples in detail but I also asked Mr Loughton about the language he used in front of the same detainee sorry, about a different detainee,
2 3 4 5	I reread it to him and I showed him the transcript and the comment coming right in the middle of the conversation about force and D1914's heart condition, and he still refused to accept that they were talking	2 3 4 5	Q. I won't go through other examples in detail but I also asked Mr Loughton about the language he used in front of the same detainee sorry, about a different detainee, D1527, who had just been found with a ligature around
2 3 4 5 6	I reread it to him and I showed him the transcript and the comment coming right in the middle of the conversation about force and D1914's heart condition, and he still refused to accept that they were talking about the detainee. He said he had heard "If he dies,	2 3 4 5 6	Q. I won't go through other examples in detail but I also asked Mr Loughton about the language he used in front of the same detainee sorry, about a different detainee, D1527, who had just been found with a ligature around his neck on 25 April 2017.
2 3 4 5 6 7	I reread it to him and I showed him the transcript and the comment coming right in the middle of the conversation about force and D1914's heart condition, and he still refused to accept that they were talking about the detainee. He said he had heard "If he dies, he dies", but it was just from a film and not referring	2 3 4 5 6 7	Q. I won't go through other examples in detail but I also asked Mr Loughton about the language he used in front of the same detainee sorry, about a different detainee, D1527, who had just been found with a ligature around his neck on 25 April 2017.  Mr Loughton, we saw on the footage, had described
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	I reread it to him and I showed him the transcript and the comment coming right in the middle of the conversation about force and D1914's heart condition, and he still refused to accept that they were talking about the detainee. He said he had heard "If he dies, he dies", but it was just from a film and not referring to detainees. I said:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. I won't go through other examples in detail but I also asked Mr Loughton about the language he used in front of the same detainee sorry, about a different detainee, D1527, who had just been found with a ligature around his neck on 25 April 2017.  Mr Loughton, we saw on the footage, had described the detainee as "a cock" in front of the detainee.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	I reread it to him and I showed him the transcript and the comment coming right in the middle of the conversation about force and D1914's heart condition, and he still refused to accept that they were talking about the detainee. He said he had heard "If he dies, he dies", but it was just from a film and not referring to detainees. I said:  "Do you accept that is used in relation to the use	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. I won't go through other examples in detail but I also asked Mr Loughton about the language he used in front of the same detainee sorry, about a different detainee, D1527, who had just been found with a ligature around his neck on 25 April 2017.  Mr Loughton, we saw on the footage, had described the detainee as "a cock" in front of the detainee.  Later he described him as "sulking" and Mr Ring had made
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	I reread it to him and I showed him the transcript and the comment coming right in the middle of the conversation about force and D1914's heart condition, and he still refused to accept that they were talking about the detainee. He said he had heard "If he dies, he dies", but it was just from a film and not referring to detainees. I said:  "Do you accept that is used in relation to the use of force they are planning?"	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. I won't go through other examples in detail but I also asked Mr Loughton about the language he used in front of the same detainee sorry, about a different detainee, D1527, who had just been found with a ligature around his neck on 25 April 2017.  Mr Loughton, we saw on the footage, had described the detainee as "a cock" in front of the detainee.  Later he described him as "sulking" and Mr Ring had made comments about calling the detainee "a Duracell bunny",
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	I reread it to him and I showed him the transcript and the comment coming right in the middle of the conversation about force and D1914's heart condition, and he still refused to accept that they were talking about the detainee. He said he had heard "If he dies, he dies", but it was just from a film and not referring to detainees. I said:  "Do you accept that is used in relation to the use of force they are planning?"  He said:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. I won't go through other examples in detail but I also asked Mr Loughton about the language he used in front of the same detainee sorry, about a different detainee, D1527, who had just been found with a ligature around his neck on 25 April 2017.  Mr Loughton, we saw on the footage, had described the detainee as "a cock" in front of the detainee.  Later he described him as "sulking" and Mr Ring had made comments about calling the detainee "a Duracell bunny", and I asked Mr Loughton if he would have challenged
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	I reread it to him and I showed him the transcript and the comment coming right in the middle of the conversation about force and D1914's heart condition, and he still refused to accept that they were talking about the detainee. He said he had heard "If he dies, he dies", but it was just from a film and not referring to detainees. I said:  "Do you accept that is used in relation to the use of force they are planning?"  He said:  "I don't think."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. I won't go through other examples in detail but I also asked Mr Loughton about the language he used in front of the same detainee sorry, about a different detainee, D1527, who had just been found with a ligature around his neck on 25 April 2017.  Mr Loughton, we saw on the footage, had described the detainee as "a cock" in front of the detainee.  Later he described him as "sulking" and Mr Ring had made comments about calling the detainee "a Duracell bunny", and I asked Mr Loughton if he would have challenged these if he had heard them, which he said he didn't, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	I reread it to him and I showed him the transcript and the comment coming right in the middle of the conversation about force and D1914's heart condition, and he still refused to accept that they were talking about the detainee. He said he had heard "If he dies, he dies", but it was just from a film and not referring to detainees. I said:  "Do you accept that is used in relation to the use of force they are planning?"  He said:  "I don't think." I said:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. I won't go through other examples in detail but I also asked Mr Loughton about the language he used in front of the same detainee sorry, about a different detainee, D1527, who had just been found with a ligature around his neck on 25 April 2017.  Mr Loughton, we saw on the footage, had described the detainee as "a cock" in front of the detainee.  Later he described him as "sulking" and Mr Ring had made comments about calling the detainee "a Duracell bunny", and I asked Mr Loughton if he would have challenged these if he had heard them, which he said he didn't, and he accepted it might have been a bit hypocritical to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	I reread it to him and I showed him the transcript and the comment coming right in the middle of the conversation about force and D1914's heart condition, and he still refused to accept that they were talking about the detainee. He said he had heard "If he dies, he dies", but it was just from a film and not referring to detainees. I said:  "Do you accept that is used in relation to the use of force they are planning?"  He said:  "I don't think."  I said:  "You think they were just quoting from a film in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. I won't go through other examples in detail but I also asked Mr Loughton about the language he used in front of the same detainee sorry, about a different detainee, D1527, who had just been found with a ligature around his neck on 25 April 2017.  Mr Loughton, we saw on the footage, had described the detainee as "a cock" in front of the detainee.  Later he described him as "sulking" and Mr Ring had made comments about calling the detainee "a Duracell bunny", and I asked Mr Loughton if he would have challenged these if he had heard them, which he said he didn't, and he accepted it might have been a bit hypocritical to challenge Mr Ring, given that he had just called the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	I reread it to him and I showed him the transcript and the comment coming right in the middle of the conversation about force and D1914's heart condition, and he still refused to accept that they were talking about the detainee. He said he had heard "If he dies, he dies", but it was just from a film and not referring to detainees. I said:  "Do you accept that is used in relation to the use of force they are planning?"  He said:  "I don't think."  I said:  "You think they were just quoting from a film in the middle of a conversation?"	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. I won't go through other examples in detail but I also asked Mr Loughton about the language he used in front of the same detainee sorry, about a different detainee, D1527, who had just been found with a ligature around his neck on 25 April 2017.  Mr Loughton, we saw on the footage, had described the detainee as "a cock" in front of the detainee.  Later he described him as "sulking" and Mr Ring had made comments about calling the detainee "a Duracell bunny", and I asked Mr Loughton if he would have challenged these if he had heard them, which he said he didn't, and he accepted it might have been a bit hypocritical to challenge Mr Ring, given that he had just called the detainee "a cock" himself. Then he added that, when
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	I reread it to him and I showed him the transcript and the comment coming right in the middle of the conversation about force and D1914's heart condition, and he still refused to accept that they were talking about the detainee. He said he had heard "If he dies, he dies", but it was just from a film and not referring to detainees. I said:  "Do you accept that is used in relation to the use of force they are planning?"  He said:  "I don't think."  I said:  "You think they were just quoting from a film in the middle of a conversation?"  And he said:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. I won't go through other examples in detail but I also asked Mr Loughton about the language he used in front of the same detainee sorry, about a different detainee, D1527, who had just been found with a ligature around his neck on 25 April 2017.  Mr Loughton, we saw on the footage, had described the detainee as "a cock" in front of the detainee.  Later he described him as "sulking" and Mr Ring had made comments about calling the detainee "a Duracell bunny", and I asked Mr Loughton if he would have challenged these if he had heard them, which he said he didn't, and he accepted it might have been a bit hypocritical to challenge Mr Ring, given that he had just called the detainee "a cock" himself. Then he added that, when I was questioning his use of the terms, that I was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	I reread it to him and I showed him the transcript and the comment coming right in the middle of the conversation about force and D1914's heart condition, and he still refused to accept that they were talking about the detainee. He said he had heard "If he dies, he dies", but it was just from a film and not referring to detainees. I said:  "Do you accept that is used in relation to the use of force they are planning?"  He said:  "I don't think."  I said:  "You think they were just quoting from a film in the middle of a conversation?"  And he said:  "Yeah, that's why he's laughing afterwards. It's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. I won't go through other examples in detail but I also asked Mr Loughton about the language he used in front of the same detainee sorry, about a different detainee, D1527, who had just been found with a ligature around his neck on 25 April 2017.  Mr Loughton, we saw on the footage, had described the detainee as "a cock" in front of the detainee.  Later he described him as "sulking" and Mr Ring had made comments about calling the detainee "a Duracell bunny", and I asked Mr Loughton if he would have challenged these if he had heard them, which he said he didn't, and he accepted it might have been a bit hypocritical to challenge Mr Ring, given that he had just called the detainee "a cock" himself. Then he added that, when I was questioning his use of the terms, that I was focusing too much on language and reading too much into
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	I reread it to him and I showed him the transcript and the comment coming right in the middle of the conversation about force and D1914's heart condition, and he still refused to accept that they were talking about the detainee. He said he had heard "If he dies, he dies", but it was just from a film and not referring to detainees. I said:  "Do you accept that is used in relation to the use of force they are planning?"  He said:  "I don't think."  I said:  "You think they were just quoting from a film in the middle of a conversation?"  And he said:  "Yeah, that's why he's laughing afterwards. It's probably just something he's just said. No one wants to see anyone die, do they?"	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. I won't go through other examples in detail but I also asked Mr Loughton about the language he used in front of the same detainee sorry, about a different detainee, D1527, who had just been found with a ligature around his neck on 25 April 2017.  Mr Loughton, we saw on the footage, had described the detainee as "a cock" in front of the detainee.  Later he described him as "sulking" and Mr Ring had made comments about calling the detainee "a Duracell bunny", and I asked Mr Loughton if he would have challenged these if he had heard them, which he said he didn't, and he accepted it might have been a bit hypocritical to challenge Mr Ring, given that he had just called the detainee "a cock" himself. Then he added that, when I was questioning his use of the terms, that I was focusing too much on language and reading too much into it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	I reread it to him and I showed him the transcript and the comment coming right in the middle of the conversation about force and D1914's heart condition, and he still refused to accept that they were talking about the detainee. He said he had heard "If he dies, he dies", but it was just from a film and not referring to detainees. I said:  "Do you accept that is used in relation to the use of force they are planning?"  He said:  "I don't think."  I said:  "You think they were just quoting from a film in the middle of a conversation?"  And he said:  "Yeah, that's why he's laughing afterwards. It's probably just something he's just said. No one wants to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. I won't go through other examples in detail but I also asked Mr Loughton about the language he used in front of the same detainee sorry, about a different detainee, D1527, who had just been found with a ligature around his neck on 25 April 2017.  Mr Loughton, we saw on the footage, had described the detainee as "a cock" in front of the detainee.  Later he described him as "sulking" and Mr Ring had made comments about calling the detainee "a Duracell bunny", and I asked Mr Loughton if he would have challenged these if he had heard them, which he said he didn't, and he accepted it might have been a bit hypocritical to challenge Mr Ring, given that he had just called the detainee "a cock" himself. Then he added that, when I was questioning his use of the terms, that I was focusing too much on language and reading too much into it.  Do you think that raising concerns about staff using
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	I reread it to him and I showed him the transcript and the comment coming right in the middle of the conversation about force and D1914's heart condition, and he still refused to accept that they were talking about the detainee. He said he had heard "If he dies, he dies", but it was just from a film and not referring to detainees. I said:  "Do you accept that is used in relation to the use of force they are planning?"  He said:  "I don't think."  I said:  "You think they were just quoting from a film in the middle of a conversation?"  And he said:  "Yeah, that's why he's laughing afterwards. It's probably just something he's just said. No one wants to see anyone die, do they?"  Is that being open about poor culture in the past	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. I won't go through other examples in detail but I also asked Mr Loughton about the language he used in front of the same detainee sorry, about a different detainee, D1527, who had just been found with a ligature around his neck on 25 April 2017.  Mr Loughton, we saw on the footage, had described the detainee as "a cock" in front of the detainee.  Later he described him as "sulking" and Mr Ring had made comments about calling the detainee "a Duracell bunny", and I asked Mr Loughton if he would have challenged these if he had heard them, which he said he didn't, and he accepted it might have been a bit hypocritical to challenge Mr Ring, given that he had just called the detainee "a cock" himself. Then he added that, when I was questioning his use of the terms, that I was focusing too much on language and reading too much into it.  Do you think that raising concerns about staff using terms like this in front of detainees and about them is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	I reread it to him and I showed him the transcript and the comment coming right in the middle of the conversation about force and D1914's heart condition, and he still refused to accept that they were talking about the detainee. He said he had heard "If he dies, he dies", but it was just from a film and not referring to detainees. I said:  "Do you accept that is used in relation to the use of force they are planning?"  He said:  "I don't think."  I said:  "You think they were just quoting from a film in the middle of a conversation?"  And he said:  "Yeah, that's why he's laughing afterwards. It's probably just something he's just said. No one wants to see anyone die, do they?"  Is that being open about poor culture in the past and learning from it?  A. Obviously, there is a misinterpretation of what was said	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. I won't go through other examples in detail but I also asked Mr Loughton about the language he used in front of the same detainee sorry, about a different detainee, D1527, who had just been found with a ligature around his neck on 25 April 2017.  Mr Loughton, we saw on the footage, had described the detainee as "a cock" in front of the detainee.  Later he described him as "sulking" and Mr Ring had made comments about calling the detainee "a Duracell bunny", and I asked Mr Loughton if he would have challenged these if he had heard them, which he said he didn't, and he accepted it might have been a bit hypocritical to challenge Mr Ring, given that he had just called the detainee "a cock" himself. Then he added that, when I was questioning his use of the terms, that I was focusing too much on language and reading too much into it.  Do you think that raising concerns about staff using terms like this in front of detainees and about them is focusing too much on language?  A. No. No.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	I reread it to him and I showed him the transcript and the comment coming right in the middle of the conversation about force and D1914's heart condition, and he still refused to accept that they were talking about the detainee. He said he had heard "If he dies, he dies", but it was just from a film and not referring to detainees. I said:  "Do you accept that is used in relation to the use of force they are planning?"  He said:  "I don't think."  I said:  "You think they were just quoting from a film in the middle of a conversation?"  And he said:  "Yeah, that's why he's laughing afterwards. It's probably just something he's just said. No one wants to see anyone die, do they?"  Is that being open about poor culture in the past and learning from it?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. I won't go through other examples in detail but I also asked Mr Loughton about the language he used in front of the same detainee sorry, about a different detainee, D1527, who had just been found with a ligature around his neck on 25 April 2017.  Mr Loughton, we saw on the footage, had described the detainee as "a cock" in front of the detainee.  Later he described him as "sulking" and Mr Ring had made comments about calling the detainee "a Duracell bunny", and I asked Mr Loughton if he would have challenged these if he had heard them, which he said he didn't, and he accepted it might have been a bit hypocritical to challenge Mr Ring, given that he had just called the detainee "a cock" himself. Then he added that, when I was questioning his use of the terms, that I was focusing too much on language and reading too much into it.  Do you think that raising concerns about staff using terms like this in front of detainees and about them is focusing too much on language?  A. No. No.  Q. Is the impression that you received at Brook House, if
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I reread it to him and I showed him the transcript and the comment coming right in the middle of the conversation about force and D1914's heart condition, and he still refused to accept that they were talking about the detainee. He said he had heard "If he dies, he dies", but it was just from a film and not referring to detainees. I said:  "Do you accept that is used in relation to the use of force they are planning?"  He said:  "I don't think."  I said:  "You think they were just quoting from a film in the middle of a conversation?"  And he said:  "Yeah, that's why he's laughing afterwards. It's probably just something he's just said. No one wants to see anyone die, do they?"  Is that being open about poor culture in the past and learning from it?  A. Obviously, there is a misinterpretation of what was said at the point, yes. That was then, I suppose; this is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. I won't go through other examples in detail but I also asked Mr Loughton about the language he used in front of the same detainee sorry, about a different detainee, D1527, who had just been found with a ligature around his neck on 25 April 2017.  Mr Loughton, we saw on the footage, had described the detainee as "a cock" in front of the detainee.  Later he described him as "sulking" and Mr Ring had made comments about calling the detainee "a Duracell bunny", and I asked Mr Loughton if he would have challenged these if he had heard them, which he said he didn't, and he accepted it might have been a bit hypocritical to challenge Mr Ring, given that he had just called the detainee "a cock" himself. Then he added that, when I was questioning his use of the terms, that I was focusing too much on language and reading too much into it.  Do you think that raising concerns about staff using terms like this in front of detainees and about them is focusing too much on language?  A. No. No.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	I reread it to him and I showed him the transcript and the comment coming right in the middle of the conversation about force and D1914's heart condition, and he still refused to accept that they were talking about the detainee. He said he had heard "If he dies, he dies", but it was just from a film and not referring to detainees. I said:  "Do you accept that is used in relation to the use of force they are planning?"  He said:  "I don't think."  I said:  "You think they were just quoting from a film in the middle of a conversation?"  And he said:  "Yeah, that's why he's laughing afterwards. It's probably just something he's just said. No one wants to see anyone die, do they?"  Is that being open about poor culture in the past and learning from it?  A. Obviously, there is a misinterpretation of what was said at the point, yes. That was then, I suppose; this is now, at this point in time. The culture — all I would say is the culture is — it's not acceptable. The words	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. I won't go through other examples in detail but I also asked Mr Loughton about the language he used in front of the same detainee sorry, about a different detainee, D1527, who had just been found with a ligature around his neck on 25 April 2017.  Mr Loughton, we saw on the footage, had described the detainee as "a cock" in front of the detainee.  Later he described him as "sulking" and Mr Ring had made comments about calling the detainee "a Duracell bunny", and I asked Mr Loughton if he would have challenged these if he had heard them, which he said he didn't, and he accepted it might have been a bit hypocritical to challenge Mr Ring, given that he had just called the detainee "a cock" himself. Then he added that, when I was questioning his use of the terms, that I was focusing too much on language and reading too much into it.  Do you think that raising concerns about staff using terms like this in front of detainees and about them is focusing too much on language?  A. No. No.  Q. Is the impression that you received at Brook House, if and when you challenge staff about language use, that you are focusing too much on language or do they accept
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	I reread it to him and I showed him the transcript and the comment coming right in the middle of the conversation about force and D1914's heart condition, and he still refused to accept that they were talking about the detainee. He said he had heard "If he dies, he dies", but it was just from a film and not referring to detainees. I said:  "Do you accept that is used in relation to the use of force they are planning?"  He said:  "I don't think."  I said:  "You think they were just quoting from a film in the middle of a conversation?"  And he said:  "Yeah, that's why he's laughing afterwards. It's probably just something he's just said. No one wants to see anyone die, do they?"  Is that being open about poor culture in the past and learning from it?  A. Obviously, there is a misinterpretation of what was said at the point, yes. That was then, I suppose; this is now, at this point in time. The culture — all I would	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. I won't go through other examples in detail but I also asked Mr Loughton about the language he used in front of the same detainee sorry, about a different detainee, D1527, who had just been found with a ligature around his neck on 25 April 2017.  Mr Loughton, we saw on the footage, had described the detainee as "a cock" in front of the detainee.  Later he described him as "sulking" and Mr Ring had made comments about calling the detainee "a Duracell bunny", and I asked Mr Loughton if he would have challenged these if he had heard them, which he said he didn't, and he accepted it might have been a bit hypocritical to challenge Mr Ring, given that he had just called the detainee "a cock" himself. Then he added that, when I was questioning his use of the terms, that I was focusing too much on language and reading too much into it.  Do you think that raising concerns about staff using terms like this in front of detainees and about them is focusing too much on language?  A. No. No.  Q. Is the impression that you received at Brook House, if and when you challenge staff about language use, that

1	it is serious?	1	Mr Fraser informally, as far as you remember, about
2	A. I think now they accept it is serious. I think,	2	failing to do constant observations?"
3	culturally-wise, the tone we set about language in front	3	He said:
4	of residents and appropriateness and decency is	4	"I don't think so, no."
5	I think the majority of the staff now fully understand	5	I said:
6	that.	6	"Did you take any action at all to ensure that what
7	Q. Do you think from the evidence and from what Mr Loughton	7	you call a safeguarding issue here doesn't happen
8	said that he maybe doesn't understand that?	8	again?"
9	A. At that point in time he didn't. I don't think he did	9	He said:
10	then.	10	"What, with Mr Fraser?"
11	Q. When he gave evidence to the inquiry?	11	I said "Yes", and he said:
12	A. I am clear in my leadership with him now, he understands	12	"I didn't speak to Clayton. He didn't often work at
13	what is expected and what is not expected language-wise.	13	Brook House."
14	Q. When you say "that point in time", do you mean when he	14	Is that something you followed up, does that cause
15	gave evidence?	15	you concern?
16	A. No, I am not talking about the evidence; I am talking	16	A. It is not something I followed up on, no.
17	about the quotation.	17	Q. Does it cause us you concern?
18	Q. But when he gave evidence	18	A. It does cause some concern, yes, because I would expect
19	A. Because I have challenged him - I have challenged him	19	senior managers to address actions, particularly when
20	on this, on the wording, et cetera, and he tells me that	20	there is a level of vulnerability of residents that need
21	the words were said when he closed the bedroom door and	21	to be cared for as well.
22	exited because he was frustrated	22	Q. Finally, in concluding his evidence, Mr Loughton was
23	Q. Sure. Well, we see him	23	asked about Facebook comments he had made about
24	A at this time, and he said he apologised for that as	24	Callum Tulley in which he said "Don't be fooled", and
25	well at the time.	25	"He's a fake", and "It's all an act". He denied that he
	7		D = -
	Page 69		Page 71
1	Q. Okay. Well, we see him on the footage calling the	1	called Mr Tulley a snitch but said that he did feel let
2	detainee "a cock" while he is walking in front of him,	2	down by him.
3	,		down ov min.
	not when he has left the room.	3	•
4			He was then asked by the chair if he was surprised
	A. Okay. I didn't see that.	3	•
4	<ul><li>A. Okay. I didn't see that.</li><li>Q. In any event, you say, when you have challenged him on</li></ul>	3 4	He was then asked by the chair if he was surprised by the Panorama footage and he said "Such as?" Then, when he was asked:
4 5	A. Okay. I didn't see that.	3 4 5	He was then asked by the chair if he was surprised by the Panorama footage and he said "Such as?" Then,
4 5 6	<ul><li>A. Okay. I didn't see that.</li><li>Q. In any event, you say, when you have challenged him on it, he has taken it seriously?</li><li>A. Yes. Yes.</li></ul>	3 4 5 6	He was then asked by the chair if he was surprised by the Panorama footage and he said "Such as?" Then, when he was asked:  "The use of force in particular."
4 5 6 7	<ul><li>A. Okay. I didn't see that.</li><li>Q. In any event, you say, when you have challenged him on it, he has taken it seriously?</li></ul>	3 4 5 6 7	He was then asked by the chair if he was surprised by the Panorama footage and he said "Such as?" Then, when he was asked:  "The use of force in particular."  He said:  "Which use of force?"
4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A. Okay. I didn't see that.</li> <li>Q. In any event, you say, when you have challenged him on it, he has taken it seriously?</li> <li>A. Yes. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Despite that, when I asked him about it, he said I was</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8	He was then asked by the chair if he was surprised by the Panorama footage and he said "Such as?" Then, when he was asked:  "The use of force in particular."  He said:
4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. Okay. I didn't see that.</li> <li>Q. In any event, you say, when you have challenged him on it, he has taken it seriously?</li> <li>A. Yes. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Despite that, when I asked him about it, he said I was focusing too much on language?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	He was then asked by the chair if he was surprised by the Panorama footage and he said "Such as?" Then, when he was asked:  "The use of force in particular."  He said:  "Which use of force?"  Then, when pressed to comment particularly about the
4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. Okay. I didn't see that.</li> <li>Q. In any event, you say, when you have challenged him on it, he has taken it seriously?</li> <li>A. Yes. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Despite that, when I asked him about it, he said I was focusing too much on language?</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	He was then asked by the chair if he was surprised by the Panorama footage and he said "Such as?" Then, when he was asked:  "The use of force in particular."  He said:  "Which use of force?"  Then, when pressed to comment particularly about the incident with Mr Paschali and D1527, he said:
4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A. Okay. I didn't see that.</li> <li>Q. In any event, you say, when you have challenged him on it, he has taken it seriously?</li> <li>A. Yes. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Despite that, when I asked him about it, he said I was focusing too much on language?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Discussing the same event, Mr Loughton said that the</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	He was then asked by the chair if he was surprised by the Panorama footage and he said "Such as?" Then, when he was asked:  "The use of force in particular."  He said:  "Which use of force?"  Then, when pressed to comment particularly about the incident with Mr Paschali and D1527, he said:  "I wasn't there so I can't comment on that. You
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. Okay. I didn't see that.</li> <li>Q. In any event, you say, when you have challenged him on it, he has taken it seriously?</li> <li>A. Yes. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Despite that, when I asked him about it, he said I was focusing too much on language?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Discussing the same event, Mr Loughton said that the incident with D1527 should never have happened,</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	He was then asked by the chair if he was surprised by the Panorama footage and he said "Such as?" Then, when he was asked:  "The use of force in particular."  He said:  "Which use of force?"  Then, when pressed to comment particularly about the incident with Mr Paschali and D1527, he said:  "I wasn't there so I can't comment on that. You have spoken to people involved in that previously, so it is down to them to comment on that."
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. Okay. I didn't see that.</li> <li>Q. In any event, you say, when you have challenged him on it, he has taken it seriously?</li> <li>A. Yes. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Despite that, when I asked him about it, he said I was focusing too much on language?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Discussing the same event, Mr Loughton said that the incident with D1527 should never have happened, shouldn't have got to the point of him having a ligature</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	He was then asked by the chair if he was surprised by the Panorama footage and he said "Such as?" Then, when he was asked:  "The use of force in particular."  He said:  "Which use of force?"  Then, when pressed to comment particularly about the incident with Mr Paschali and D1527, he said:  "I wasn't there so I can't comment on that. You have spoken to people involved in that previously, so it
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. Okay. I didn't see that.</li> <li>Q. In any event, you say, when you have challenged him on it, he has taken it seriously?</li> <li>A. Yes. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Despite that, when I asked him about it, he said I was focusing too much on language?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Discussing the same event, Mr Loughton said that the incident with D1527 should never have happened, shouldn't have got to the point of him having a ligature around his neck, and he said that he should have been on</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	He was then asked by the chair if he was surprised by the Panorama footage and he said "Such as?" Then, when he was asked:  "The use of force in particular."  He said:  "Which use of force?"  Then, when pressed to comment particularly about the incident with Mr Paschali and D1527, he said:  "I wasn't there so I can't comment on that. You have spoken to people involved in that previously, so it is down to them to comment on that."  You don't have to be present at that event to have
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. Okay. I didn't see that.</li> <li>Q. In any event, you say, when you have challenged him on it, he has taken it seriously?</li> <li>A. Yes. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Despite that, when I asked him about it, he said I was focusing too much on language?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Discussing the same event, Mr Loughton said that the incident with D1527 should never have happened, shouldn't have got to the point of him having a ligature around his neck, and he said that he should have been on constant watch by Mr Fraser.</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	He was then asked by the chair if he was surprised by the Panorama footage and he said "Such as?" Then, when he was asked:  "The use of force in particular."  He said:  "Which use of force?"  Then, when pressed to comment particularly about the incident with Mr Paschali and D1527, he said:  "I wasn't there so I can't comment on that. You have spoken to people involved in that previously, so it is down to them to comment on that."  You don't have to be present at that event to have a view on it, do you, Mr Hewer?
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. Okay. I didn't see that.</li> <li>Q. In any event, you say, when you have challenged him on it, he has taken it seriously?</li> <li>A. Yes. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Despite that, when I asked him about it, he said I was focusing too much on language?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Discussing the same event, Mr Loughton said that the incident with D1527 should never have happened, shouldn't have got to the point of him having a ligature around his neck, and he said that he should have been on constant watch by Mr Fraser. I asked him:</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	He was then asked by the chair if he was surprised by the Panorama footage and he said "Such as?" Then, when he was asked:  "The use of force in particular."  He said:  "Which use of force?"  Then, when pressed to comment particularly about the incident with Mr Paschali and D1527, he said:  "I wasn't there so I can't comment on that. You have spoken to people involved in that previously, so it is down to them to comment on that."  You don't have to be present at that event to have a view on it, do you, Mr Hewer?  A. No, you don't. No.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. Okay. I didn't see that.</li> <li>Q. In any event, you say, when you have challenged him on it, he has taken it seriously?</li> <li>A. Yes. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Despite that, when I asked him about it, he said I was focusing too much on language?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Discussing the same event, Mr Loughton said that the incident with D1527 should never have happened, shouldn't have got to the point of him having a ligature around his neck, and he said that he should have been on constant watch by Mr Fraser. <ul> <li>I asked him:</li> <li>"Did you report Mr Fraser for failing to do proper</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	He was then asked by the chair if he was surprised by the Panorama footage and he said "Such as?" Then, when he was asked:  "The use of force in particular."  He said:  "Which use of force?"  Then, when pressed to comment particularly about the incident with Mr Paschali and D1527, he said:  "I wasn't there so I can't comment on that. You have spoken to people involved in that previously, so it is down to them to comment on that."  You don't have to be present at that event to have a view on it, do you, Mr Hewer?  A. No, you don't. No.  Q. You have told us yourself it is obviously unacceptable?
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. Okay. I didn't see that.</li> <li>Q. In any event, you say, when you have challenged him on it, he has taken it seriously?</li> <li>A. Yes. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Despite that, when I asked him about it, he said I was focusing too much on language?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Discussing the same event, Mr Loughton said that the incident with D1527 should never have happened, shouldn't have got to the point of him having a ligature around his neck, and he said that he should have been on constant watch by Mr Fraser.  I asked him:  "Did you report Mr Fraser for failing to do proper observations, as you see it?"</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	He was then asked by the chair if he was surprised by the Panorama footage and he said "Such as?" Then, when he was asked:  "The use of force in particular."  He said:  "Which use of force?"  Then, when pressed to comment particularly about the incident with Mr Paschali and D1527, he said:  "I wasn't there so I can't comment on that. You have spoken to people involved in that previously, so it is down to them to comment on that."  You don't have to be present at that event to have a view on it, do you, Mr Hewer?  A. No, you don't. No.  Q. You have told us yourself it is obviously unacceptable?  A. Yes. Yes.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. Okay. I didn't see that.</li> <li>Q. In any event, you say, when you have challenged him on it, he has taken it seriously?</li> <li>A. Yes. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Despite that, when I asked him about it, he said I was focusing too much on language?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Discussing the same event, Mr Loughton said that the incident with D1527 should never have happened, shouldn't have got to the point of him having a ligature around his neck, and he said that he should have been on constant watch by Mr Fraser. <ul> <li>I asked him:</li> <li>"Did you report Mr Fraser for failing to do proper observations, as you see it?"</li> <li>He said:</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	He was then asked by the chair if he was surprised by the Panorama footage and he said "Such as?" Then, when he was asked:  "The use of force in particular."  He said:  "Which use of force?"  Then, when pressed to comment particularly about the incident with Mr Paschali and D1527, he said:  "I wasn't there so I can't comment on that. You have spoken to people involved in that previously, so it is down to them to comment on that."  You don't have to be present at that event to have a view on it, do you, Mr Hewer?  A. No, you don't. No.  Q. You have told us yourself it is obviously unacceptable?  A. Yes. Yes.  Q. Finally, Mr Loughton was asked about how staff might be
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. Okay. I didn't see that.</li> <li>Q. In any event, you say, when you have challenged him on it, he has taken it seriously?</li> <li>A. Yes. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Despite that, when I asked him about it, he said I was focusing too much on language?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Discussing the same event, Mr Loughton said that the incident with D1527 should never have happened, shouldn't have got to the point of him having a ligature around his neck, and he said that he should have been on constant watch by Mr Fraser. <ul> <li>I asked him:</li> <li>"Did you report Mr Fraser for failing to do proper observations, as you see it?"</li> <li>He said:</li> <li>"I didn't report him, no. I was frustrated at the</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	He was then asked by the chair if he was surprised by the Panorama footage and he said "Such as?" Then, when he was asked:  "The use of force in particular."  He said:  "Which use of force?"  Then, when pressed to comment particularly about the incident with Mr Paschali and D1527, he said:  "I wasn't there so I can't comment on that. You have spoken to people involved in that previously, so it is down to them to comment on that."  You don't have to be present at that event to have a view on it, do you, Mr Hewer?  A. No, you don't. No.  Q. You have told us yourself it is obviously unacceptable?  A. Yes. Yes.  Q. Finally, Mr Loughton was asked about how staff might be assisted, again by the chair, to cope with distressing
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. Okay. I didn't see that.</li> <li>Q. In any event, you say, when you have challenged him on it, he has taken it seriously?</li> <li>A. Yes. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Despite that, when I asked him about it, he said I was focusing too much on language?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Discussing the same event, Mr Loughton said that the incident with D1527 should never have happened, shouldn't have got to the point of him having a ligature around his neck, and he said that he should have been on constant watch by Mr Fraser. <ul> <li>I asked him:</li> <li>"Did you report Mr Fraser for failing to do proper observations, as you see it?"</li> <li>He said:</li> <li>"I didn't report him, no. I was frustrated at the time because I felt I did his job for him."</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	He was then asked by the chair if he was surprised by the Panorama footage and he said "Such as?" Then, when he was asked:  "The use of force in particular."  He said:  "Which use of force?"  Then, when pressed to comment particularly about the incident with Mr Paschali and D1527, he said:  "I wasn't there so I can't comment on that. You have spoken to people involved in that previously, so it is down to them to comment on that."  You don't have to be present at that event to have a view on it, do you, Mr Hewer?  A. No, you don't. No.  Q. You have told us yourself it is obviously unacceptable?  A. Yes. Yes.  Q. Finally, Mr Loughton was asked about how staff might be assisted, again by the chair, to cope with distressing events. He said he tries to support his staff but you
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. Okay. I didn't see that.</li> <li>Q. In any event, you say, when you have challenged him on it, he has taken it seriously?</li> <li>A. Yes. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Despite that, when I asked him about it, he said I was focusing too much on language?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Discussing the same event, Mr Loughton said that the incident with D1527 should never have happened, shouldn't have got to the point of him having a ligature around his neck, and he said that he should have been on constant watch by Mr Fraser. <ul> <li>I asked him:</li> <li>"Did you report Mr Fraser for failing to do proper observations, as you see it?"</li> <li>He said:</li> <li>"I didn't report him, no. I was frustrated at the time because I felt I did his job for him."</li> <li>Then he explained a little more about how he entered</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	He was then asked by the chair if he was surprised by the Panorama footage and he said "Such as?" Then, when he was asked:  "The use of force in particular."  He said:  "Which use of force?"  Then, when pressed to comment particularly about the incident with Mr Paschali and D1527, he said:  "I wasn't there so I can't comment on that. You have spoken to people involved in that previously, so it is down to them to comment on that."  You don't have to be present at that event to have a view on it, do you, Mr Hewer?  A. No, you don't. No.  Q. You have told us yourself it is obviously unacceptable?  A. Yes. Yes.  Q. Finally, Mr Loughton was asked about how staff might be assisted, again by the chair, to cope with distressing events. He said he tries to support his staff but you cannot teach coping mechanisms; he said they are not
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. Okay. I didn't see that.</li> <li>Q. In any event, you say, when you have challenged him on it, he has taken it seriously?</li> <li>A. Yes. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Despite that, when I asked him about it, he said I was focusing too much on language?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Discussing the same event, Mr Loughton said that the incident with D1527 should never have happened, shouldn't have got to the point of him having a ligature around his neck, and he said that he should have been on constant watch by Mr Fraser. <ul> <li>I asked him:</li> <li>"Did you report Mr Fraser for failing to do proper observations, as you see it?"</li> <li>He said:</li> <li>"I didn't report him, no. I was frustrated at the time because I felt I did his job for him."</li> <li>Then he explained a little more about how he entered the room.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	He was then asked by the chair if he was surprised by the Panorama footage and he said "Such as?" Then, when he was asked:  "The use of force in particular."  He said:  "Which use of force?"  Then, when pressed to comment particularly about the incident with Mr Paschali and D1527, he said:  "I wasn't there so I can't comment on that. You have spoken to people involved in that previously, so it is down to them to comment on that."  You don't have to be present at that event to have a view on it, do you, Mr Hewer?  A. No, you don't. No.  Q. You have told us yourself it is obviously unacceptable?  A. Yes. Yes.  Q. Finally, Mr Loughton was asked about how staff might be assisted, again by the chair, to cope with distressing events. He said he tries to support his staff but you cannot teach coping mechanisms; he said they are not taught and he doesn't believe they can be taught.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. Okay. I didn't see that.</li> <li>Q. In any event, you say, when you have challenged him on it, he has taken it seriously?</li> <li>A. Yes. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Despite that, when I asked him about it, he said I was focusing too much on language?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Discussing the same event, Mr Loughton said that the incident with D1527 should never have happened, shouldn't have got to the point of him having a ligature around his neck, and he said that he should have been on constant watch by Mr Fraser. <ul> <li>I asked him:</li> <li>"Did you report Mr Fraser for failing to do proper observations, as you see it?"</li> <li>He said:</li> <li>"I didn't report him, no. I was frustrated at the time because I felt I did his job for him."</li> <li>Then he explained a little more about how he entered the room.</li> <li>I said:</li> <li>"You said you didn't report him. Did you speak to</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	He was then asked by the chair if he was surprised by the Panorama footage and he said "Such as?" Then, when he was asked:  "The use of force in particular."  He said:  "Which use of force?"  Then, when pressed to comment particularly about the incident with Mr Paschali and D1527, he said:  "I wasn't there so I can't comment on that. You have spoken to people involved in that previously, so it is down to them to comment on that."  You don't have to be present at that event to have a view on it, do you, Mr Hewer?  A. No, you don't. No.  Q. You have told us yourself it is obviously unacceptable?  A. Yes. Yes.  Q. Finally, Mr Loughton was asked about how staff might be assisted, again by the chair, to cope with distressing events. He said he tries to support his staff but you cannot teach coping mechanisms; he said they are not taught and he doesn't believe they can be taught.  Mr Loughton is now assistant director at Brook House. He is or might be, as we have seen,
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. Okay. I didn't see that.</li> <li>Q. In any event, you say, when you have challenged him on it, he has taken it seriously?</li> <li>A. Yes. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Despite that, when I asked him about it, he said I was focusing too much on language?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Discussing the same event, Mr Loughton said that the incident with D1527 should never have happened, shouldn't have got to the point of him having a ligature around his neck, and he said that he should have been on constant watch by Mr Fraser. <ul> <li>I asked him:</li> <li>"Did you report Mr Fraser for failing to do proper observations, as you see it?"</li> <li>He said:</li> <li>"I didn't report him, no. I was frustrated at the time because I felt I did his job for him."</li> <li>Then he explained a little more about how he entered the room.</li> <li>I said:</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	He was then asked by the chair if he was surprised by the Panorama footage and he said "Such as?" Then, when he was asked:  "The use of force in particular."  He said:  "Which use of force?"  Then, when pressed to comment particularly about the incident with Mr Paschali and D1527, he said:  "I wasn't there so I can't comment on that. You have spoken to people involved in that previously, so it is down to them to comment on that."  You don't have to be present at that event to have a view on it, do you, Mr Hewer?  A. No, you don't. No.  Q. You have told us yourself it is obviously unacceptable?  A. Yes. Yes.  Q. Finally, Mr Loughton was asked about how staff might be assisted, again by the chair, to cope with distressing events. He said he tries to support his staff but you cannot teach coping mechanisms; he said they are not taught and he doesn't believe they can be taught.  Mr Loughton is now assistant director at

	T		
1 involved in investigating s	taff cultural issues. Is it	1	However, when asked about the debrief of the event, he
2 fair to assume, given the ev	vidence he gave to the	2	only said that there was a discrepancy, and I am reading
3 inquiry, that he hadn't reall	y reflected on the events	3	from his account now:
4 he was involved in?		4	" which have I have admitted was a mistake but at
5 A. It is fair to assume that,	yes.	5	the time, again and I have no extra training to be
6 Q. What do you intend to do	about that?	6	a supervisor and I would only hope that, obviously, if
7 A. Well, I will separately d	iscuss with my senior	7	it was a review after these sorts of errors would have
8 management team on the	matter.	8	been made where I would have been made aware of it."
9 Q. He has been promoted in	fact, hasn't he, between the	9	Ms Townshend asked him:
10 relevant period and now?		10	"Did you need extra training to tell the truth at
11 A. He has indeed, yes.		11	a debrief?"
12 Q. He was a DCM then and l	he became a E1 in 2019 and in 2020	12	He said:
13 a further promotion saw hi	m join the senior management	13	"I am not saying I haven't told the truth. I am
team where he remains?		14	saying it was a mistake and I was concentrating on the
15 <b>A. Yes.</b>		15	version of events."
16 Q. Another senior director is	Mr Dix. He gave evidence on	16	He says bear in mind your adrenaline is running
17 9 March and was asked by	Ms Townshend about a number of	17	high, he may have been working 13 to 15 hours that day:
18 events in which he was inv	rolved. One related to	18	"It was a mistake that slipped my mind."
19 a detained person who was	to be moved to the CSU under	19	Ms Townshend said:
20 rule 40. If you saw his evi	dence, or you have read	20	"It couldn't have slipped your mind, could it,
21 Mr Collier's report, you wi	ll be familiar with this	21	because you said the exact opposite of what in fact
22 event.		22	happened?"
23 A. Yes.		23	He said:
Q. It is a use of force on D19	978 on 26 May, and in short	24	"I don't at the time of the debrief, it's just
25 I will just read from Mr Co	ollier's report because it	25	an initial response to what happened. Sometimes you are
Th.	72		D 75
Page	2 / 3		Page 75
1 summarises it at paragrap	sh 384. There is no need to	1	going to miss things, sometimes you make mistakes, but
2 turn it up. Mr Collier's re	eport says:	2	in hindsight, you know, if I had been aware of the
3 "The footage from the	debrief [and the debrief was	3	mistakes I had made and it had been picked up, it would
4 by Mr Dix] provides a di	fferent version of events when	4	have been picked up, but I didn't have any prior
5 described by DCM Dix a	s compared to what actually	5	knowledge to what the footage showed, or anything like
6 happened. During the de	brief he states D1978 started to	6	that."
7 encroach towards him an	d he had no option but to deploy	7	So he failed, in short, to accept during the debrief
8 the team. The scene foot	age clearly shows DCM Dix stand	8	that he had lied about why force was used, when asked by
9 aside to allow D1978 to l	eave the room and then the team	9	the inquiry. He did accept that force should never have
move in and restrain D19	778. DCM Dix makes a	10	been used but, even when faced with footage of the
11 half-hearted attempt to st	op staff, but only after the	11	incident and the debrief and with the inquiry's expert
12 first DCM has entered the	e room. DCM Dix utters quietly	12	report, he wouldn't accept that he didn't tell the truth
to himself 'No, no, no'."		13	in the debrief.
Now, Mr Dix accepted	during his evidence that he	14	It is a really serious thing to fabricate, isn't it,
15 didn't wait for the detained	ee to leave compliantly. He	15	the rationale for the use of force?
said, "Obviously, I wish I	I did." He said that looking	16	A. Yes. Yes.
17 at the footage, which sho	ws the detainee nod and walk	17	Q. I will ask you what Mr Dix was asked: you don't need
18 towards the door, he said		1.0	training, do you, to not lie in a debrief? He shouldn't
19 "It looked like he was	:	18	training, do you, to not he in a deorier. The shouldn't
	: going to comply and obviously	19	rely, as he seems to, on someone else picking up his
there was a mistake and I			
there was a mistake and I 21 his team] by going 'No, n	going to comply and obviously 've tried to stop them [meaning	19	rely, as he seems to, on someone else picking up his
21 his team] by going 'No, n	going to comply and obviously 've tried to stop them [meaning	19 20	rely, as he seems to, on someone else picking up his mistake by watching the footage, he should have been
his team] by going 'No, n  He was asked why he t	going to comply and obviously 've tried to stop them [meaning o, no'."	19 20 21	rely, as he seems to, on someone else picking up his mistake by watching the footage, he should have been honest and accurate at the debrief in the first place.
his team] by going 'No, n He was asked why he t the detainee started to en	going to comply and obviously 've tried to stop them [meaning o, no'." then said at the debrief that	19 20 21 22	rely, as he seems to, on someone else picking up his mistake by watching the footage, he should have been honest and accurate at the debrief in the first place.  Does it concern you, or did it when you were
his team] by going 'No, n He was asked why he t the detainee started to en	going to comply and obviously  've tried to stop them [meaning o, no'."  then said at the debrief that croach and so the team had no nd he kept repeating it was	19 20 21 22 23	rely, as he seems to, on someone else picking up his mistake by watching the footage, he should have been honest and accurate at the debrief in the first place.  Does it concern you, or did it when you were watching his evidence, that Mr Dix wouldn't accept that
his team] by going 'No, n He was asked why he t the detainee started to en choice but to use force, a	going to comply and obviously 've tried to stop them [meaning o, no'." then said at the debrief that croach and so the team had no nd he kept repeating it was been verbally abused.	19 20 21 22 23 24	rely, as he seems to, on someone else picking up his mistake by watching the footage, he should have been honest and accurate at the debrief in the first place.  Does it concern you, or did it when you were watching his evidence, that Mr Dix wouldn't accept that he had lied?

1	truthful evidence given at the time.	1	a delay in responding and he accepted that the failure
2	Q. You say it did concern you. So you did watch his	2	to include this almost looked like a cover up. He said
3	evidence, did you?	3	he left it out because he didn't want to look bad.
4	A. I did watch his evidence, yes. I have questioned, after	4	Now, unlike Mr Dix, when he gave evidence he did
5	that evidence, asked for some explanation on some of	5	accept that his account at the time was inaccurate in
6	that as well.	6	a serious respect, I am sure you would agree. Have you
7	Q. And did you get an explanation?	7	been through this event with Mr Donnelly since you took
8	A. That he had made a mistake at the point in time and	8	over at Serco?
9	there was no intention to send the team into the room at	9	A. I haven't, no.
10	that point in time. So	10	Q. Why not?
11	Q. Yes, so that is about the use of force. What did he	11	A. I have not had the opportunity to discuss it with him.
12	tell you about the lie at the debrief?	12	Q. You haven't had the opportunity?
13	A. No.	13	A. No, I have not discussed it with him at all.
14	Q. Did you ask him about that?	14	Q. Do you intend now to discuss it with him?
15	A. I haven't asked him about that, no.	15	A. Yes, we will have a discussion with him, and part of my
16	Q. Why not?	16	senior team will as well.
17	A. Because I have not recalled that part of it.	17	Q. Mr Hewer, there is no time today to go through the
18	Q. So you watched his evidence	18	evidence of other individuals who remain employed at
19	A. I didn't see every part of his evidence, I will be quite	19	Brook House and ask you about whether their accounts to
20	honest, so	20	the inquiry show a lack of reflection, or failure to
21	Q. Will you now ask him about that?	21	learn lessons, or in some case a denial that they heard
22	A. Yes.	22	or saw things when the footage places them right at the
23	Q. What do expect to get from him?	23	centre of an event.
24	A. A full and frank understanding of the circumstances.	24	I have mentioned three people to you now, and you
25	Q. Does it concern you, not only generally but also when	25	said you will speak to them; are you going to speak to
			7 7 7 8 8 1
	Page 77		Page 79
1	you have a contract which relies to some extent on	1	other people who I have not mentioned but who have given
2	self-reporting and holding up your hands and admitting	2	evidence to the inquiry if their evidence causes you a
3	to mistakes, that your senior management team might not	3	concern?
4	be doing so?	4	A. I think it is fair to say there will be a review of
5	A. I would hope so, that culturally-wise and from my	5	everyone that has took part in the inquiry, who's gave
6	leadership, that the team is open, honest and fully	6	evidence from a Serco perspective, and then discuss with
7	transparent now.	7	my legal team as well.
8	Q. Yes, but we have seen some examples of that not being	8	Q. Mr Hewer, a healthy culture document and a spreadsheet
9	the case.	9	is one thing, but real change depends on individuals
10	A. Yes.	10	accepting their errors, being open and honest and
11	Q. We have also heard from Mr Donnelly. He was a DCM	11	holding themselves to account and being held
12	during the relevant period and he is still a DCM now,	12	accountable. Has this happened yet?
13	I believe?	13	A. In respect of?
14	A. Correct.	14	Q. Some of the incidents I have just referred to, for
17	A. COLLECT.		
			example?
15	Q. He was asked by Mr Altman about his actions during	15	example?  A. Yes. It is not evident that it is part of it and part
15 16	Q. He was asked by Mr Altman about his actions during an event where he had entered a room and found	15 16	A. Yes. It is not evident that it is part of it and part
15 16 17	Q. He was asked by Mr Altman about his actions during an event where he had entered a room and found a detainee on the floor that was D865. He completed	15	A. Yes. It is not evident that it is part of it and part of the cultural change programme that we are developing
15 16 17 18	Q. He was asked by Mr Altman about his actions during an event where he had entered a room and found a detainee on the floor that was D865. He completed an incident report where he failed to mention that the	15 16 17	A. Yes. It is not evident that it is part of it and part of the cultural change programme that we are developing and moving forward and things are changing and things
15 16 17 18 19	Q. He was asked by Mr Altman about his actions during an event where he had entered a room and found a detainee on the floor that was D865. He completed an incident report where he failed to mention that the detainee had a ligature around his neck, which he hadn't	15 16 17 18 19	A. Yes. It is not evident that it is part of it and part of the cultural change programme that we are developing and moving forward and things are changing and things are getting for the better, yes, but that is depending
15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. He was asked by Mr Altman about his actions during an event where he had entered a room and found a detainee on the floor that was D865. He completed an incident report where he failed to mention that the detainee had a ligature around his neck, which he hadn't noticed until about two minutes later when Mr Tulley	15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Yes. It is not evident that it is part of it and part of the cultural change programme that we are developing and moving forward and things are changing and things are getting for the better, yes, but that is depending on my leadership and my direction as well within the
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. He was asked by Mr Altman about his actions during an event where he had entered a room and found a detainee on the floor that was D865. He completed an incident report where he failed to mention that the detainee had a ligature around his neck, which he hadn't noticed until about two minutes later when Mr Tulley pointed it out. He didn't mention on the incident	15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Yes. It is not evident that it is part of it and part of the cultural change programme that we are developing and moving forward and things are changing and things are getting for the better, yes, but that is depending on my leadership and my direction as well within the centre.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. He was asked by Mr Altman about his actions during an event where he had entered a room and found a detainee on the floor — that was D865. He completed an incident report where he failed to mention that the detainee had a ligature around his neck, which he hadn't noticed until about two minutes later when Mr Tulley pointed it out. He didn't mention on the incident report that it had taken Mr Tulley to point out before	15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Yes. It is not evident that it is part of it and part of the cultural change programme that we are developing and moving forward and things are changing and things are getting for the better, yes, but that is depending on my leadership and my direction as well within the centre.  Q. Michelle Brown was a member of the SMT during the
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. He was asked by Mr Altman about his actions during an event where he had entered a room and found a detainee on the floor — that was D865. He completed an incident report where he failed to mention that the detainee had a ligature around his neck, which he hadn't noticed until about two minutes later when Mr Tulley pointed it out. He didn't mention on the incident report that it had taken Mr Tulley to point out before he acted. He accepted that there was a paragraph	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Yes. It is not evident that it is part of it and part of the cultural change programme that we are developing and moving forward and things are changing and things are getting for the better, yes, but that is depending on my leadership and my direction as well within the centre.  Q. Michelle Brown was a member of the SMT during the relevant period. She was both head of safeguarding and,
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. He was asked by Mr Altman about his actions during an event where he had entered a room and found a detainee on the floor that was D865. He completed an incident report where he failed to mention that the detainee had a ligature around his neck, which he hadn't noticed until about two minutes later when Mr Tulley pointed it out. He didn't mention on the incident report that it had taken Mr Tulley to point out before he acted. He accepted that there was a paragraph missing from his report which should have mentioned both	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Yes. It is not evident that it is part of it and part of the cultural change programme that we are developing and moving forward and things are changing and things are getting for the better, yes, but that is depending on my leadership and my direction as well within the centre.  Q. Michelle Brown was a member of the SMT during the relevant period. She was both head of safeguarding and, at another point, head of security. Stayed on under
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. He was asked by Mr Altman about his actions during an event where he had entered a room and found a detainee on the floor — that was D865. He completed an incident report where he failed to mention that the detainee had a ligature around his neck, which he hadn't noticed until about two minutes later when Mr Tulley pointed it out. He didn't mention on the incident report that it had taken Mr Tulley to point out before he acted. He accepted that there was a paragraph	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Yes. It is not evident that it is part of it and part of the cultural change programme that we are developing and moving forward and things are changing and things are getting for the better, yes, but that is depending on my leadership and my direction as well within the centre.  Q. Michelle Brown was a member of the SMT during the relevant period. She was both head of safeguarding and,
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. He was asked by Mr Altman about his actions during an event where he had entered a room and found a detainee on the floor that was D865. He completed an incident report where he failed to mention that the detainee had a ligature around his neck, which he hadn't noticed until about two minutes later when Mr Tulley pointed it out. He didn't mention on the incident report that it had taken Mr Tulley to point out before he acted. He accepted that there was a paragraph missing from his report which should have mentioned both	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Yes. It is not evident that it is part of it and part of the cultural change programme that we are developing and moving forward and things are changing and things are getting for the better, yes, but that is depending on my leadership and my direction as well within the centre.  Q. Michelle Brown was a member of the SMT during the relevant period. She was both head of safeguarding and, at another point, head of security. Stayed on under

1	the inquiry at paragraph 126:	1	Is that because, as Ms Shayne Munroe told the
2	"I could not cope working for G4S or Serco any	2	inquiry, it is just the same staff in a different
3	longer. I felt excluded and pushed out. In this	3	uniform?
4	inquiry I fully expect current employees to close ranks	4	A. I don't know that I don't believe that to be true in
5	and it would take a brave person at Gatwick to speak the	5	any way, shape or form.
6	truth about current conditions for detainees and staff."	6	MS MOORE: Chair, it is 11.35. I suggest we have
7	It is concerning, isn't it, that a former member of	7	a 15-minute break now and return at 11.50.
8	staff would say at that, not just about G4S but about	8	THE CHAIR: Thank you very much. Thank you, Ms Moore.
9	Serco instead?	9	Thank you, Mr Hewer.
10	Is your experience that employees have closed ranks?	10	(11.35 am)
11	A. No, not at all. Not at all.	11	(A short break)
12	Q. Ms Brown also discusses in her statement a grievance she	12	(11.55 am)
13	submitted, which has now been provided to the inquiry.	13	THE CHAIR: Thank you very much. Thank you, Ms Moore.
14	I presume you were aware of it at the time, although it	14	MS MOORE: We continue with Mr Hewer's evidence.
15	is addressed to Ms Newland?	15	Mr Hewer, I want to ask now about the Brook House
16	A. It wasn't addressed directly to me but I am aware of it	16	building and facilities briefly.
17	now.	17	We have heard original proposals were for it to be
18	Q. To Ms Newland and not to you, yes.	18	a short term holding facility. We have seen of course,
19	A. Yes.	19	during the relevant period, that people were held for
20	Q. The same reasons effectively for the grievance were the	20	years and you mentioned to us earlier that the longest
21	reasons for her resignation, which she discusses both of	21	detained person had been there, now, for just over a
22	in her statement. She mentions you in her statement,	22	year I think?
23	and you have been provided with that. At page 43,	23	A. That's right.
24	paragraph 72, she describes attending a case review	24	Q. In terms of the building itself, are there challenges in
25	where a detainee was speaking about witnessing his	25	holding someone for this long in a centre apparently
	70.00		D 00
	Page 81		Page 83
1	family being killed, which she found very upsetting and	1	built to hold people, on average, for a short period?
2	moving. She says she went to your office where you and	2	A. Yes.
3	Ms Newland were and says:	3	Q. What short of challenges are there?
4	"I remember saying to them, 'I have just sat in on	4	A. I mean the challenges are the built environment. The
5	one of the saddest case reviews ever and the entire	5	built environment is what we have obviously took over
6	panel was moved', and I recall Steve Hewer replying,	6	and inherited. Structurally-wise, there is little
7	'Well, what lies is he telling you then?' She adds,	7	change you can make to the built environment. What we
8	'I was shocked at this comment, the sheer lack of	8	have tried to do is tried to soften certain areas to
9	interest or compassion and denial of an individual's	9	make it more decent, and by way of opening more gates
10	trauma'."	10	and doors and open up the areas, et cetera, and just be
11	Do you recall that event happening?	11	redecoration, lots of decoration throughout the centre
12	A. Not at all, and I will totally refute that to that	12	as well. So that is what we have tried to do to soften
13	comment and I think the same question was put to	13	some of the aspects of it, more than anything.
14	Sarah Newland and she does not recognise that comment	14	There is very little else we can do with the built
15	and it is not something I would say.	15	environment without radical changes, unfortunately.
16	Q. It would be inappropriate as a thing to say?	16	Q. You describe at paragraph 47 of your statement "a huge
17	A. It would be totally inappropriate and not the language	17	investment in changing the physical appearance",
18	I would use.	18	obviously limited to what you can do.
19	Q. We don't need to go through the ins and outs of	19	A. Yes.
20	Ms Brown's resignation and complaint, but the point,	20	Q. You say this is stuff like keeping gates open where
21	Mr Hewer, is she was a senior and experienced member of	21	possible, redecoration; is there anything else that has
22	staff, she was dissatisfied and raised concerns while	22	formed part of this investment?
23	she was under G4S; Serco took over but, clearly from her	23	A. A number of innovative initiatives we have moved forward
24	point of view, things didn't change to the extent that	24	on as well, which is biometric gates, so the entrance to
25	she felt able to stay.	25	each wing location has a biometric gate where residents
	•		
	D 00		D 0.4
	Page 82		Page 84

		1	
1	can go in and out of, to the activities area as well.	1	make the delivery of a humane and supportive regime very
2	So there is it allows free movement, shall I say.	2	difficult."
3	Post-Covid it allows a lot more free movement, and in	3	Do you agree with the fact that the building and the
4	Covid it was restricted a little bit.	4	restrictions that go with it do pose challenges to the
5	Q. Sure. Not just the building but what about the regimes	5	delivery of a human regime?
6	and the activities you can offer? Are these suited for	6	A. It does pose challenges, yes, just by pure design of the
7	detention of the sorts of lengths that you might be	7	building as well, yes.
8	looking at?	8	Q. Turning, now, to staff visibility around the wings, you
9	A. From an activities perspective, we try to put a range of	9	may be aware that an issue we have heard about
10	activities on and part of the solution, the bid solution	10	repeatedly in relation to the relevant period was the
11	we put forward, was to a range of activities and	11	lack of visibility and engagement from the SMT towards
12	education. So from art classes things that interest	12	staff on the wing floor and with detainees, and you say,
13	people, interest different cultures as well, and	13	at paragraph 21, that the SMT are now fully visible
14	gymnasium, additional gymnasiums, a weights room and	14	across both Gatwick sites, although the examples that
15	generally activities on the wings and on the yards as	15	you give at 21, just pertain mainly to Tinsley House or
16	well.	16	to some arrangements that were notionally in place, for
17	So we have tried to encourage as many people to take	17	example, that the SMT would attend various meetings.
18	part in activities. Unfortunately, we cannot force	18	Can you just tell us, in practical terms, what steps
19	everybody to be part of that but we make it as enticing	19	Serco has taken to increase that level of visibility?
20	as possible for them to take part.	20	A. Yes, as per my paragraph 21, we have to be visible
21	Q. There are enticements I think in terms of	21	across both sites to Gatwick IRCs is held of
22	competitions I have heard about pool competitions	22	Brook House and Tinsley House, so we have residents in
23	where you can win, is it sort of financial credits that	23	both areas, so we spend our time in both sites and that
24	you can spend?	24	is why I give reference to have a morning meeting at
25	A. Yes, so they can spend in the shop et cetera. It is	25	Tinsley on a Tuesday and Thursday, where we share time.
	Page 85		Page 87
			-
1	a cashless society but we put credits on their account,	1	There is a permanent SMT member in Tinsley House,
2	and there's competitions and pool games and table	2	Mr Haughton, and my office and the dep's office is in
3	tennis, et cetera, and things like that.	3	Brook House, so we spend a lot of time in Brook House as
4	Q. Dr Hindpal Singh Bhui of the HMIP said in his live	4	well.
5	evidence last week:	5	From a visibility point of view, we have
6	"Brook House is a centre which looks and feels like	6	an assistant director that is covering operations and he
7	a prison and it is designed like a prison. As we have	7	will go round every visit every area as part of his
8	said many times, that is inappropriate for a detainee	8	tour on a daily basis, as lots of the SMT will. So the
9	population."	9	visibility part is led by us to look at go through
10	He went on to say the:	10	all wing areas and tours of the centre as well.
11	"I think we have reported on this in a number of	11	Q. Does that include E wing and CSU?
12	centres with high numbers of people with mental health	12	A. Yes.
13	problems and serious mental health problems. That kind	13	Q. Professor Bosworth commented on the question of
14	of environment is not appropriate for people with mental	14	visibility in her first report at 4.53. She says that
15	health difficulties. They should be held in a normal	15	the lack of formal and informal interactions between
16	location if possible."	16	senior management and DCOs draws into question the
17	Thinking specifically, Mr Hewer, about people with	17	extent to which the SMT were aware of the kinds of
18	mental health difficulties then, detained as they are in	18 19	problems staff in the detained community were facing,
19	this prison-like environment, do you accept Dr Bhui's	20	talking about 2017. A. Yes.
20 21	concerns there?	20 21	A. Yes.  Q. And she adds that this should be remedied by relocating
	A. Yes.	21 22	SMT out of the administrative offices for a greater
	() And Protector Requireth also commented on the building	44	-
22	Q. And Professor Bosworth also commented on the building,	23	nroportion of their day and moving their offices into
22 23	at paragraph 9.9 of her first report. She said:	23	proportion of their day and moving their offices into the main body of the building. And she says that more
22 23 24	at paragraph 9.9 of her first report. She said: "The restrictions of a category B prison make no	24	the main body of the building. And she says that more
22 23	at paragraph 9.9 of her first report. She said:		
22 23 24	at paragraph 9.9 of her first report. She said: "The restrictions of a category B prison make no	24	the main body of the building. And she says that more

1	communication channels.	1	authority I presume that means the Home Office of
2	What is your view on the SMT location question?	2	those who have been victims of torture and those whose
3	A. We are in the main body of the building, so I'm a little	3	physical and mental health is seriously affected by
4	bit perplexed by that statement, because we are in the	4	detention, ensuring referral to healthcare staff who are
5	main part of the building and my office is some	5	appropriately trained to deal with this?
6	20 metres away from each of the wings'	6	A. Yes.
7	Q. What about the	7	Q. So overseeing the implementation of Adults at Risk, does
8	A office areas.	8	that fall within the responsibility of Serco?
9	Q. What about the question of attention being paid to	9	A. The policy they set out obviously, from an Home
10	formal and informal communication channels; would you	10	Office perspective, the policy, which has recently
11	agree that is important?	11	been well, it has been updated in recent years,
12	A. Yes, very much so. One of the things we kind of we	12	obviously, as we've heard from previous evidence, but in
13	pride ourself is more access to communications for staff	13	respect of rule 35, I mean, our staff are fully aware of
14	and for residents as well within the centre and that is	14	the process procedures and we will welfare department
15	from a number of updates for staff groups, better access	15	will share that and signpost residents if they have
16	to IT and email for staff groups as well, so they can	16	concerns or questions in respect of that.
17	access, particularly, procedural stuff, and better	17	Q. So rule 35, Serco and your operational staff's role is
18	access to for residents to see SMT members. And part	18	to say
19	of 16.4.1 culture-wise is to meet on a monthly basis	19	A. We will signpost it, yes, no other part in it.
20	and, obviously, on the wing forum with senior managers	20	Q. And in terms of Adults at Risk, what is Serco's role
21	as well. So there's more access than ever there has	21	there?
22	been.	22	A. We have weekly Adults at Risk meetings and any residents
23	Q. Just an example of that then, if a detainee wanted to	23	we have concerns and that is multidisciplinary as
24	see a member of the SMT, what would they have to do?	24	well, so the IMB will attend that meeting and the
25	A. They would either the DOM would ask for to us attend	25	Home Office will attend that meeting and the healthcare
			· ·
	Page 89		Page 91
1	the wing to see them and/or have a discussion with them	1	will attend that meeting as well so it is a joint
1	the wing to see them and/or have a discussion with them,	1	will attend that meeting as well, so it is a joint,
2	or they can put in an application to see us. So there	2	multidisciplinary meeting that will discuss any if we
2 3	or they can put in an application to see us. So there are various ways they can do that.	2 3	multidisciplinary meeting that will discuss any if we feel there is risk, concern or vulnerabilities with as
2 3 4	or they can put in an application to see us. So there are various ways they can do that.  Q. How frequently does that happen?	2 3 4	multidisciplinary meeting that will discuss any if we feel there is risk, concern or vulnerabilities with as well.
2 3 4 5	or they can put in an application to see us. So there are various ways they can do that.  Q. How frequently does that happen?  A. Quite frequently actually, quite frequently.	2 3 4 5	multidisciplinary meeting that will discuss any if we feel there is risk, concern or vulnerabilities with as well.  Q. Have you heard evidence during this phase from Ms Calver
2 3 4 5 6	or they can put in an application to see us. So there are various ways they can do that.  Q. How frequently does that happen?  A. Quite frequently actually, quite frequently.  Q. I want to turn now to the population itself, in	2 3 4 5 6	multidisciplinary meeting that will discuss any if we feel there is risk, concern or vulnerabilities with as well.  Q. Have you heard evidence during this phase from Ms Calver and the GPs working at Brook House?
2 3 4 5 6 7	or they can put in an application to see us. So there are various ways they can do that.  Q. How frequently does that happen?  A. Quite frequently actually, quite frequently.  Q. I want to turn now to the population itself, in particular to vulnerable detained persons?	2 3 4 5 6 7	multidisciplinary meeting that will discuss any if we feel there is risk, concern or vulnerabilities with as well.  Q. Have you heard evidence during this phase from Ms Calver and the GPs working at Brook House?  A. Briefly, not too much
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	or they can put in an application to see us. So there are various ways they can do that.  Q. How frequently does that happen?  A. Quite frequently actually, quite frequently.  Q. I want to turn now to the population itself, in particular to vulnerable detained persons?  A. Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	multidisciplinary meeting that will discuss any if we feel there is risk, concern or vulnerabilities with as well.  Q. Have you heard evidence during this phase from Ms Calver and the GPs working at Brook House?  A. Briefly, not too much  Q. Has any of it been summarised to you?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	or they can put in an application to see us. So there are various ways they can do that.  Q. How frequently does that happen?  A. Quite frequently actually, quite frequently.  Q. I want to turn now to the population itself, in particular to vulnerable detained persons?  A. Yes.  Q. You make the point on a couple of occasions in your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	multidisciplinary meeting that will discuss any if we feel there is risk, concern or vulnerabilities with as well.  Q. Have you heard evidence during this phase from Ms Calver and the GPs working at Brook House?  A. Briefly, not too much  Q. Has any of it been summarised to you?  A. No.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	or they can put in an application to see us. So there are various ways they can do that.  Q. How frequently does that happen?  A. Quite frequently actually, quite frequently.  Q. I want to turn now to the population itself, in particular to vulnerable detained persons?  A. Yes.  Q. You make the point on a couple of occasions in your witness statement that you cannot really comment on the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	multidisciplinary meeting that will discuss any if we feel there is risk, concern or vulnerabilities with as well.  Q. Have you heard evidence during this phase from Ms Calver and the GPs working at Brook House?  A. Briefly, not too much Q. Has any of it been summarised to you?  A. No. Q. Did what you heard, or just your experience of how
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	or they can put in an application to see us. So there are various ways they can do that.  Q. How frequently does that happen?  A. Quite frequently actually, quite frequently.  Q. I want to turn now to the population itself, in particular to vulnerable detained persons?  A. Yes.  Q. You make the point on a couple of occasions in your witness statement that you cannot really comment on the function or otherwise of rule 35 in 2020, or now,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	multidisciplinary meeting that will discuss any if we feel there is risk, concern or vulnerabilities with as well.  Q. Have you heard evidence during this phase from Ms Calver and the GPs working at Brook House?  A. Briefly, not too much Q. Has any of it been summarised to you?  A. No. Q. Did what you heard, or just your experience of how things work now, tell you anything about how effectively
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	or they can put in an application to see us. So there are various ways they can do that.  Q. How frequently does that happen?  A. Quite frequently actually, quite frequently.  Q. I want to turn now to the population itself, in particular to vulnerable detained persons?  A. Yes.  Q. You make the point on a couple of occasions in your witness statement that you cannot really comment on the function or otherwise of rule 35 in 2020, or now, because that is a matter primarily for PPG	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	multidisciplinary meeting that will discuss any if we feel there is risk, concern or vulnerabilities with as well.  Q. Have you heard evidence during this phase from Ms Calver and the GPs working at Brook House?  A. Briefly, not too much Q. Has any of it been summarised to you?  A. No. Q. Did what you heard, or just your experience of how things work now, tell you anything about how effectively Adults at Risk is working at the moment in Brook House?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	or they can put in an application to see us. So there are various ways they can do that.  Q. How frequently does that happen?  A. Quite frequently actually, quite frequently.  Q. I want to turn now to the population itself, in particular to vulnerable detained persons?  A. Yes.  Q. You make the point on a couple of occasions in your witness statement that you cannot really comment on the function or otherwise of rule 35 in 2020, or now, because that is a matter primarily for PPG  A. Yes, that's correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	multidisciplinary meeting that will discuss any if we feel there is risk, concern or vulnerabilities with as well.  Q. Have you heard evidence during this phase from Ms Calver and the GPs working at Brook House?  A. Briefly, not too much Q. Has any of it been summarised to you?  A. No. Q. Did what you heard, or just your experience of how things work now, tell you anything about how effectively Adults at Risk is working at the moment in Brook House?  A. I don't think I am best placed to comment on that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	or they can put in an application to see us. So there are various ways they can do that.  Q. How frequently does that happen?  A. Quite frequently actually, quite frequently.  Q. I want to turn now to the population itself, in particular to vulnerable detained persons?  A. Yes.  Q. You make the point on a couple of occasions in your witness statement that you cannot really comment on the function or otherwise of rule 35 in 2020, or now, because that is a matter primarily for PPG  A. Yes, that's correct.  Q and the Home Office.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	multidisciplinary meeting that will discuss any if we feel there is risk, concern or vulnerabilities with as well.  Q. Have you heard evidence during this phase from Ms Calver and the GPs working at Brook House?  A. Briefly, not too much Q. Has any of it been summarised to you?  A. No. Q. Did what you heard, or just your experience of how things work now, tell you anything about how effectively Adults at Risk is working at the moment in Brook House?  A. I don't think I am best placed to comment on that. Q. So from Serco's perspective?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	or they can put in an application to see us. So there are various ways they can do that.  Q. How frequently does that happen?  A. Quite frequently actually, quite frequently.  Q. I want to turn now to the population itself, in particular to vulnerable detained persons?  A. Yes.  Q. You make the point on a couple of occasions in your witness statement that you cannot really comment on the function or otherwise of rule 35 in 2020, or now, because that is a matter primarily for PPG  A. Yes, that's correct.  Q and the Home Office. Serco's contractual service provision, however,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	multidisciplinary meeting that will discuss any if we feel there is risk, concern or vulnerabilities with as well.  Q. Have you heard evidence during this phase from Ms Calver and the GPs working at Brook House?  A. Briefly, not too much Q. Has any of it been summarised to you?  A. No. Q. Did what you heard, or just your experience of how things work now, tell you anything about how effectively Adults at Risk is working at the moment in Brook House?  A. I don't think I am best placed to comment on that. Q. So from Serco's perspective?  A. As far as I am aware, it is working well, and it is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	or they can put in an application to see us. So there are various ways they can do that.  Q. How frequently does that happen?  A. Quite frequently actually, quite frequently.  Q. I want to turn now to the population itself, in particular to vulnerable detained persons?  A. Yes.  Q. You make the point on a couple of occasions in your witness statement that you cannot really comment on the function or otherwise of rule 35 in 2020, or now, because that is a matter primarily for PPG  A. Yes, that's correct.  Q and the Home Office.  Serco's contractual service provision, however, gives rise to an obligation which we have discussed to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	multidisciplinary meeting that will discuss any if we feel there is risk, concern or vulnerabilities with as well.  Q. Have you heard evidence during this phase from Ms Calver and the GPs working at Brook House?  A. Briefly, not too much Q. Has any of it been summarised to you?  A. No. Q. Did what you heard, or just your experience of how things work now, tell you anything about how effectively Adults at Risk is working at the moment in Brook House?  A. I don't think I am best placed to comment on that. Q. So from Serco's perspective?  A. As far as I am aware, it is working well, and it is working fine at this point in time with the numbers.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	or they can put in an application to see us. So there are various ways they can do that.  Q. How frequently does that happen?  A. Quite frequently actually, quite frequently.  Q. I want to turn now to the population itself, in particular to vulnerable detained persons?  A. Yes.  Q. You make the point on a couple of occasions in your witness statement that you cannot really comment on the function or otherwise of rule 35 in 2020, or now, because that is a matter primarily for PPG  A. Yes, that's correct.  Q and the Home Office.  Serco's contractual service provision, however, gives rise to an obligation which we have discussed to put into place procedures' compliance with DSOs, which	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	multidisciplinary meeting that will discuss any if we feel there is risk, concern or vulnerabilities with as well.  Q. Have you heard evidence during this phase from Ms Calver and the GPs working at Brook House?  A. Briefly, not too much Q. Has any of it been summarised to you?  A. No. Q. Did what you heard, or just your experience of how things work now, tell you anything about how effectively Adults at Risk is working at the moment in Brook House?  A. I don't think I am best placed to comment on that. Q. So from Serco's perspective?  A. As far as I am aware, it is working well, and it is working fine at this point in time with the numbers. Q. What about any other protections to assure people, who
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	or they can put in an application to see us. So there are various ways they can do that.  Q. How frequently does that happen?  A. Quite frequently actually, quite frequently.  Q. I want to turn now to the population itself, in particular to vulnerable detained persons?  A. Yes.  Q. You make the point on a couple of occasions in your witness statement that you cannot really comment on the function or otherwise of rule 35 in 2020, or now, because that is a matter primarily for PPG  A. Yes, that's correct.  Q and the Home Office.  Serco's contractual service provision, however, gives rise to an obligation which we have discussed to put into place procedures' compliance with DSOs, which would include Adults at Risk procedures, wouldn't it?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	multidisciplinary meeting that will discuss any if we feel there is risk, concern or vulnerabilities with as well.  Q. Have you heard evidence during this phase from Ms Calver and the GPs working at Brook House?  A. Briefly, not too much Q. Has any of it been summarised to you?  A. No. Q. Did what you heard, or just your experience of how things work now, tell you anything about how effectively Adults at Risk is working at the moment in Brook House?  A. I don't think I am best placed to comment on that. Q. So from Serco's perspective?  A. As far as I am aware, it is working well, and it is working fine at this point in time with the numbers. Q. What about any other protections to assure people, who perhaps shouldn't be detained or whose detention should
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	or they can put in an application to see us. So there are various ways they can do that.  Q. How frequently does that happen?  A. Quite frequently actually, quite frequently.  Q. I want to turn now to the population itself, in particular to vulnerable detained persons?  A. Yes.  Q. You make the point on a couple of occasions in your witness statement that you cannot really comment on the function or otherwise of rule 35 in 2020, or now, because that is a matter primarily for PPG  A. Yes, that's correct.  Q and the Home Office.  Serco's contractual service provision, however, gives rise to an obligation which we have discussed to put into place procedures' compliance with DSOs, which would include Adults at Risk procedures, wouldn't it?  A. Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	multidisciplinary meeting that will discuss any if we feel there is risk, concern or vulnerabilities with as well.  Q. Have you heard evidence during this phase from Ms Calver and the GPs working at Brook House?  A. Briefly, not too much Q. Has any of it been summarised to you?  A. No. Q. Did what you heard, or just your experience of how things work now, tell you anything about how effectively Adults at Risk is working at the moment in Brook House?  A. I don't think I am best placed to comment on that. Q. So from Serco's perspective?  A. As far as I am aware, it is working well, and it is working fine at this point in time with the numbers. Q. What about any other protections to assure people, who perhaps shouldn't be detained or whose detention should be reviewed, are being reviewed?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	or they can put in an application to see us. So there are various ways they can do that.  Q. How frequently does that happen?  A. Quite frequently actually, quite frequently.  Q. I want to turn now to the population itself, in particular to vulnerable detained persons?  A. Yes.  Q. You make the point on a couple of occasions in your witness statement that you cannot really comment on the function or otherwise of rule 35 in 2020, or now, because that is a matter primarily for PPG  A. Yes, that's correct.  Q and the Home Office.  Serco's contractual service provision, however, gives rise to an obligation which we have discussed to put into place procedures' compliance with DSOs, which would include Adults at Risk procedures, wouldn't it?  A. Yes.  Q. Serco is also contractually obliged, as I understand it,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	multidisciplinary meeting that will discuss any if we feel there is risk, concern or vulnerabilities with as well.  Q. Have you heard evidence during this phase from Ms Calver and the GPs working at Brook House?  A. Briefly, not too much Q. Has any of it been summarised to you?  A. No. Q. Did what you heard, or just your experience of how things work now, tell you anything about how effectively Adults at Risk is working at the moment in Brook House?  A. I don't think I am best placed to comment on that. Q. So from Serco's perspective?  A. As far as I am aware, it is working well, and it is working fine at this point in time with the numbers. Q. What about any other protections to assure people, who perhaps shouldn't be detained or whose detention should be reviewed, are being reviewed?  A. Serco play no part in detention or in who is allocated
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	or they can put in an application to see us. So there are various ways they can do that.  Q. How frequently does that happen?  A. Quite frequently actually, quite frequently.  Q. I want to turn now to the population itself, in particular to vulnerable detained persons?  A. Yes.  Q. You make the point on a couple of occasions in your witness statement that you cannot really comment on the function or otherwise of rule 35 in 2020, or now, because that is a matter primarily for PPG  A. Yes, that's correct.  Q and the Home Office.  Serco's contractual service provision, however, gives rise to an obligation which we have discussed to put into place procedures' compliance with DSOs, which would include Adults at Risk procedures, wouldn't it?  A. Yes.  Q. Serco is also contractually obliged, as I understand it, to put into place sufficient operating arrangements to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	multidisciplinary meeting that will discuss any if we feel there is risk, concern or vulnerabilities with as well.  Q. Have you heard evidence during this phase from Ms Calver and the GPs working at Brook House?  A. Briefly, not too much  Q. Has any of it been summarised to you?  A. No.  Q. Did what you heard, or just your experience of how things work now, tell you anything about how effectively Adults at Risk is working at the moment in Brook House?  A. I don't think I am best placed to comment on that.  Q. So from Serco's perspective?  A. As far as I am aware, it is working well, and it is working fine at this point in time with the numbers.  Q. What about any other protections to assure people, who perhaps shouldn't be detained or whose detention should be reviewed, are being reviewed?  A. Serco play no part in detention or in who is allocated to the centre. The Home Office are obviously best
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	or they can put in an application to see us. So there are various ways they can do that.  Q. How frequently does that happen?  A. Quite frequently actually, quite frequently.  Q. I want to turn now to the population itself, in particular to vulnerable detained persons?  A. Yes.  Q. You make the point on a couple of occasions in your witness statement that you cannot really comment on the function or otherwise of rule 35 in 2020, or now, because that is a matter primarily for PPG  A. Yes, that's correct.  Q and the Home Office.  Serco's contractual service provision, however, gives rise to an obligation which we have discussed to put into place procedures' compliance with DSOs, which would include Adults at Risk procedures, wouldn't it?  A. Yes.  Q. Serco is also contractually obliged, as I understand it, to put into place sufficient operating arrangements to allow Serco to work with the healthcare provider to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	multidisciplinary meeting that will discuss any if we feel there is risk, concern or vulnerabilities with as well.  Q. Have you heard evidence during this phase from Ms Calver and the GPs working at Brook House?  A. Briefly, not too much  Q. Has any of it been summarised to you?  A. No.  Q. Did what you heard, or just your experience of how things work now, tell you anything about how effectively Adults at Risk is working at the moment in Brook House?  A. I don't think I am best placed to comment on that.  Q. So from Serco's perspective?  A. As far as I am aware, it is working well, and it is working fine at this point in time with the numbers.  Q. What about any other protections to assure people, who perhaps shouldn't be detained or whose detention should be reviewed, are being reviewed?  A. Serco play no part in detention or in who is allocated to the centre. The Home Office are obviously best placed to answer that question.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	or they can put in an application to see us. So there are various ways they can do that.  Q. How frequently does that happen?  A. Quite frequently actually, quite frequently.  Q. I want to turn now to the population itself, in particular to vulnerable detained persons?  A. Yes.  Q. You make the point on a couple of occasions in your witness statement that you cannot really comment on the function or otherwise of rule 35 in 2020, or now, because that is a matter primarily for PPG  A. Yes, that's correct.  Q and the Home Office.  Serco's contractual service provision, however, gives rise to an obligation which we have discussed to put into place procedures' compliance with DSOs, which would include Adults at Risk procedures, wouldn't it?  A. Yes.  Q. Serco is also contractually obliged, as I understand it, to put into place sufficient operating arrangements to allow Serco to work with the healthcare provider to identify the health and social needs of detainees who	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	multidisciplinary meeting that will discuss any — if we feel there is risk, concern or vulnerabilities with as well.  Q. Have you heard evidence during this phase from Ms Calver and the GPs working at Brook House?  A. Briefly, not too much —  Q. Has any of it been summarised to you?  A. No.  Q. Did what you heard, or just your experience of how things work now, tell you anything about how effectively Adults at Risk is working at the moment in Brook House?  A. I don't think I am best placed to comment on that.  Q. So from Serco's perspective?  A. As far as I am aware, it is working well, and it is working fine at this point in time with the numbers.  Q. What about any other protections to assure people, who perhaps shouldn't be detained or whose detention should be reviewed, are being reviewed?  A. Serco play no part in detention or in who is allocated to the centre. The Home Office are obviously best placed to answer that question.  Q. At paragraphs 113 and 115 of your witness statement, you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	or they can put in an application to see us. So there are various ways they can do that.  Q. How frequently does that happen?  A. Quite frequently actually, quite frequently.  Q. I want to turn now to the population itself, in particular to vulnerable detained persons?  A. Yes.  Q. You make the point on a couple of occasions in your witness statement that you cannot really comment on the function or otherwise of rule 35 in 2020, or now, because that is a matter primarily for PPG  A. Yes, that's correct.  Q and the Home Office.  Serco's contractual service provision, however, gives rise to an obligation which we have discussed to put into place procedures' compliance with DSOs, which would include Adults at Risk procedures, wouldn't it?  A. Yes.  Q. Serco is also contractually obliged, as I understand it, to put into place sufficient operating arrangements to allow Serco to work with the healthcare provider to identify the health and social needs of detainees who may be subject to torture and trauma and have procedures	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	multidisciplinary meeting that will discuss any if we feel there is risk, concern or vulnerabilities with as well.  Q. Have you heard evidence during this phase from Ms Calver and the GPs working at Brook House?  A. Briefly, not too much Q. Has any of it been summarised to you?  A. No. Q. Did what you heard, or just your experience of how things work now, tell you anything about how effectively Adults at Risk is working at the moment in Brook House?  A. I don't think I am best placed to comment on that. Q. So from Serco's perspective?  A. As far as I am aware, it is working well, and it is working fine at this point in time with the numbers. Q. What about any other protections to assure people, who perhaps shouldn't be detained or whose detention should be reviewed, are being reviewed?  A. Serco play no part in detention or in who is allocated to the centre. The Home Office are obviously best placed to answer that question. Q. At paragraphs 113 and 115 of your witness statement, you say that PPG and the Home Office would be better placed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	or they can put in an application to see us. So there are various ways they can do that.  Q. How frequently does that happen?  A. Quite frequently actually, quite frequently.  Q. I want to turn now to the population itself, in particular to vulnerable detained persons?  A. Yes.  Q. You make the point on a couple of occasions in your witness statement that you cannot really comment on the function or otherwise of rule 35 in 2020, or now, because that is a matter primarily for PPG  A. Yes, that's correct.  Q and the Home Office.  Serco's contractual service provision, however, gives rise to an obligation which we have discussed to put into place procedures' compliance with DSOs, which would include Adults at Risk procedures, wouldn't it?  A. Yes.  Q. Serco is also contractually obliged, as I understand it, to put into place sufficient operating arrangements to allow Serco to work with the healthcare provider to identify the health and social needs of detainees who	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	multidisciplinary meeting that will discuss any — if we feel there is risk, concern or vulnerabilities with as well.  Q. Have you heard evidence during this phase from Ms Calver and the GPs working at Brook House?  A. Briefly, not too much —  Q. Has any of it been summarised to you?  A. No.  Q. Did what you heard, or just your experience of how things work now, tell you anything about how effectively Adults at Risk is working at the moment in Brook House?  A. I don't think I am best placed to comment on that.  Q. So from Serco's perspective?  A. As far as I am aware, it is working well, and it is working fine at this point in time with the numbers.  Q. What about any other protections to assure people, who perhaps shouldn't be detained or whose detention should be reviewed, are being reviewed?  A. Serco play no part in detention or in who is allocated to the centre. The Home Office are obviously best placed to answer that question.  Q. At paragraphs 113 and 115 of your witness statement, you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	or they can put in an application to see us. So there are various ways they can do that.  Q. How frequently does that happen?  A. Quite frequently actually, quite frequently.  Q. I want to turn now to the population itself, in particular to vulnerable detained persons?  A. Yes.  Q. You make the point on a couple of occasions in your witness statement that you cannot really comment on the function or otherwise of rule 35 in 2020, or now, because that is a matter primarily for PPG  A. Yes, that's correct.  Q and the Home Office.  Serco's contractual service provision, however, gives rise to an obligation which we have discussed to put into place procedures' compliance with DSOs, which would include Adults at Risk procedures, wouldn't it?  A. Yes.  Q. Serco is also contractually obliged, as I understand it, to put into place sufficient operating arrangements to allow Serco to work with the healthcare provider to identify the health and social needs of detainees who may be subject to torture and trauma and have procedures	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	multidisciplinary meeting that will discuss any if we feel there is risk, concern or vulnerabilities with as well.  Q. Have you heard evidence during this phase from Ms Calver and the GPs working at Brook House?  A. Briefly, not too much Q. Has any of it been summarised to you?  A. No. Q. Did what you heard, or just your experience of how things work now, tell you anything about how effectively Adults at Risk is working at the moment in Brook House?  A. I don't think I am best placed to comment on that. Q. So from Serco's perspective?  A. As far as I am aware, it is working well, and it is working fine at this point in time with the numbers. Q. What about any other protections to assure people, who perhaps shouldn't be detained or whose detention should be reviewed, are being reviewed?  A. Serco play no part in detention or in who is allocated to the centre. The Home Office are obviously best placed to answer that question. Q. At paragraphs 113 and 115 of your witness statement, you say that PPG and the Home Office would be better placed

1	2021?	1	transfer?
2	A. Yes.	2	A. Yes, and the mental institute would come in and assess
3	Q. Do you consider there to be any relevance of Serco to	3	them and they would look then for a place for them to be
4	understand why the numbers of those reports appeared to	4	transported there.
5	be so low and whether they accurately reflect the	5	Q. So Brook House could be sort of a temporary facility
6	detained population's needs?	6	where until they are removed?
7	A. As I said, we don't play a part in, other than	7	A. It has been, yes.
8	supporting, it. I mean, our role is to support	8	Q. Thank you for clarifying that. Turning then to rule 40
9	vulnerable residents and that come within our care	9	briefly, so removal from association, and perhaps 42 as
10	and signpost them in that direction, if there's if	10	well, in your statement, at paragraph 103, you say that
11	there is reports of torture, or of that nature, we will	11	rule 40 is no longer used pre-emptively in advance of
12	refer them more than anything.	12	charter flights; is that right?
13	And we have a comprehensive welfare department to	13	A. That's correct.
14	support residents on that.	14	Q. Only as a last resort, where required, where the
15	Q. If you can then next, it would help if you could	15	detainee's behaviour impacts on the good order and
16	clarify, if you are able to, some evidence we heard from	16	stability of the sector?
17	Mr Haughton about a different issue, but particular	17	A. Yes.
18	mental health needs. He referred to the weekly	18	Q. Who made the decision that rule 40 would no longer be
19	vulnerable meetings that you mention as well in the	19	used pre-emptively?
20	multidisciplinary meetings?	20	A. There is no decision been made on that. It is well,
21	A. Yes.	21	it's appropriateness of rule 40 in the first place.
22	Q. He said, "You know, we look after at Brook House some	22	Q. So rule 40 shouldn't be used pre-emptively, in your
23	mentally unwell people". He said, "We look after people	23	view?
24	that are on section. Are staff adequately trained to	24	A. It shouldn't be, no.
25	properly manage someone who is under a section? No.	25	Q. And did that cease to happen from when you took over
	Page 93		Page 95
1	But they would need to be clinically trained in order to	1	A. Well, I can't comment to the relevant period. Is that
2	do that". And then he said, "They do an amazing job".	2	what you are talking about? No?
3	Do Brook House hold people who are under section?	3	Q. Sure. It hasn't happened since you were there?
4	By which I mean I presume you meant detained under	4	A. No, no. It is whether it is appropriate and affects the
5	the Mental Health Act?	5	good order and stability of the centre.
6	A. There are a number of residents we have held in the past	6	Q. You state at 102, just above, that any use of rule 40 is
7	18 months that have actually been sectioned under	7	agreed by the Home Office?
8	section 48 and been referred and sectioned to a mental	8	A. Yes.
9	institution, so there's a number of residents we have	9	Q. Does that mean agreed in advance?
10	held that have been quite vulnerable, yes, and we have	10	A. If there is any pre-authorisation, we would submit under
11	cared and supported those residents with the appropriate	11	rule 40, we would submit an annex B for authorisation,
12	care we would expect from our staff.	12	a written annex B. They would then authorise that and
13	Q. So, for those who are not as aware of the Mental Health	13	agree with the terms and, if there is any risk or
			concerns that unless there is a necessity to put in
14	Act as perhaps others, section 48 is a provision by	14	
	Act as perhaps others, section 48 is a provision by which somebody can be removed to a secure institution?	15	place a rule 40.
15	which somebody can be removed to a secure institution?	15	place a rule 40.  O. So there is also a process by I think it's
15 16	which somebody can be removed to a secure institution?  A. Correct, yes.	15 16	Q. So there is also a process by I think it's
15 16 17	which somebody can be removed to a secure institution?  A. Correct, yes.  Q. So you don't hold people who were detained under, for	15	<u>*</u>
15 16 17 18	which somebody can be removed to a secure institution?  A. Correct, yes.  Q. So you don't hold people who were detained under, for example, sections 2 or 3?	15 16 17	Q. So there is also a process by I think it's rule 40(2), by which, in urgent cases, somebody at the detention centre can
15 16 17	which somebody can be removed to a secure institution?  A. Correct, yes.  Q. So you don't hold people who were detained under, for example, sections 2 or 3?  A. No, we'd have to wait for a they would be referred	15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. So there is also a process by I think it's rule 40(2), by which, in urgent cases, somebody at the detention centre can</li> <li>A. That's correct, yes.</li> </ul>
15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>which somebody can be removed to a secure institution?</li> <li>A. Correct, yes.</li> <li>Q. So you don't hold people who were detained under, for example, sections 2 or 3?</li> <li>A. No, we'd have to wait for a — they would be referred then, obviously, by a psychiatrist, and they would refer</li> </ul>	15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. So there is also a process by I think it's rule 40(2), by which, in urgent cases, somebody at the detention centre can</li> <li>A. That's correct, yes.</li> <li>Q authorise it and then report it later?</li> </ul>
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>which somebody can be removed to a secure institution?</li> <li>A. Correct, yes.</li> <li>Q. So you don't hold people who were detained under, for example, sections 2 or 3?</li> <li>A. No, we'd have to wait for a they would be referred then, obviously, by a psychiatrist, and they would refer them.</li> </ul>	15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. So there is also a process by I think it's rule 40(2), by which, in urgent cases, somebody at the detention centre can</li> <li>A. That's correct, yes.</li> <li>Q authorise it and then report it later?</li> <li>A. We would report it immediately to the Home Office to get</li> </ul>
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>which somebody can be removed to a secure institution?</li> <li>A. Correct, yes.</li> <li>Q. So you don't hold people who were detained under, for example, sections 2 or 3?</li> <li>A. No, we'd have to wait for a they would be referred then, obviously, by a psychiatrist, and they would refer them.</li> <li>Q. A psychiatrist might give rise to a concern that</li> </ul>	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. So there is also a process by I think it's rule 40(2), by which, in urgent cases, somebody at the detention centre can</li> <li>A. That's correct, yes.</li> <li>Q authorise it and then report it later?</li> <li>A. We would report it immediately to the Home Office to get authorisation and that would then be reviewed within</li> </ul>
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	which somebody can be removed to a secure institution?  A. Correct, yes.  Q. So you don't hold people who were detained under, for example, sections 2 or 3?  A. No, we'd have to wait for a — they would be referred then, obviously, by a psychiatrist, and they would refer them.  Q. A psychiatrist might give rise to a concern that somebody needs to be transferred under section 48?	15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. So there is also a process by I think it's rule 40(2), by which, in urgent cases, somebody at the detention centre can</li> <li>A. That's correct, yes.</li> <li>Q authorise it and then report it later?</li> <li>A. We would report it immediately to the Home Office to get authorisation and that would then be reviewed within the within 24 hours as well.</li> </ul>
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>which somebody can be removed to a secure institution?</li> <li>A. Correct, yes.</li> <li>Q. So you don't hold people who were detained under, for example, sections 2 or 3?</li> <li>A. No, we'd have to wait for a they would be referred then, obviously, by a psychiatrist, and they would refer them.</li> <li>Q. A psychiatrist might give rise to a concern that</li> </ul>	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. So there is also a process by I think it's rule 40(2), by which, in urgent cases, somebody at the detention centre can</li> <li>A. That's correct, yes.</li> <li>Q authorise it and then report it later?</li> <li>A. We would report it immediately to the Home Office to get authorisation and that would then be reviewed within</li> </ul>
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	which somebody can be removed to a secure institution?  A. Correct, yes.  Q. So you don't hold people who were detained under, for example, sections 2 or 3?  A. No, we'd have to wait for a — they would be referred then, obviously, by a psychiatrist, and they would refer them.  Q. A psychiatrist might give rise to a concern that somebody needs to be transferred under section 48?  A. Yes. Yes.	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. So there is also a process by I think it's rule 40(2), by which, in urgent cases, somebody at the detention centre can</li> <li>A. That's correct, yes.</li> <li>Q authorise it and then report it later?</li> <li>A. We would report it immediately to the Home Office to get authorisation and that would then be reviewed within the within 24 hours as well.</li> <li>Q. So both of those provisions are still used</li> </ul>
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	which somebody can be removed to a secure institution?  A. Correct, yes.  Q. So you don't hold people who were detained under, for example, sections 2 or 3?  A. No, we'd have to wait for a — they would be referred then, obviously, by a psychiatrist, and they would refer them.  Q. A psychiatrist might give rise to a concern that somebody needs to be transferred under section 48?  A. Yes. Yes.	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. So there is also a process by I think it's rule 40(2), by which, in urgent cases, somebody at the detention centre can</li> <li>A. That's correct, yes.</li> <li>Q authorise it and then report it later?</li> <li>A. We would report it immediately to the Home Office to get authorisation and that would then be reviewed within the within 24 hours as well.</li> <li>Q. So both of those provisions are still used</li> </ul>

1	Q the pre-authorisation and the urgent process?	1	case but only depending on particular circumstances?
2	A yes, indeed.	2	A. Yes.
3	Q. And, again, you weren't there during the relevant	3	Q. Mr Dix also was asked about this by the chair. She
4	period, of course, but it has been suggested in evidence	4	asked:
5	we have seen that only 13 per cent of rule 40s were	5	"You told us about people being placed on rule 40,
6	approved in advance by the Home Office in 2017 and the	6	so taken off association, and that they could find
7	rest were done under the urgent procedure.	7	themselves on E wing rather than in the CSU. Is that
8	Do you know now obviously, roughly rather than	8	still the case at the moment?"
9	with any specificity how often it is done urgently	9	And he said:
10	versus pre-authorised?	10	"Yes, so the majority of people, if they are
11	A. I couldn't give you an exact figure, to be honest.	11	refractory or something like that, could go on to CSU,
12	Q. Does	12	but obviously E wing, because they have Safer Custody
13	A. I would say there were a larger percentage are	13	suites, so obviously, if someone was in there, but they
14	pre-authorised at this point in time.	14	couldn't be placed on rule 40 at the same time in that
15	Q. A larger percentage than during the relevant period?	15	room."
16	A. Yes.	16	And the chair asked:
17	Q. Do you know if that is the majority or is that too	17	"Those would be the circumstances that someone would
18	difficult to say?	18	be there; is that right?"
19	A. I wouldn't be able to say at this point. I can find	19	And he said:
20	out.	20	"Yes, if they are on an ACDT."
21	Q. Is rule 40 used at present for detainees with mental	21	And the chair asked:
22	health problems?	22	"Being held on rule 40 at the same time?"
23	A. Not particularly, no.	23	And Mr Dix said:
24	Q. Is the E wing used to hold such people?	24	"Yes."
25	A. Depending on the circumstances and the vulnerabilities,	25	So just to be clear, are people being held in CSU
	•		
	Page 97		Page 99
1	it's a case-hy-case review	1	for the nurnoses of being constantly observed under
1 2	it's a case-by-case review.	1 2	for the purposes of being constantly observed under ACDTs as far as you know?
2	Q. What about the CSU?	2	ACDTs, as far as you know?
2 3	<ul><li>Q. What about the CSU?</li><li>A. The same would apply but very rarely.</li></ul>	2 3	ACDTs, as far as you know?  A. No. Not always. We have our residents who are observed
2 3 4	<ul><li>Q. What about the CSU?</li><li>A. The same would apply but very rarely.</li><li>Q. What circumstances would make it appropriate to hold</li></ul>	2 3 4	ACDTs, as far as you know?  A. No. Not always. We have our residents who are observed constantly on the wing as well.
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>Q. What about the CSU?</li> <li>A. The same would apply but very rarely.</li> <li>Q. What circumstances would make it appropriate to hold</li> <li>A. If there are certain levels of violence or concerns with</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	ACDTs, as far as you know?  A. No. Not always. We have our residents who are observed constantly on the wing as well.  Q. So they are not always held, but they might be held?
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Q. What about the CSU?</li> <li>A. The same would apply but very rarely.</li> <li>Q. What circumstances would make it appropriate to hold</li> <li>A. If there are certain levels of violence or concerns with staff and offences against other residents as well, so</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	ACDTs, as far as you know?  A. No. Not always. We have our residents who are observed constantly on the wing as well.  Q. So they are not always held, but they might be held?  I want to ask you now about a situation which arose
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. What about the CSU?</li> <li>A. The same would apply but very rarely.</li> <li>Q. What circumstances would make it appropriate to hold</li> <li>A. If there are certain levels of violence or concerns with staff and offences against other residents as well, so there could be depending on the circumstances.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	ACDTs, as far as you know?  A. No. Not always. We have our residents who are observed constantly on the wing as well.  Q. So they are not always held, but they might be held?  I want to ask you now about a situation which arose in late 2020, which you mention briefly in your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. What about the CSU?</li> <li>A. The same would apply but very rarely.</li> <li>Q. What circumstances would make it appropriate to hold</li> <li>A. If there are certain levels of violence or concerns with staff and offences against other residents as well, so there could be depending on the circumstances.</li> <li>Q. So</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	ACDTs, as far as you know?  A. No. Not always. We have our residents who are observed constantly on the wing as well.  Q. So they are not always held, but they might be held?  I want to ask you now about a situation which arose in late 2020, which you mention briefly in your statement and which we have heard about from other
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. What about the CSU?</li> <li>A. The same would apply but very rarely.</li> <li>Q. What circumstances would make it appropriate to hold</li> <li>A. If there are certain levels of violence or concerns with staff and offences against other residents as well, so there could be depending on the circumstances.</li> <li>Q. So</li> <li>A. Each case would be dealt with individually.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	ACDTs, as far as you know?  A. No. Not always. We have our residents who are observed constantly on the wing as well.  Q. So they are not always held, but they might be held?  I want to ask you now about a situation which arose in late 2020, which you mention briefly in your statement and which we have heard about from other witnesses as well. So this is from late July 2020.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. What about the CSU?</li> <li>A. The same would apply but very rarely.</li> <li>Q. What circumstances would make it appropriate to hold</li> <li>A. If there are certain levels of violence or concerns with staff and offences against other residents as well, so there could be depending on the circumstances.</li> <li>Q. So</li> <li>A. Each case would be dealt with individually.</li> <li>Q. Would there be circumstances where the detained person</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	ACDTs, as far as you know?  A. No. Not always. We have our residents who are observed constantly on the wing as well.  Q. So they are not always held, but they might be held?  I want to ask you now about a situation which arose in late 2020, which you mention briefly in your statement and which we have heard about from other witnesses as well. So this is from late July 2020.  Brook House was used to host a population of asylum
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q. What about the CSU?</li> <li>A. The same would apply but very rarely.</li> <li>Q. What circumstances would make it appropriate to hold</li> <li>A. If there are certain levels of violence or concerns with staff and offences against other residents as well, so there could be depending on the circumstances.</li> <li>Q. So</li> <li>A. Each case would be dealt with individually.</li> <li>Q. Would there be circumstances where the detained person hasn't done anything themselves, for example, been</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	ACDTs, as far as you know?  A. No. Not always. We have our residents who are observed constantly on the wing as well.  Q. So they are not always held, but they might be held?  I want to ask you now about a situation which arose in late 2020, which you mention briefly in your statement and which we have heard about from other witnesses as well. So this is from late July 2020.  Brook House was used to host a population of asylum seekers who the UK was to send to other EU Member States
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. What about the CSU?</li> <li>A. The same would apply but very rarely.</li> <li>Q. What circumstances would make it appropriate to hold</li> <li>A. If there are certain levels of violence or concerns with staff and offences against other residents as well, so there could be depending on the circumstances.</li> <li>Q. So</li> <li>A. Each case would be dealt with individually.</li> <li>Q. Would there be circumstances where the detained person hasn't done anything themselves, for example, been violent in a way that would normally mean that you could</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	ACDTs, as far as you know?  A. No. Not always. We have our residents who are observed constantly on the wing as well.  Q. So they are not always held, but they might be held?  I want to ask you now about a situation which arose in late 2020, which you mention briefly in your statement and which we have heard about from other witnesses as well. So this is from late July 2020.  Brook House was used to host a population of asylum seekers who the UK was to send to other EU Member States under the Dublin Convention. So they were mostly
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. What about the CSU?</li> <li>A. The same would apply but very rarely.</li> <li>Q. What circumstances would make it appropriate to hold</li> <li>A. If there are certain levels of violence or concerns with staff and offences against other residents as well, so there could be depending on the circumstances.</li> <li>Q. So</li> <li>A. Each case would be dealt with individually.</li> <li>Q. Would there be circumstances where the detained person hasn't done anything themselves, for example, been violent in a way that would normally mean that you could take them to E wing or CSU but, because of their</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	ACDTs, as far as you know?  A. No. Not always. We have our residents who are observed constantly on the wing as well.  Q. So they are not always held, but they might be held?  I want to ask you now about a situation which arose in late 2020, which you mention briefly in your statement and which we have heard about from other witnesses as well. So this is from late July 2020.  Brook House was used to host a population of asylum seekers who the UK was to send to other EU Member States under the Dublin Convention. So they were mostly people, as I understand it, who had crossed the channel
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. What about the CSU?</li> <li>A. The same would apply but very rarely.</li> <li>Q. What circumstances would make it appropriate to hold</li> <li>A. If there are certain levels of violence or concerns with staff and offences against other residents as well, so there could be depending on the circumstances.</li> <li>Q. So</li> <li>A. Each case would be dealt with individually.</li> <li>Q. Would there be circumstances where the detained person hasn't done anything themselves, for example, been violent in a way that would normally mean that you could take them to E wing or CSU but, because of their vulnerabilities, they are taken there?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	ACDTs, as far as you know?  A. No. Not always. We have our residents who are observed constantly on the wing as well.  Q. So they are not always held, but they might be held?  I want to ask you now about a situation which arose in late 2020, which you mention briefly in your statement and which we have heard about from other witnesses as well. So this is from late July 2020.  Brook House was used to host a population of asylum seekers who the UK was to send to other EU Member States under the Dublin Convention. So they were mostly people, as I understand it, who had crossed the channel on small boats?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. What about the CSU?</li> <li>A. The same would apply but very rarely.</li> <li>Q. What circumstances would make it appropriate to hold</li> <li>A. If there are certain levels of violence or concerns with staff and offences against other residents as well, so there could be depending on the circumstances.</li> <li>Q. So</li> <li>A. Each case would be dealt with individually.</li> <li>Q. Would there be circumstances where the detained person hasn't done anything themselves, for example, been violent in a way that would normally mean that you could take them to E wing or CSU but, because of their vulnerabilities, they are taken there?</li> <li>A. The only assistance, we use a quieter area, depending on</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	ACDTs, as far as you know?  A. No. Not always. We have our residents who are observed constantly on the wing as well.  Q. So they are not always held, but they might be held?  I want to ask you now about a situation which arose in late 2020, which you mention briefly in your statement and which we have heard about from other witnesses as well. So this is from late July 2020.  Brook House was used to host a population of asylum seekers who the UK was to send to other EU Member States under the Dublin Convention. So they were mostly people, as I understand it, who had crossed the channel on small boats?  A. Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. What about the CSU?</li> <li>A. The same would apply but very rarely.</li> <li>Q. What circumstances would make it appropriate to hold</li> <li>A. If there are certain levels of violence or concerns with staff and offences against other residents as well, so there could be depending on the circumstances.</li> <li>Q. So</li> <li>A. Each case would be dealt with individually.</li> <li>Q. Would there be circumstances where the detained person hasn't done anything themselves, for example, been violent in a way that would normally mean that you could take them to E wing or CSU but, because of their vulnerabilities, they are taken there?</li> <li>A. The only assistance, we use a quieter area, depending on their it's all depending on their vulnerabilities.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	ACDTs, as far as you know?  A. No. Not always. We have our residents who are observed constantly on the wing as well.  Q. So they are not always held, but they might be held?  I want to ask you now about a situation which arose in late 2020, which you mention briefly in your statement and which we have heard about from other witnesses as well. So this is from late July 2020.  Brook House was used to host a population of asylum seekers who the UK was to send to other EU Member States under the Dublin Convention. So they were mostly people, as I understand it, who had crossed the channel on small boats?  A. Yes.  Q. And there was a window to be able to move them to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. What about the CSU?</li> <li>A. The same would apply but very rarely.</li> <li>Q. What circumstances would make it appropriate to hold</li> <li>A. If there are certain levels of violence or concerns with staff and offences against other residents as well, so there could be depending on the circumstances.</li> <li>Q. So</li> <li>A. Each case would be dealt with individually.</li> <li>Q. Would there be circumstances where the detained person hasn't done anything themselves, for example, been violent in a way that would normally mean that you could take them to E wing or CSU but, because of their vulnerabilities, they are taken there?</li> <li>A. The only assistance, we use a quieter area, depending on their it's all depending on their vulnerabilities.</li> <li>E wing, as we are aware, is a quieter area and there is</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	ACDTs, as far as you know?  A. No. Not always. We have our residents who are observed constantly on the wing as well.  Q. So they are not always held, but they might be held?  I want to ask you now about a situation which arose in late 2020, which you mention briefly in your statement and which we have heard about from other witnesses as well. So this is from late July 2020.  Brook House was used to host a population of asylum seekers who the UK was to send to other EU Member States under the Dublin Convention. So they were mostly people, as I understand it, who had crossed the channel on small boats?  A. Yes.  Q. And there was a window to be able to move them to a different country which would have to determine their
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. What about the CSU?</li> <li>A. The same would apply but very rarely.</li> <li>Q. What circumstances would make it appropriate to hold</li> <li>A. If there are certain levels of violence or concerns with staff and offences against other residents as well, so there could be depending on the circumstances.</li> <li>Q. So</li> <li>A. Each case would be dealt with individually.</li> <li>Q. Would there be circumstances where the detained person hasn't done anything themselves, for example, been violent in a way that would normally mean that you could take them to E wing or CSU but, because of their vulnerabilities, they are taken there?</li> <li>A. The only assistance, we use a quieter area, depending on their it's all depending on their vulnerabilities.</li> <li>E wing, as we are aware, is a quieter area and there is some better visibility and bedroom visibility if there</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	ACDTs, as far as you know?  A. No. Not always. We have our residents who are observed constantly on the wing as well.  Q. So they are not always held, but they might be held?  I want to ask you now about a situation which arose in late 2020, which you mention briefly in your statement and which we have heard about from other witnesses as well. So this is from late July 2020.  Brook House was used to host a population of asylum seekers who the UK was to send to other EU Member States under the Dublin Convention. So they were mostly people, as I understand it, who had crossed the channel on small boats?  A. Yes.  Q. And there was a window to be able to move them to a different country which would have to determine their asylum claim and that window was before Britain left the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. What about the CSU?</li> <li>A. The same would apply but very rarely.</li> <li>Q. What circumstances would make it appropriate to hold</li> <li>A. If there are certain levels of violence or concerns with staff and offences against other residents as well, so there could be depending on the circumstances.</li> <li>Q. So</li> <li>A. Each case would be dealt with individually.</li> <li>Q. Would there be circumstances where the detained person hasn't done anything themselves, for example, been violent in a way that would normally mean that you could take them to E wing or CSU but, because of their vulnerabilities, they are taken there?</li> <li>A. The only assistance, we use a quieter area, depending on their it's all depending on their vulnerabilities.</li> <li>E wing, as we are aware, is a quieter area and there is some better visibility and bedroom visibility if there are any concerns of self-harm or issues as well.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	ACDTs, as far as you know?  A. No. Not always. We have our residents who are observed constantly on the wing as well.  Q. So they are not always held, but they might be held?  I want to ask you now about a situation which arose in late 2020, which you mention briefly in your statement and which we have heard about from other witnesses as well. So this is from late July 2020.  Brook House was used to host a population of asylum seekers who the UK was to send to other EU Member States under the Dublin Convention. So they were mostly people, as I understand it, who had crossed the channel on small boats?  A. Yes.  Q. And there was a window to be able to move them to a different country which would have to determine their asylum claim and that window was before Britain left the EU?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. What about the CSU?</li> <li>A. The same would apply but very rarely.</li> <li>Q. What circumstances would make it appropriate to hold</li> <li>A. If there are certain levels of violence or concerns with staff and offences against other residents as well, so there could be depending on the circumstances.</li> <li>Q. So</li> <li>A. Each case would be dealt with individually.</li> <li>Q. Would there be circumstances where the detained person hasn't done anything themselves, for example, been violent in a way that would normally mean that you could take them to E wing or CSU but, because of their vulnerabilities, they are taken there?</li> <li>A. The only assistance, we use a quieter area, depending on their it's all depending on their vulnerabilities.</li> <li>E wing, as we are aware, is a quieter area and there is some better visibility and bedroom visibility if there are any concerns of self-harm or issues as well.</li> <li>So it is a case-by-case, individual basis.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	ACDTs, as far as you know?  A. No. Not always. We have our residents who are observed constantly on the wing as well.  Q. So they are not always held, but they might be held?  I want to ask you now about a situation which arose in late 2020, which you mention briefly in your statement and which we have heard about from other witnesses as well. So this is from late July 2020.  Brook House was used to host a population of asylum seekers who the UK was to send to other EU Member States under the Dublin Convention. So they were mostly people, as I understand it, who had crossed the channel on small boats?  A. Yes.  Q. And there was a window to be able to move them to a different country which would have to determine their asylum claim and that window was before Britain left the EU?  A. Correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. What about the CSU?</li> <li>A. The same would apply but very rarely.</li> <li>Q. What circumstances would make it appropriate to hold</li> <li>A. If there are certain levels of violence or concerns with staff and offences against other residents as well, so there could be depending on the circumstances.</li> <li>Q. So</li> <li>A. Each case would be dealt with individually.</li> <li>Q. Would there be circumstances where the detained person hasn't done anything themselves, for example, been violent in a way that would normally mean that you could take them to E wing or CSU but, because of their vulnerabilities, they are taken there?</li> <li>A. The only assistance, we use a quieter area, depending on their it's all depending on their vulnerabilities.</li> <li>E wing, as we are aware, is a quieter area and there is some better visibility and bedroom visibility if there are any concerns of self-harm or issues as well.</li> <li>So it is a case-by-case, individual basis.</li> <li>Q. We heard from Mary Molyneux from the IMB last week, and</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	ACDTs, as far as you know?  A. No. Not always. We have our residents who are observed constantly on the wing as well.  Q. So they are not always held, but they might be held?  I want to ask you now about a situation which arose in late 2020, which you mention briefly in your statement and which we have heard about from other witnesses as well. So this is from late July 2020.  Brook House was used to host a population of asylum seekers who the UK was to send to other EU Member States under the Dublin Convention. So they were mostly people, as I understand it, who had crossed the channel on small boats?  A. Yes.  Q. And there was a window to be able to move them to a different country which would have to determine their asylum claim and that window was before Britain left the EU?  A. Correct.  Q. So 31 December 2020. You describe that as "Esparto
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. What about the CSU?</li> <li>A. The same would apply but very rarely.</li> <li>Q. What circumstances would make it appropriate to hold</li> <li>A. If there are certain levels of violence or concerns with staff and offences against other residents as well, so there could be depending on the circumstances.</li> <li>Q. So</li> <li>A. Each case would be dealt with individually.</li> <li>Q. Would there be circumstances where the detained person hasn't done anything themselves, for example, been violent in a way that would normally mean that you could take them to E wing or CSU but, because of their vulnerabilities, they are taken there?</li> <li>A. The only assistance, we use a quieter area, depending on their it's all depending on their vulnerabilities.</li> <li>E wing, as we are aware, is a quieter area and there is some better visibility and bedroom visibility if there are any concerns of self-harm or issues as well.</li> <li>So it is a case-by-case, individual basis.</li> <li>Q. We heard from Mary Molyneux from the IMB last week, and she said there are too many people coming in who, it</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	ACDTs, as far as you know?  A. No. Not always. We have our residents who are observed constantly on the wing as well.  Q. So they are not always held, but they might be held?  I want to ask you now about a situation which arose in late 2020, which you mention briefly in your statement and which we have heard about from other witnesses as well. So this is from late July 2020.  Brook House was used to host a population of asylum seekers who the UK was to send to other EU Member States under the Dublin Convention. So they were mostly people, as I understand it, who had crossed the channel on small boats?  A. Yes.  Q. And there was a window to be able to move them to a different country which would have to determine their asylum claim and that window was before Britain left the EU?  A. Correct.  Q. So 31 December 2020. You describe that as "Esparto flights", but is it the same thing?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. What about the CSU?</li> <li>A. The same would apply but very rarely.</li> <li>Q. What circumstances would make it appropriate to hold</li> <li>A. If there are certain levels of violence or concerns with staff and offences against other residents as well, so there could be depending on the circumstances.</li> <li>Q. So</li> <li>A. Each case would be dealt with individually.</li> <li>Q. Would there be circumstances where the detained person hasn't done anything themselves, for example, been violent in a way that would normally mean that you could take them to E wing or CSU but, because of their vulnerabilities, they are taken there?</li> <li>A. The only assistance, we use a quieter area, depending on their it's all depending on their vulnerabilities.</li> <li>E wing, as we are aware, is a quieter area and there is some better visibility and bedroom visibility if there are any concerns of self-harm or issues as well.</li> <li>So it is a case-by-case, individual basis.</li> <li>Q. We heard from Mary Molyneux from the IMB last week, and she said there are too many people coming in who, it becomes apparent very quickly, have serious mental</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	ACDTs, as far as you know?  A. No. Not always. We have our residents who are observed constantly on the wing as well.  Q. So they are not always held, but they might be held?  I want to ask you now about a situation which arose in late 2020, which you mention briefly in your statement and which we have heard about from other witnesses as well. So this is from late July 2020.  Brook House was used to host a population of asylum seekers who the UK was to send to other EU Member States under the Dublin Convention. So they were mostly people, as I understand it, who had crossed the channel on small boats?  A. Yes.  Q. And there was a window to be able to move them to a different country which would have to determine their asylum claim and that window was before Britain left the EU?  A. Correct.  Q. So 31 December 2020. You describe that as "Esparto flights", but is it the same thing?  A. That's correct, yes, Dublin Convention flights.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. What about the CSU?</li> <li>A. The same would apply but very rarely.</li> <li>Q. What circumstances would make it appropriate to hold</li> <li>A. If there are certain levels of violence or concerns with staff and offences against other residents as well, so there could be depending on the circumstances.</li> <li>Q. So</li> <li>A. Each case would be dealt with individually.</li> <li>Q. Would there be circumstances where the detained person hasn't done anything themselves, for example, been violent in a way that would normally mean that you could take them to E wing or CSU but, because of their vulnerabilities, they are taken there?</li> <li>A. The only assistance, we use a quieter area, depending on their it's all depending on their vulnerabilities.</li> <li>E wing, as we are aware, is a quieter area and there is some better visibility and bedroom visibility if there are any concerns of self-harm or issues as well.</li> <li>So it is a case-by-case, individual basis.</li> <li>Q. We heard from Mary Molyneux from the IMB last week, and she said there are too many people coming in who, it becomes apparent very quickly, have serious mental health problems. And she says CSU and E wing are still</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	ACDTs, as far as you know?  A. No. Not always. We have our residents who are observed constantly on the wing as well.  Q. So they are not always held, but they might be held?  I want to ask you now about a situation which arose in late 2020, which you mention briefly in your statement and which we have heard about from other witnesses as well. So this is from late July 2020.  Brook House was used to host a population of asylum seekers who the UK was to send to other EU Member States under the Dublin Convention. So they were mostly people, as I understand it, who had crossed the channel on small boats?  A. Yes.  Q. And there was a window to be able to move them to a different country which would have to determine their asylum claim and that window was before Britain left the EU?  A. Correct.  Q. So 31 December 2020. You describe that as "Esparto flights", but is it the same thing?  A. That's correct, yes, Dublin Convention flights.  Q. What knowledge, if any, did you have, before those
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. What about the CSU?</li> <li>A. The same would apply but very rarely.</li> <li>Q. What circumstances would make it appropriate to hold</li> <li>A. If there are certain levels of violence or concerns with staff and offences against other residents as well, so there could be depending on the circumstances.</li> <li>Q. So</li> <li>A. Each case would be dealt with individually.</li> <li>Q. Would there be circumstances where the detained person hasn't done anything themselves, for example, been violent in a way that would normally mean that you could take them to E wing or CSU but, because of their vulnerabilities, they are taken there?</li> <li>A. The only assistance, we use a quieter area, depending on their it's all depending on their vulnerabilities.</li> <li>E wing, as we are aware, is a quieter area and there is some better visibility and bedroom visibility if there are any concerns of self-harm or issues as well.</li> <li>So it is a case-by-case, individual basis.</li> <li>Q. We heard from Mary Molyneux from the IMB last week, and she said there are too many people coming in who, it becomes apparent very quickly, have serious mental</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	ACDTs, as far as you know?  A. No. Not always. We have our residents who are observed constantly on the wing as well.  Q. So they are not always held, but they might be held?  I want to ask you now about a situation which arose in late 2020, which you mention briefly in your statement and which we have heard about from other witnesses as well. So this is from late July 2020.  Brook House was used to host a population of asylum seekers who the UK was to send to other EU Member States under the Dublin Convention. So they were mostly people, as I understand it, who had crossed the channel on small boats?  A. Yes.  Q. And there was a window to be able to move them to a different country which would have to determine their asylum claim and that window was before Britain left the EU?  A. Correct.  Q. So 31 December 2020. You describe that as "Esparto flights", but is it the same thing?  A. That's correct, yes, Dublin Convention flights.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. What about the CSU?</li> <li>A. The same would apply but very rarely.</li> <li>Q. What circumstances would make it appropriate to hold</li> <li>A. If there are certain levels of violence or concerns with staff and offences against other residents as well, so there could be depending on the circumstances.</li> <li>Q. So</li> <li>A. Each case would be dealt with individually.</li> <li>Q. Would there be circumstances where the detained person hasn't done anything themselves, for example, been violent in a way that would normally mean that you could take them to E wing or CSU but, because of their vulnerabilities, they are taken there?</li> <li>A. The only assistance, we use a quieter area, depending on their it's all depending on their vulnerabilities.</li> <li>E wing, as we are aware, is a quieter area and there is some better visibility and bedroom visibility if there are any concerns of self-harm or issues as well.</li> <li>So it is a case-by-case, individual basis.</li> <li>Q. We heard from Mary Molyneux from the IMB last week, and she said there are too many people coming in who, it becomes apparent very quickly, have serious mental health problems. And she says CSU and E wing are still</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	ACDTs, as far as you know?  A. No. Not always. We have our residents who are observed constantly on the wing as well.  Q. So they are not always held, but they might be held?  I want to ask you now about a situation which arose in late 2020, which you mention briefly in your statement and which we have heard about from other witnesses as well. So this is from late July 2020.  Brook House was used to host a population of asylum seekers who the UK was to send to other EU Member States under the Dublin Convention. So they were mostly people, as I understand it, who had crossed the channel on small boats?  A. Yes.  Q. And there was a window to be able to move them to a different country which would have to determine their asylum claim and that window was before Britain left the EU?  A. Correct.  Q. So 31 December 2020. You describe that as "Esparto flights", but is it the same thing?  A. That's correct, yes, Dublin Convention flights.  Q. What knowledge, if any, did you have, before those

be expecting at Brook House?  A. A Probably Brite knowledge at that time.  A. A We took as in flux, due to the House Office enforced by antitive office of the comparison of the compressed mature of the own and the contract of the comparison of the compressed mature of the character flight programme with Brook House as its sole character flight programme with Brook House as its sole character flight programme with Brook House as its sole character flight programme with Brook House as its sole character flight programme with Brook House as its sole character flight programme with Brook House as its sole character flight programme with Brook House as its sole character flight programme with Brook House as its sole character flight programme with Brook House as its sole character flight programme with Brook House as its sole character flight programme with Brook House as its sole character flight programme with Brook House as its sole character flight programme with Brook House as its sole character flight programme with Brook House as its sole character flight programme with Brook House as its sole character flight programme with Brook House as its sole character flight programme with Brook House as its sole character flight programme with Brook House as its sole character flight programme with Brook House as its sole character flight programme, with Brook House as its sole character flight programme with Brook House as its sole character flight programme, with Brook House and the flight and their index of the compressed mature of the character flight programme with Brook House as its sole character flight programme with Brook House and the flight and their mediance is sole of the character flight programme with Brook House and the flight and their mediance is sole of the character flight programme with Brook House and the flight and their mediance is sole of the character flight programme with Brook House and the flight and their mediance is sole of the character flight programme with Brook House and the flight a				
detainee population shifted to detainees who had arrived a A. We took an influx due to the Homo Office canfored by a civity in respect of Esparto flights from August onwards, right through to December.  Q. And when did you know the was going to happen, how long before you started to take the influx?  A. We will have been notified when – probably in June or July, that that were the activity or the strategy at that point in time.  10. Q. So gois acity after you took the contract?  11. A. Yes. Yes.  12. Q. So you would not be the strategy at that point in time.  13. A. Yes. Yes.  14. Q. What honviedge, if any, did you have about the characteristics or vulnerabilities or the people who had a five that point in time.  15. A. Yes. Yes.  16. Control Rule 25 assessments.  17. A. Ondy by lownvedge and - having worked in previous IRCs and having a knowledge of anytum seekers and some of their vulnerabilities and actions, that is prior knowledge, and some of the attract and sense management teem had knowledge of that.  28. The last built point fraction of the countrease in levels of self-hurm and suicidal idention and autionabilities, with different submerabilities?  Page 101  1 A. Yes.  Q. So you wereafine, beard and sense management teem had knowledge of a sylum seekers and some of their vulnerabilities and actions, that is prior with the seekers and some of their vulnerabilities and settions, that is prior with the seekers and some of their vulnerabilities and settions, that is prior with the seekers and some of their vulnerabilities and settions, that is prior with the seekers and some of their vulnerabilities and settions, that is prior with the seekers and some of their vulnerabilities and settions, that is prior with the seekers and some of their vulnerabilities and setting the seekers and some of their vulnerabilities and setting the seekers and some of their vulnerabilities and setting that was decided by the Homo Office.  18. A. Yes.  Q. And were you able to put anything, and, if so, what, in place before they a	1	be expecting at Brook House?	1	and it says:
4 A. We took an influx due to the Home Office enforced by a convaris, right through to Departs Digibls from August of owards, right through to December.  7 Q. And when did you know that was going to happen, how long before you started to take influx?  9 A. We will have been notified when — probably in June or July, that that were the activity or the strategy at that that point in time.  10 or July, that that were the activity or the strategy at that that point in time.  112 Q. So quite abortly after you took the contract?  113 A. Yes. Yes.  114 A. Yes. Yes.  115 characteristics or vinderabilities of the people who had been arriving before you met before?  116 that point in time.  117 A. Only by knowledge and — having worked in previous IRCs and having a knowledge of anylum seckers and some of the staff and senior management temperabilities and stans, that is prior their vinderabilities and stans, that is prior to the work and the process of the Characteristics or vinderabilities and stans, that is prior to the work of the staff and senior management temperabilities and stans, that is prior to the work of the staff and senior management temperabilities and stans, that is prior to the work of the staff and senior management temperabilities and stans, that is prior to the work of the staff and senior management temperabilities and stans, that is prior to the staff and senior management temperabilities and stans, that is prior to the staff and senior management temperabilities and stans, that is prior to the staff and senior management temperabilities and stans, that is prior to the staff and senior management temperabilities and stans, that is prior to the staff and senior management temperabilities and stans, that is prior to the staff and senior management temperabilities and stans, that is prior to the staff and senior management temperabilities and stans, that is prior to the staff and senior management temperabilities and stans, that is prior to the staff and senior management temperabilities and stans, that	2	A. Probably little knowledge at that time.	2	"This report found from late July, the centre's
5 activity in respect of Esparro flights from August 6 onwards, right through to December. 7 Q. And wend did you know that was going to happen, how long 8 before you started to take the influx? 9 A. We will have been notified when – probably in June 10 or July, that that were the activity or the strategy at 11 that point in time. 12 Q. So squis bortly after you took the contract? 13 A. Yes. Yes. 14 Q. What knowledge, if any, did you have about the 15 characterissic or vulnerabilities and actions, that is prior 16 been arriving before you met hem? 17 A. Only by knowledge and – having worked in previous IRCs 18 and having a knowledge of anytum seckers and some of 19 their vulnerabilities and actions, that is prior 12 knowledge, and some of the staff and senior management 12 team had knowledge of fat. 12 Q. So you were aftive, because of your experience, to the 13 place before they arrived? 14 A. Yes. 15 Q. And were you able to put anything, and, if so, what, in 16 place before they arrived? 17 A. Yes. 2 Q. And were you able to put anything, and, if so, what, in 18 place before they arrived? 19 A. Yes. 2 Q. And were you able to put anything, and, if so, what, in 2 place for vulnerable detainces who had crossed the 2 Page 101 2 the month of our role was just to ensure — we did not decided by the Home Office. 3 What we did do is we were able to bring — move staff around the centres, who could actually — on the small boat cases for the Esparto flights were in the centre and whatever. From an enforcement activity, that was decided by the Home Office. 3 What we did do is we were able to bring — move staff around the centres, who could actually — on the small boat cases for the Esparto flights were in the staff that speak Farsi and Arabic, et certar, and they assisted in keeping them affe and calm, and they also were mediating with them as well, so that assisted, that allowed us to do that part and we did do not a contain the part of the centre and whatever. From an enforcement activity, that was decided by the Home Off	3	Q. And when did you become aware that that would happen?	3	detainee population shifted to detainees who had arrived
onwards, right through to December, 1979. And when did you know that was going to happen, how long before you strated to take the influx?  A. We will have been notified when — probably in Jame 11 that point in time.  Q. So quite shortly after you took the contract?  A. Yes. Yes.  4. Q. What knowledge, if any, did you have about the been arriving before you met them?  4. A. Only by knowledge and — having worked in previous IRCs and having a knowledge and — having worked in previous IRCs and having a knowledge of anythm seckers and some of their vulnerabilities and actions, that is prior learned than knowledge of that.  2. Q. So you were alive, because of your experience, to the fact that asylam seckers, particularly who had you have about the appears of the contract of the	4	A. We took an influx due to the Home Office enforced by	4	after crossing the channel in small boats.
charter flight programme with Brook House as its solc base for Dublin Convention flights and the fundamental base for Dublin Convention flights and the fundamental or July, that that were the activity or the strategy at that point in time.  10	5	activity in respect of Esparto flights from August	5	The last bullet point there:
before you started to take the influx?  A. We will have been notified when – probably in June or July, that that were the activity or the strategy at that point in time.  Os on quie shortly after you took the contract?  A. Ye, Ye, S.  Os Quie shortly after you took the contract?  A. Ye, Ye, S.  Og What knowledge, if any, did you have about the characteristics or valnerabilities of the people who had been arriving before you met them?  A. Only by knowledge and – having worked in previous IRCs and having a knowledge of anyth metalogue of the trivincerabilities and actions, that is prior knowledge, and some of the staff and senior management tream had knowledge of that.  Og So you were alive, because of your experience, to the fact that asylum seckers, particularly who had just receibly crossed the Chamed in small boats, would have different vulnerabilities?  Day on agree, with that as a summary?  A. Yes, ye.  Og And were you able to put anything, and, if so, what, in place before they arrived?  A. I mean, part of our role was just to ensure — we did not decide who were allocated to the centre and whatever. From an enforcement activity, that was decided by the Home Office.  What we did do is we were able to bring — move staff around the centres, who could actually — communication, obviously, is key in these particular a reas, et cetera, and given that loss of the residents on the small boat case, who could actually — communication, obviously, is key in these particular a reas, et cetera, and given that lots of the residents on the small boat case for the Expart oflights were sither, you know, Iranian, Iraqi, et cetera, so we had a number of staff that speak Farsi and Arabic, et cetera, and they sustice in keeping them safe and calm, and they also were mediating with them as well, so that assisted, that allowed us to do that part and we did move a lot of staff just to manage that particular appect of it. Communication was key in that, So that assisted, that allowed us to do that part and we edit passe for Dublin co	6	onwards, right through to December.	6	"The combination of the compressed nature of the
A. We will have been notified when — probably in June or July, that that were the activity or the strategy at that pain in time.  Q. So quite shortly after you took the contract?  A. Yes. Yes. A. Yes. Yes. A. Only by knowledge, if any, did you have about the characteristics or vulnerabilities and actions, that is prof their vulnerabilities and actions, that is prof knowledge, and some of the staff and senior management team had knowledge of that.  A. Only by knowledge and – having worked in previous IRCs and having a knowledge of that.  A. I made actions, that is prof knowledge, and some of the staff and senior management team had knowledge of that.  A. Tex. Yes.  Q. On you were alive, because of your experience, to the fact that asylum seekers, particularly who had just recently crossed the Channel in small boats, would have  Page 101  A. Yes.  Q. And were you able to put anything, and, if so, what, in place before they arrived?  A. I mean, part of our role was just to ensure — we did not decide who were allocated to the centre and whatever. From an enforcement activity, that was decided by the Home Office.  What we did do is we were able to bring — move staff around the centres, who could actually — communication, obviously, is key in these particular areas, et cetera, and given that lots of the residents on the small boat cases, for the Exparto flights were cither, you know, Iranian, Iraqi, et cetera, so we had a number of staff that speak Farsi and Arabic, etither, you know, Iranian, Iraqi, et cetera, so we had a number of staff that speak Farsi and Arabic, etither, you know, Iranian, Iraqi, et cetera, so we had a number of staff that speak Farsi and Arabic, etither, you know, Iranian, Iraqi, et cetera, so we had a number of staff that speak Farsi and Arabic, etither, you know, Iranian, Iraqi, et cetera, so we had a number of staff that speak Farsi and Arabic, etith	7	Q. And when did you know that was going to happen, how long	7	charter flight programme with Brook House as its sole
that point in time.  Q. So qui were alive, because of your experience, to the page:  The chards of the control of the change in small boats, would have the control of the change in small boats, would have the control of the chard of the change in small boats, would have the control of the change in small boats, would have the control of the chard of the change in small boats, would have the control of the control of the change in small boats, would have the control of the control of the control of the control of the change in small boats, would have the control of the c	8	before you started to take the influx?	8	base for Dublin Convention flights and the fundamental
that point in time.  2	9	A. We will have been notified when probably in June	9	changes in the centre's population and nationalities,
12 Q. So quite shortly after you took the contract? 13 A. Yes. Yes. 14 Q. What knowledge, if any, did you have about the 15 characteristics or vulnerabilities of the people who had 16 been arriving before you met them? 17 A. Only by knowledge and — having worked in previous IRCs 18 and having a knowledge of asytum seekers and some of 19 their vulnerabilities and actions, that is prior 19 their vulnerabilities and actions, that is prior 20 knowledge, and some of the staff and senior management 21 team had knowledge of that. 22 Q. So you were alive, because of your experience, to the 23 fact that anythum seekers, particularly who had just 24 recently crossed the Channel in small boats, would have 25 different vulnerabilities? 26 Q. And were you able to put anything, and, if so, what, in 27 place before they arrived? 28 A. Yes. 29 Q. And were you able to put anything, and, if so, what, in 29 place before they arrived? 30 A. Tenan, part of our role was just to ensure — we did 31 not decide who were allocated to the centre and 32 whatever. From an enforcement activity, that was 33 decided by the Home Office. 34 A. Tenan, part of our role was just to ensure — we did 35 not decided by the Home Office. 36 What we did do is we were able to bring — move 37 staff around the centres, who could actually— 38 communication, obviously, is key in these particular 39 on the small boat cases for the Esparto flights were 30 either, you know, Iranian, Iraqi, et cetera, so we had 30 a number of staff that placed that power allocated in keeping them safe and 31 calm, and they also were mediating with them as well. 32 So that assisted, that allowed us to do that part and we 33 decided by the lamper of staff that place the residents 44 a number of staff supeck Farsi and Rapet Arabic, 45 et cetera, and they also were mediating with them as well. 46 So that assisted, that allowed us to do that part and well and the centres, who could a that part and well and the centres, who could a that part and well and the centre of the decidents on c	10	or July, that that were the activity or the strategy at	10	with different vulnerabilities and their needs, put the
A. Yes. Yes.  Q. What knowledge, if any, did you have about the characteristics or vulnerabilities of the people who had been arriving before you met them?  A. Only by knowledge and — having worked in previous IRCs and having a knowledge of asylum seekers and some of their vulnerabilities and actions, that is prior knowledge, and some of the staff and senior management team had knowledge of that.  Q. Q. So you were alive, because of your experience, to the fact that asylum seekers, particularly who had just recently crossed the Channel in small boats, would have different vulnerabilities?  Page 101  A. Yes.  Q. And were you able to put anything, and, if so, what, in place before they arrived?  A. I mean, part of our role was just to ensure — we did mytavetver. From an enforcement activity, that was decided by the Home Office.  What we did do is we were able to bring — move staff around the centres, who could actually—communication, obviously, is key in these particular areas, et cetera, and given that lots of the residents on the small boat cases for the Exparto flights were cither, you know, Iranian, Iraqi, et cetera, so we had a number of staff that speak Farsi and Arabic, et cetera, and given that lots of the residents on the small boat cases for the Exparto flights were did move a lot of staff just to manage that particular aspect of it. Communication was key in that.  So that assisted, that allowed us to do that part and we did move a lot of staff just to manage that particular aspect of it. Communication was key in that.  But our role is to prevent self-harm and support them as well. Such as a page 5 and just leave that up.  Covered in page 6, under "How fairly and humanely were detainess were generally treated humanely at Brock House."  Brock House, Tan and they abower encliating with them as well.  So that assisted, that allowed us to do that part and we did move a lot of staff just to manage that particular aspect of it. Communication was key in that.  So that assisted she assisted in keeping them safe	11	that point in time.	11	centre systems, detainees and staff under great stress
14 Q. What knowledge, if any, did you have about the 15 characteristics or vulnerabilities of the people who had 16 been arriving before you met them? 17 A. Only by knowledge and – having worked in previous IRCs 18 and having a knowledge of asylum seckers and some of 19 their vulnerabilities and actions, that is prior 20 knowledge, and some of the staff and senior management 21 team had knowledge of that. 22 Q. So you were alive, because of your experience, to the 23 fact that asylum seckers, particularly who had just 24 recently crossed the Channel in small boats, would have 25 different vulnerabilities? 26 Page 101 27 A. Ves. 2 Q. And were you able to put anything, and, if so, what, in 28 place before they arrived? 3 A. I mean, part of our role was just to ensure — we did 3 not decide who were allocated to the centre and 4 whatever. From an enforcement activity, that was 4 decided by the Home Office. 4 What we did do is we were able to bring — move 4 staff around the centres, who could actually — 5 communication, obvoissly, is key in these particular 11 areas, et cetera, and given that lots of the residents 12 on the small boat cases for the Exparto flights were 13 either, you know, Iranian, Iraqi, et cetera, so we had 14 a number of staff that speak Farsi and Arabic, 15 et cetera, and they assisted in keeping them safe and 16 calm, and they also were mediating with them as well, 17 So that assisted, that allowed us to do that part and we 18 did move a lot of staff just to manage that particular 19 aspect of it. Communication was key in that. 20 Q. Ves. I am going to refer you to the IMB report, 2020, 21 which dealt — part of it deals with this situation. If 22 I can ask to be shown on screen, please. So charter 23 flights are there, mentioned from the third bullet point 24 flights are there, mentioned from the third bullet point 25 flights are there, mentioned from the third bullet point 26 flowerer, the beard's view is that the circumstances 27 flights are there, mentioned from the third bullet point 28 flo	12	Q. So quite shortly after you took the contract?	12	and raised some concerns for the board. Most notably,
15 characteristics or vulnerabilities of the people who had 16 been arriving before you met them? 17 A. Only by knowledge and - having worked in previous IRCs 18 and having a knowledge and - having worked in previous IRCs 18 and having a knowledge of asylum seckers and some of their vulnerabilities and actions, that is prior 20 knowledge, and some of the staff and senior management team had knowledge of that. 21 Q. So you were alive, because of your experience, to the fact that asylum seekers, particularly who had just 22 recently crossed the Channel in small boats, would have 23 different vulnerabilities? 22 Page 101 23 Fact that asylum seekers, particularly who had just 24 recently crossed the Channel in small boats, would have 25 different vulnerabilities? 24 Page 101 25 Q. And were you able to put anything, and, if so, what, in 3 place before they arrived? 26 A. I man, part of our role was just to ensure — we did not decide who were allocated to the centre and whatever. From an enforcement activity, that was decided by the Home Office. 26 What we did do is we were able to bring — move staff around the centres, who could actually — communication, obviously, is key in these particularly a number of staff that speak Fars's and Arabic, 21 a number of staff that speak Fars's and Arabic, 22 etcera, and given that lust of the residents on the small boat cases for the Esparto flights were either, you know, Iranian, Iraqi, et ectera, so we had 21 a number of staff that speak Fars's and Arabic, 22 etcera, and they assisted in keeping them safe and 23 calm, and they also were mediating with them as well. 24 a number of staff that speak Fars's and Arabic, 24 etcetera, and they assisted in keeping them safe and 24 calm, and they also were mediating with them as well. 25 etcetera, and they assisted in keeping them safe and 24 calm, and they also were mediating with them as well. 26 etcetera, and they assisted in keeping them safe and 27 calm and 28 calm and 28 calm and 28 calm and 29 calm and 29 calm and 29 calm and 29 c	13	A. Yes. Yes.	13	there was a dramatic increase in levels of self-harm and
16   Deen arriving before you met them?   16   17   A. Only by knowledge and — having worked in previous IRCs   18   A. Only by knowledge of anythm seekers and some of   18   A. Yes, yes.   20   C. So you were alive, because of your experience, to the   22   C. So you were alive, because of your experience, to the   22   G. So you were alive, because of your experience, to the   23   fact that asylum seekers, particularly who had just   24   recently crossed the Channel in small boats, would have   25   different vulnerabilities?   25   different vulnerabilities?   26   Page 101   Page 103   Page 103    1	14	Q. What knowledge, if any, did you have about the	14	suicidal ideation, deficiencies in the induction process
Do you agree with that as a summary?  A. Only by knowledge and — having worked in previous IRCs and having a knowledge of asylum seckers and some of their vulnerabilities and actions, that is prior team had knowledge of that.  20	15	characteristics or vulnerabilities of the people who had	15	and increased needs for legal support and Detention
and having a knowledge of asylum seckers and some of their vulnerabilities and actions, that is prior knowledge, and some of the staff and senior management to knowledge, and some of the staff and senior management to knowledge, and some of the staff and senior management to knowledge, and some of the staff and senior management to knowledge, and some of the staff and senior management to the page:  Q. So you were alive, because of your experience, to the page of fact that asylum seekers, particularly who had just recently crossed the Channel in small boats, would have the latter months of 2020, Brook House was not a safe place for vulnerabilities?  Page 101  A. Yes.  Q. And were you able to put anything, and, if so, what, in place before they arrived?  A. I mean, part of our role was just to ensure — we did not decide who were allocated to the centre and whatever. From an enforcement activity, that was decided by the Home Office.  What we did do is we were able to bring — move staff around the centres, who could actually — communication, obviously, is key in these particular areas, et cetera, and given that lots of the residents on the small boat cases for the Esparto flights were either, you know, Iranian, Iraqi, et cetera, so we had a number of staff that speak Parsi and Arabic, et cetera, and they assisted in keeping them safe and calm, and they also were meditating with them as well. So that assisted, that allowed us to do that part and we did move a lot of staff just to manage that particular aspect of it. Communication was key in that.  D. Q. Yes. I am going to refer you to the IMB report, 2020, which dealt — part of it deals with this situation. If I can ask to be shown on screen, please, SMB000202>, and if we can look at page 5 and just leave that up, that document, on the screen, please, SMB000202>, and if we can look at page 5 and just leave that up, that document, on the screen, please. So charter flights are there, mentioned from the third bullet point that document, on the screen, please. So chart	16	been arriving before you met them?	16	Centre Rule 35 assessments."
their vulnerabilities and actions, that is prior knowledge, and some of the staff and senior management team had knowledge of that.  2 Q. So you were alive, because of your experience, to the fact that asylum seckers, particularly who had just recently crossed the Channel in small boats, would have different vulnerabilities?  2 Despoy on were alive, because of your experience, to the different vulnerabilities?  2 Despoy on were alive, because of your experience, to the different vulnerabilities?  2 Despoy on were alive, because of your experience, to the different vulnerabilities?  2 Despoy on were alive, because of your experience, to the different vulnerabilities?  2 Despoy on were alive, because of your experience, to the different vulnerabilities?  3 Dage 101  1 A. Yes.  2 Q. And were you able to put anything, and, if so, what, in place before they arrived?  4 A. I mean, part of our role was just to ensure — we did not decide who were allocated to the centre and whatever. From an enforcement activity, that was decided by the Home Office.  8 What we did do is we were able to bring — move staff around the centres, who could actually — communication, obviously, is key in these particular areas, et cetera, and given that lots of the residents areas, et cetera, and given that lots of the residents areas, et cetera, and given that lots of the residents areas, et cetera, and given that lots of the residents on the small boat cases for the Esparto flights were either, you know, Iranian, Iraqi, et cetera, so we had a number of staff that speak Farsi and Arabic, et cetera, and they assisted in keeping them safe and calm, and they also were mediating with them as well. So that assisted, that allowed us to do that part and we did move a lot of staff just to manage that particular part of it deals with this situation. If 1 areas, et cetera, and given that loss of the residents and we did many functions, and I suppose, at that time, there were quite a number of residents on constant supervisions to supervise and support	17	A. Only by knowledge and having worked in previous IRCs	17	Do you agree with that as a summary?
their vulnerabilities and actions, that is prior knowledge, and some of the staff and senior management team had knowledge of that.  2 Q. So you were alive, because of your experience, to the fact that asylum seekers, particularly who had just recently crossed the Channel in small boats, would have different vulnerabilities?  2 D. So you were alive, because of your experience, to the different vulnerabilities?  2 D. So you were alive, because of your experience, to the different vulnerabilities?  2 D. So you were alive, because of your experience, to the place for vulnerable detainces who had crossed the Page 101  2 D. What we did do is put anything, and, if so, what, in place before they arrived?  4 A. I mean, part of our role was just to ensure — we did not decide who were allocated to the centre and whatever. From an enforcement activity, that was decided by the Home Office.  8 What we did do is we were able to bring — move staff around the centres, who could actually — communication, obviously, is key in these particular a reas, et cetera, and given that lots of the residents on the small boat cases for the Esparto flights were either, you know, Iranian, Iraqi, et cetera, so we had a number of staff that speak Farsi and Arabic, et cetera, and they also were mediating with them as well. So that assisted, that allowed us to do that part and we did move a lot of staff just to manage that particular paper of it deals with his situation. If 1 paper of it deals with his situation. If 1 paper of it deals with his situation. If 1 paper of it deals with his situation. If 1 paper of it deals with his situation. If 1 paper of it deals with his situation. If 1 paper of it deals with his situation. If 1 paper of it deals with his situation. If 1 paper of it deals with his situation. If 1 paper of it deals with his situation. If 1 paper of it deals with his situation. If 1 paper of it deals with his situation. If 1 paper of it deals with his situation. If 1 paper of it deals with his situation. If 1 paper of it deals wit	18	and having a knowledge of asylum seekers and some of	18	A. Yes, yes.
team had knowledge of that.  2 Q. So you were allocated to the centre and whatever. From an enforcement activity, that was decided by the Home Office.  What we did do is we were allocated to the centre and whatever. From an enforcement activity, that was decided by the Home Office.  What we did do is we were allocated to the residents on the small boat cases for the Esparto flights were either, you know, Iranian, Iraqi, et cetera, so we had a number of staff that speak Farsi and Arabic, et cetera, and they assisted, that allowed us to do that part and we did move a lot of staff just to manage that particular aspect of it. Communication was key in that.  Q. Yes. I am going to refer you to the IMB report, 2020, which dealt - part of it deals with this situation. If I can ask to be shown on screen, please, \$4\text{MB0000002}{2}, and if we can look at page 5 and just leave that up, that document, on the screen, please, \$4\text{MB000002}{2}, and if we can look at page 5 and just leave that up, that document, on the screen, please, \$6\text{MB000002}{2}, and if we can look at page 5 and just leave that up, that document, on the screen, please, \$6\text{MB0000002}{2}, and if we can look at page 5 and just leave that up, that document, on the screen, please, \$6\text{MB0000002}{2}, and if we can look at page 5 and just leave that up, that document, on the screen, please, \$6\text{MB0000002}{2}, and if we can look at page 5 and just leave that up, that document, on the screen, please, \$6\text{MB0000002}{2}, and if we can look at page 5 and just leave that up, that document, on the screen, please, \$6\text{MB0000002}{2}, and if we can look at page 5 and just leave that up, that document, on the screen, please, \$6\text{MB10000002}{2}, and if we can look at page 5 and just leave that up, that document, on the screen, please, \$6\text{MB10000002}{2}, and if we can look at page 5 and just leave that up, that document, on the screen, please, \$6\text{MB10000002}{2}, and if we can look at page 5 and just leave that up, that document,	19	·	19	Q. Under paragraph 3.2, which I think is a bit further down
team had knowledge of that.  Q. So you were alive, because of your experience, to the fact that asylum seekers, particularly who had just the that asylum seekers, particularly who had just to the Dublin Convention charter programme, in the latter months of 2020, Brook House was not a safe place for vulnerable detainees who had crossed the Page 101  1 A. Yes. 2 Q. And were you able to put anything, and, if so, what, in place before they arrived? 4 A. I mean, part of our role was just to ensure — we did not decide who were allocated to the centre and whatever. From an enforcement activity, that was decided by the Home Office.  8 What we did do is we were able to bring — move staff around the centres, who could actually — communication, obviously, is key in these particular areas, et cetera, and given that lots of the residents on the small boat cases for the Esparto flights were either, you know, Iranian, Iraqi, et cetera, so we had dan a number of staff that speak Fars and Arabic, et cetera, and they assisted, that allowed us to do that part and we did move a lot of staff just to manage that particular aspect of it. Communication was key in that.  Q. Yes. I am going to refer you to the IMB report, 2020, which dealt — part of it deals with this situation. If can ask to be shown on screen, please, «IMB000202>, and if we can look at page 5 and just leave that up, that document, on the screen, please, «IMB000202>, and if we can look at page 5 and just leave that up, that document, on the screen, please. So charter flights are there, mentioned from the third bullet point in the candidate of the Dublin Convention charter programme, in the later months of 2020, Brook House are the later months of 2020, Brook House as the talter months of 2020, Brook House as the later months of 2020, Brook House as the state interments of 2020, Brook House are the later months of 2020, Brook House are the place for vulnerable detaines who had craines with site wich is small boats.  2 I can had knowe a lot of staff just to manage that p	20	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	20	the page:
related to the Dublin Convention charter programme, in the latter months of 2020, Brook House was not a safe place for vulnerable detainees who had crossed the Page 101  1 A. Yes. 2 Q. And were you able to put anything, and, if so, what, in place before they arrived? 4 A. I mean, part of our role was just to ensure — we did not decide who were allocated to the centre and whatever. From an enforcement activity, that was decided by the Home Office. 8 What we did do is we were able to bring — move staff around the centres, who could actually — communication, obviously, is key in these particular areas, et cetera, and given that lots of the residents on the small boat cases for the Esparto flights were either, you know, Iranian, Iraqi, et cetera, so we had a number of staff that speak Farsi and Arabic, et cetera, and they assisted, in keeping them safe and calm, and they also were mediating with them as well. 17 So that assisted, that allowed us to do that part and we did move a lot of staff just to manage that particular aspect of it. Communication was key in that. 20 Q. Yes. I am going to refer you to the IMB report, 2020, which dealt — part of it deals with this situation. If 1 can ask to be shown on screen, please, «IMB000202», and if we can look at page 5 and just leave that up, that document, on the screen, please, «IMB000202», and if we can look at page 5 and just leave that up, that document, on the screen, please, «IMB000202», and if we can look at page 5 and just leave that up, that document, on the screen, please, «IMB000202», and if we can look at page 5 and just leave that up, that document, on the screen, please, «IMB000202», and if we can look at page 5 and just leave that up, that document, on the screen, please, of the screen and the part and the circumstances and if we can look at page 5 and just leave that up, that document, on the screen, please, of the control of the page 1 and 1 an	21		21	"Main judgments: how safe is the IRC?
the latter months of 2020, Brook House was not a safe place for vulnerable detainees who had crossed the  Page 101  A. Yes.  Q. And were you able to put anything, and, if so, what, in place before they arrived?  A. I mean, part of our role was just to ensure — we did not decide who were allocated to the centre and whatever. From an enforcement activity, that was decided by the Home Office.  What we did do is we were able to bring — move staff around the centres, who could actually — communication, obviously, is key in these particular areas, et cetera, and given that lots of the residents on the small boat cases for the Esparto flights were either, you know, Iranian, Iraqi, et cetera, so we had a number of staff that speak Farsi and Arabic, et cetera, and they also were mediating with them as well. So that assisted, that allowed us to do that part and we did move a lot of staff just to manage that particular aspect of it. Communication was key in that.  Q. Yes. I am going to refer you to the IMB report, 2020, which dealt — part of it deals with this situation. If I can ask to be shown on screen, please, <indb000202>, and if we can look at page 5 and just leave that up, that document, on the screen, please. So charter flights are there, mentioned from the third bullet point  at the latter months of 2020, Brook House was not a safe place for vulnerable detainees who had crossed the  Page 103  channel in small boats."  It goes on to say this is evidenced by the time. Do you agree, during this period, Brook House was not a safe place for the detainees?  A. Not particularly — it wasn't safe. We made it as safe as possible and cared for the residents we had in our care.  They were obviously allocated, from an Home Office perspective, ready for their flights. I have to say it was a difficult period. There was a lot of self-harm, particularly from the residents, and use of force, which you will see in the statistics that correlate with that.  But our role is to prevent self-harm and support the residents, and use of fo</indb000202>	22	Q. So you were alive, because of your experience, to the	22	"The board's view is that due to circumstances
the latter months of 2020, Brook House was not a safe place for vulnerable detainees who had crossed the  Page 101  A. Yes.  Q. And were you able to put anything, and, if so, what, in place before they arrived?  A. I mean, part of our role was just to ensure — we did not decide who were allocated to the centre and whatever. From an enforcement activity, that was decided by the Home Office.  What we did do is we were able to bring — move staff around the centres, who could actually — communication, obviously, is key in these particular areas, et cetera, and given that lots of the residents on the small boat cases for the Esparto flights were either, you know, Iranian, Iraqi, et cetera, so we had a number of staff that speak Farsi and Arabic, et cetera, and they assisted in keeping them safe and calm, and they also were mediating with them as well. So that assisted, that allowed us to do that part and we did move a lot of staff just to manage that particular aspect of it. Communication was key in that.  Q. Yes. I am going to refer you to the IMB report, 2020, which dealt — part of it deals with this situation. If I can ask to be shown on screen, please, <imbonous 2020,="" <imbonous="" am="" and="" as="" ask="" assisted="" be="" can="" constant="" deals="" dealt="" going="" i="" if="" imb="" it="" language="" of="" on="" part="" pl<="" please,="" plus="" q.="" refer="" report,="" screen,="" shown="" situation.="" spoke="" staff="" supervise="" supervisions="" support="" td="" that="" the="" their="" them="" them.="" this="" to="" ves.="" well="" well.="" which="" with="" yes.="" you="" —=""><td>23</td><td>fact that asylum seekers, particularly who had just</td><td>23</td><td>related to the Dublin Convention charter programme, in</td></imbonous>	23	fact that asylum seekers, particularly who had just	23	related to the Dublin Convention charter programme, in
Page 101  A. Yes.  Q. And were you able to put anything, and, if so, what, in place before they arrived?  A. I mean, part of our role was just to ensure — we did not decide who were allocated to the centre and whatever. From an enforcement activity, that was decided by the Home Office.  What we did do is we were able to bring — move staff around the centres, who could actually — communication, obviously, is key in these particular areas, et cetera, and given that lots of the residents on the small boat cases for the detaines.  They were obviously allocated, from an Home Office perspective, ready for their flights. I have to say it was a difficult period. There was a lot of self-harm, particularly from the residents, and use of force, which you will see in the statistics that correlate with that.  But our role is to prevent self-harm and support the residents on constant supervisions to supervise and support them as well.  So that assisted, that allowed us to do that part and we did move a lot of staff just to manage that particular aspect of it. Communication was key in that.  Q. Yes. I am going to refer you to the IMB report, 2020, which dealt — part of it deals with this situation. If I can ask to be shown on screen, please, <imb000202>, and if we can look at page 5 and just leave that up, that document, on the screen, please. So charter flights are there, mentioned from the third bullet point  Page 103  channel in small boats."  It goes on to say this is evidenced by the time. Do you agree, during this period. Brook House was not a safe place for the detainese."  A. Not particularly — it wasn't safe. We made it as safe as possible and cared for the residents as safe as possible and cared for the residents we had in our care.  They were obviously allocated, from an Home Office perspective, ready for their flights. I have to say it was a difficult period. There was a lot of self-harm, particularly from the residents, and use of force, which you will see in the statistics that correlate with that.  But our role</imb000202>	24		24	the latter months of 2020, Brook House was not a safe
1 A. Yes. 2 Q. And were you able to put anything, and, if so, what, in place before they arrived? 4 A. I mean, part of our role was just to ensure — we did not decide who were allocated to the centre and whatever. From an enforcement activity, that was decided by the Home Office. 8 What we did do is we were able to bring — move staff around the centres, who could actually — staff around the centres, who could actually — communication, obviously, is key in these particular areas, et cetera, and given that lots of the residents on the small boat cases for the Esparto flights were either, you know, Iranian, Iraqi, et cetera, so we had a number of staff that speak Farsi and Arabic, et cetera, and they also were mediating with them as well. So that assisted, that allowed us to do that part and we did move a lot of staff just to manage that particular aspect of it. Communication was key in that. 20 Q. Yes. I am going to refer you to the IMB report, 2020, which dealt — part of it deals with this situation. If I can ask to be shown on screen, please, SIMB000202>, and if we can look at page 5 and just leave that up, that document, on the screen, please. So charter flights are there, mentioned from the third bullet point in the situation and they also were mediating with them as well. So that assisted them, part and we detain the staff that spoke their language as well that assisted them. 20 Q. Yes. I am going to refer you to the IMB report, 2020, which dealt — part of it deals with this situation. If I can ask to be shown on screen, please, SIMB000202>, and if we can look at page 5 and just leave that up, that document, on the screen, please. So charter flights are there, mentioned from the third bullet point in the situation and the centres and support them are sidents. In the part and we did many functions, and I suppose, at that time, there were quite a number of residents on constant supervisions to supervise and support them as well, plus the staff that spoke their language as well that assisted them. 20 Q. Overlea	25	•	25	place for vulnerable detainees who had crossed the
1 A. Yes. 2 Q. And were you able to put anything, and, if so, what, in place before they arrived? 4 A. I mean, part of our role was just to ensure — we did not decide who were allocated to the centre and whatever. From an enforcement activity, that was decided by the Home Office. 8 What we did do is we were able to bring — move staff around the centres, who could actually — staff that speak Farsi and Arabic, either, you know, Iranian, Iraqi, et cetera, so we had a number of staff that speak Farsi and Arabic, et cetera, and they also were mediating with them as well. So that assisted, that allowed us to do that part and we did move a lot of staff just to manage that particular aspect of it. Communication was key in that.  20 Q. Yes. I am going to refer you to the IMB report, 2020, which dealt — part of it deals with this situation. If lan ask to be shown on screen, please, sIMB000202>, and if we can look at page 5 and just leave that up, that document, on the screen, please. So charter lights are there, mentioned from the third bullet point sta				
Q. And were you able to put anything, and, if so, what, in place before they arrived?  A. I mean, part of our role was just to ensure – we did not decide who were allocated to the centre and whatever. From an enforcement activity, that was decided by the Home Office.  What we did do is we were able to bring – move staff around the centres, who could actually – communication, obviously, is key in these particular areas, et cetera, and given that lots of the residents on the small boat cases for the Esparto flights were either, you know, Iranian, Iraqi, et cetera, so we had a number of staff that speak Farsi and Arabic, et cetera, and they assisted in keeping them safe and calm, and they also were mediating with them as well.  So that assisted, that allowed us to do that part and we did move a lot of staff just to manage that particular aspect of it. Communication was key in that.  Q. Yes. I am going to refer you to the IMB report, 2020, which dealt – part of it deals with this situation. If I can ask to be shown on screen, please, <imbodologo2>, and if we can look at page 5 and just leave that up, that document, on the screen, please. So charter flights are there, mentioned from the third bullet point  It goes on to say this is evidenced by the high-levels of self-harm and suicidal ideation at the time. Do you agree, during this period, Brook House was not a safe place for the detainnees?  A. Not particularly – it wasn't safe. We made it as safe as possible and cared for the residents we had in our care.  They were obviously allocated, from an Home Office perspective, ready for their flights. I have to say it was a difficult period. There was a lot of self-harm, particularly from the residents, and use of force, which you will see in the statistics that correlate with that.  But our role is to prevent self-harm and support the residents, and we did many functions, and I suppose, at that time, there were quite a number of residents on constant supervisions to supervise and support them as well, plus the staff tha</imbodologo2>		Page 101		Page 103
Q. And were you able to put anything, and, if so, what, in place before they arrived?  A. I mean, part of our role was just to ensure – we did not decide who were allocated to the centre and whatever. From an enforcement activity, that was decided by the Home Office.  What we did do is we were able to bring – move staff around the centres, who could actually – communication, obviously, is key in these particular areas, et cetera, and given that lots of the residents on the small boat cases for the Esparto flights were either, you know, Iranian, Iraqi, et cetera, so we had a number of staff that speak Farsi and Arabic, et cetera, and they assisted in keeping them safe and calm, and they also were mediating with them as well.  So that assisted, that allowed us to do that part and we did move a lot of staff just to manage that particular aspect of it. Communication was key in that.  Q. Yes. I am going to refer you to the IMB report, 2020, which dealt – part of it deals with this situation. If I can ask to be shown on screen, please, <imbodologous, 5="" a="" a.="" agree,="" allocated,="" an="" and="" are="" as="" at="" brook="" bullet="" but="" by="" can="" care.="" cared="" charter="" constant="" correlate="" detainees?="" did="" difficult="" do="" document,="" during="" evidenced="" flights="" flights.="" for="" force,="" from="" functions,="" goes="" had="" have="" high-levels="" home="" house="" i="" ideation="" if="" in="" is="" it="" just="" leave="" look="" lot="" made="" many="" mentioned="" not="" number="" obviously="" of="" office="" on="" our="" page="" particularly="" period,="" period.="" perspective,="" place="" please.="" plus="" point="" possible="" prevent="" quite="" ready="" residents="" residents,="" role="" safe="" safe.="" say="" screen,="" see="" self-harm="" self-harm,="" so="" staff="" statistics="" sucicidal="" supervise="" supervisions="" support="" suppose,="" td="" tha<="" that="" that.="" the="" their="" them="" there="" there,="" they="" third="" this="" time,="" time.="" to="" up,="" use="" was="" wasn't="" we="" well,="" were="" which="" will="" with="" you="" –=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></imbodologous,>				
high-levels of self-harm and suicidal ideation at the time. Do you agree, during this period, Brook House was not a safe place for the detainees?  A. I mean, part of our role was just to ensure – we did not decide who were allocated to the centre and whatever. From an enforcement activity, that was decided by the Home Office.  What we did do is we were able to bring – move staff around the centres, who could actually – communication, obviously, is key in these particular areas, et cetera, and given that lots of the residents on the small boat cases for the Esparto flights were either, you know, Iranian, Iraqi, et cetera, so we had a number of staff that speak Farsi and Arabic, et cetera, and they assisted in keeping them safe and calm, and they also were mediating with them as well.  So that assisted, that allowed us to do that part and we did move a lot of staff just to manage that particular aspect of it. Communication was key in that.  Q. Yes. I am going to refer you to the IMB report, 2020, which dealt – part of it deals with this situation. If I can ask to be shown on screen, please, <imbodo2022, 5="" a="" a.="" agree,="" allocated,="" an="" and="" are="" as="" at="" brook="" bullet="" can="" care.="" cared="" charter="" detainees?="" difficult="" do="" document,="" during="" flights="" flights.="" for="" from="" had="" have="" high-levels="" home="" house="" i="" ideation="" if="" in="" it="" just="" leave="" look="" lot="" made="" mentioned="" not="" obviously="" of="" office="" on="" our="" page="" particularly="" period,="" period.="" perspective,="" place="" please.="" point="" possible="" ready="" residents="" sa<="" safe="" safe.="" say="" screen,="" self-harm="" so="" suicidal="" td="" that="" the="" their="" there="" there,="" they="" third="" this="" time.="" to="" up,="" was="" wasn't="" we="" were="" you="" –=""><td>1</td><td>A. Yes.</td><td>1</td><td>channel in small boats."</td></imbodo2022,>	1	A. Yes.	1	channel in small boats."
4 A. I mean, part of our role was just to ensure — we did 5 not decide who were allocated to the centre and 6 whatever. From an enforcement activity, that was 7 decided by the Home Office. 8 What we did do is we were able to bring — move 9 staff around the centres, who could actually — 10 communication, obviously, is key in these particular 11 areas, et cetera, and given that lots of the residents 12 on the small boat cases for the Esparto flights were 13 either, you know, Iranian, Iraqi, et cetera, so we had 14 a number of staff that speak Farsi and Arabic, 15 et cetera, and they assisted in keeping them safe and 16 calm, and they also were mediating with them as well. 17 So that assisted, that allowed us to do that part and we 18 did move a lot of staff just to manage that particular 19 aspect of it. Communication was key in that. 20 Q. Yes. I am going to refer you to the IMB report, 2020, 21 which dealt — part of it deals with this situation. If 22 I can ask to be shown on screen, please, <imb000202>, 23 and if we can look at page 5 and just leave that up, 24 that document, on the screen, please. So charter 25 flights are there, mentioned from the third bullet point  4 time. Do you agree, during this period, Brook House?  A. Not particularly — it wasn't safe. We made it as safe as possible and cared for the residents we had in our care.  7 They were obviously allocated, from an Home Office perspective, ready for their flights. I have to say it was a difficult period. There was a lot of self-harm, particularly from the residents, and use of force, which you will see in the statistics that correlate with that.  8 But our role is to prevent self-harm and support the residents on constant supervisions to supervise and support them as well, plus the staff that spoke their language as well that assisted them.  9 Overleaf on page 6, under "How fairly and humanely were detainees treated?", the IMB says:  10 Overleaf on page 6, under "How fairly and humanely were detainees were generally treated humanely at Brook Hou</imb000202>				
mot decide who were allocated to the centre and whatever. From an enforcement activity, that was decided by the Home Office.  What we did do is we were able to bring move staff around the centres, who could actually communication, obviously, is key in these particular areas, et cetera, and given that lots of the residents on the small boat cases for the Esparto flights were either, you know, Iranian, Iraqi, et cetera, so we had a number of staff that speak Farsi and Arabic, et cetera, and they assisted in keeping them safe and calm, and they also were mediating with them as well.  So that assisted, that allowed us to do that part and we did move a lot of staff just to manage that particular aspect of it. Communication was key in that.  Q. Yes. I am going to refer you to the IMB report, 2020, which dealt part of it deals with this situation. If I can ask to be shown on screen, please, <imb000202>, and if we can look at page 5 and just leave that up, that document, on the screen, please. So charter flights are there, mentioned from the third bullet point on the safe place for the detainees?  A. Not particularly it wasn't safe. We made it as safe as possible and cared for the residents we had in our care.  They were obviously allocated, from an Home Office perspective, ready for their flights. I have to say it was a difficult period. There was a lot of self-harm, particularly from the residents, and use of force, which was a difficult period. There was a lot of self-harm, particularly from the residents, and use of force, which deal that speak Farsi and Arabic, te ctetra, so we had a number of staff that speak flaris and use of force, which deal that speak flaris and use of force, which deal that speak flaris and transfer and carea.  15 To be were obviously allocated, from an Home Office perspective, ready for their flights. I have to say it was a difficult period. There was a lot of self-harm, particularly from the residents, and use of force, which during the staff that speak flaris and use of force,</imb000202>	2	Q. And were you able to put anything, and, if so, what, in	2	It goes on to say this is evidenced by the
decided by the Home Office.  What we did do is we were able to bring move staff around the centres, who could actually communication, obviously, is key in these particular areas, et cetera, and given that lots of the residents on the small boat cases for the Esparto flights were either, you know, Iranian, Iraqi, et cetera, so we had a number of staff that speak Farsi and Arabic, et cetera, and they assisted in keeping them safe and calm, and they also were mediating with them as well.  So that assisted, that allowed us to do that part and we did move a lot of staff just to manage that particular aspect of it. Communication was key in that.  Q. Yes. I am going to refer you to the IMB report, 2020, which dealt part of it deals with this situation. If I can ask to be shown on screen, please, <imb000202>, and if we can look at page 5 and just leave that up, that document, on the screen, please. So charter flights are there, mentioned from the third bullet point  as possible and cared for the residents we had in our care.  They were obviously allocated, from an Home Office perspective, ready for their flights. I have to say it was a difficult period. There was a lot of self-harm, particularly from the residents, and use of force, which you will see in the statistics that correlate with that.  But our role is to prevent self-harm and support the residents, and we did many functions, and I suppose, at that time, there were quite a number of residents on constant supervisions to supervise and support them as well, plus the staff that spoke their language as well that assisted them.  Q. Overleaf on page 6, under "How fairly and humanely were detainces treated?", the IMB says:  "The detainces were generally treated humanely at Brook House."  Brook House."  But says:  "However, the board's view is that the circumstances</imb000202>	2	Q. And were you able to put anything, and, if so, what, in place before they arrived?	2 3	It goes on to say this is evidenced by the high-levels of self-harm and suicidal ideation at the
8 What we did do is we were able to bring move 9 staff around the centres, who could actually 10 communication, obviously, is key in these particular 11 areas, et cetera, and given that lots of the residents 12 on the small boat cases for the Esparto flights were 13 either, you know, Iranian, Iraqi, et cetera, so we had 14 a number of staff that speak Farsi and Arabic, 15 et cetera, and they assisted in keeping them safe and 16 calm, and they also were mediating with them as well. 17 So that assisted, that allowed us to do that part and we 18 did move a lot of staff just to manage that particular 19 aspect of it. Communication was key in that. 20 Q. Yes. I am going to refer you to the IMB report, 2020, 21 which dealt part of it deals with this situation. If 22 I can ask to be shown on screen, please, <imb000202>, 23 and if we can look at page 5 and just leave that up, 24 that document, on the screen, please. So charter 25 flights are there, mentioned from the third bullet point  8 care.  10 They were obviously allocated, from an Home Office perspective, ready for their flights. I have to say it was a difficult period. There was a lot of self-harm, particular was a difficult period. There was a lot of self-harm, particular you will see in the statistics that correlate with that.  12 But our role is to prevent self-harm and support the residents, and we did many functions, and I suppose, at that time, there were quite a number of residents on constant supervisions to supervise and support them as well, plus the staff that spoke their language as well that assisted them.  12 Q. Overleaf on page 6, under "How fairly and humanely were detainces treated?", the IMB says:  13 Brook House."  14 But our role is to prevent self-harm and support the residents, and use of force, which you will see in the statistics that correlate with that.  15 Constant supervisions to supervise and support them as well, plus the staff that spoke their language as well that assisted them.  16 Constant supervisions to supervise and</imb000202>	2 3 4	<ul><li>Q. And were you able to put anything, and, if so, what, in place before they arrived?</li><li>A. I mean, part of our role was just to ensure we did</li></ul>	2 3 4	It goes on to say this is evidenced by the high-levels of self-harm and suicidal ideation at the time. Do you agree, during this period, Brook House was
8 What we did do is we were able to bring move 9 staff around the centres, who could actually 10 communication, obviously, is key in these particular 11 areas, et cetera, and given that lots of the residents 12 on the small boat cases for the Esparto flights were 13 either, you know, Iranian, Iraqi, et cetera, so we had 14 a number of staff that speak Farsi and Arabic, 15 et cetera, and they assisted in keeping them safe and 16 calm, and they also were mediating with them as well. 17 So that assisted, that allowed us to do that part and we 18 did move a lot of staff just to manage that particular 19 aspect of it. Communication was key in that. 20 Q. Yes. I am going to refer you to the IMB report, 2020, 21 which dealt part of it deals with this situation. If 22 I can ask to be shown on screen, please, <imb000202>, 23 and if we can look at page 5 and just leave that up, 24 that document, on the screen, please. So charter 25 flights are there, mentioned from the third bullet point  8 care.  10 They were obviously allocated, from an Home Office perspective, ready for their flights. I have to say it was a difficult period. There was a lot of self-harm, particular was a difficult period. There was a lot of self-harm, particular you will see in the statistics that correlate with that.  12 But our role is to prevent self-harm and support the residents, and we did many functions, and I suppose, at that time, there were quite a number of residents on constant supervisions to supervise and support them as well, plus the staff that spoke their language as well that assisted them.  12 Q. Overleaf on page 6, under "How fairly and humanely were detainces treated?", the IMB says:  13 Brook House."  14 But our role is to prevent self-harm and support the residents, and use of force, which you will see in the statistics that correlate with that.  15 Constant supervisions to supervise and support them as well, plus the staff that spoke their language as well that assisted them.  16 Constant supervisions to supervise and</imb000202>	2 3 4 5	<ul><li>Q. And were you able to put anything, and, if so, what, in place before they arrived?</li><li>A. I mean, part of our role was just to ensure we did not decide who were allocated to the centre and</li></ul>	2 3 4 5	It goes on to say this is evidenced by the high-levels of self-harm and suicidal ideation at the time. Do you agree, during this period, Brook House was not a safe place for the detainees?
communication, obviously, is key in these particular areas, et cetera, and given that lots of the residents on the small boat cases for the Esparto flights were either, you know, Iranian, Iraqi, et cetera, so we had a number of staff that speak Farsi and Arabic, et cetera, and they assisted in keeping them safe and calm, and they also were mediating with them as well. So that assisted, that allowed us to do that part and we did move a lot of staff just to manage that particular aspect of it. Communication was key in that.  Q. Yes. I am going to refer you to the IMB report, 2020, which dealt part of it deals with this situation. If I can ask to be shown on screen, please, <imb000202>, and if we can look at page 5 and just leave that up, that document, on the screen, please. So charter flights are there, mentioned from the third bullet point  10 perspective, ready for their flights. I have to say it was a difficult period. There was a lot of self-harm, particularly from the residents, and use of force, which you will see in the statistics that correlate with that. But our role is to prevent self-harm and support the residents, and we did many functions, and I suppose, at that time, there were quite a number of residents on constant supervisions to supervise and support them as well, plus the staff that spoke their language as well that assisted them. Q. Overleaf on page 6, under "How fairly and humanely were detainees treated?", the IMB says:  "The detainees were generally treated humanely at Brook House."  But our role is to prevent self-harm, particularly from the residents, and use of force, which you will see in the statistics that correlate with that.  But our role is to prevent self-harm and support the residents, and use of force, which you will see in the statistics that correlate with that.  But our role is to prevent self-harm and support the residents, and use of force, which you will see in the statistics that correlate with that.  But our role is to prevent self-harm and support the residents, and</imb000202>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Q. And were you able to put anything, and, if so, what, in place before they arrived?</li> <li>A. I mean, part of our role was just to ensure we did not decide who were allocated to the centre and whatever. From an enforcement activity, that was</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	It goes on to say this is evidenced by the high-levels of self-harm and suicidal ideation at the time. Do you agree, during this period, Brook House was not a safe place for the detainees?  A. Not particularly it wasn't safe. We made it as safe
areas, et cetera, and given that lots of the residents on the small boat cases for the Esparto flights were either, you know, Iranian, Iraqi, et cetera, so we had a number of staff that speak Farsi and Arabic, et cetera, and they assisted in keeping them safe and calm, and they also were mediating with them as well. So that assisted, that allowed us to do that part and we did move a lot of staff just to manage that particular aspect of it. Communication was key in that.  Q. Yes. I am going to refer you to the IMB report, 2020, which dealt part of it deals with this situation. If Can ask to be shown on screen, please, <imb000202>, and if we can look at page 5 and just leave that up, that document, on the screen, please. So charter flights are there, mentioned from the third bullet point  was a difficult period. There was a lot of self-harm, particularly from the residents, and use of force, which you will see in the statistics that correlate with that.  But our role is to prevent self-harm and support the residents, and we did many functions, and I suppose, at that time, there were quite a number of residents on constant supervisions to supervise and support them as well, plus the staff that spoke their language as well that assisted them.  Q. Overleaf on page 6, under "How fairly and humanely were detainces treated?", the IMB says:  "The detainces were generally treated humanely at Brook House."  But says:  "However, the board's view is that the circumstances</imb000202>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. And were you able to put anything, and, if so, what, in place before they arrived?</li> <li>A. I mean, part of our role was just to ensure we did not decide who were allocated to the centre and whatever. From an enforcement activity, that was decided by the Home Office.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	It goes on to say this is evidenced by the high-levels of self-harm and suicidal ideation at the time. Do you agree, during this period, Brook House was not a safe place for the detainees?  A. Not particularly — it wasn't safe. We made it as safe as possible and cared for the residents we had in our
areas, et cetera, and given that lots of the residents on the small boat cases for the Esparto flights were either, you know, Iranian, Iraqi, et cetera, so we had a number of staff that speak Farsi and Arabic, et cetera, and they assisted in keeping them safe and calm, and they also were mediating with them as well. So that assisted, that allowed us to do that part and we did move a lot of staff just to manage that particular aspect of it. Communication was key in that.  Q. Yes. I am going to refer you to the IMB report, 2020, which dealt part of it deals with this situation. If Can ask to be shown on screen, please, <imb000202>, and if we can look at page 5 and just leave that up, that document, on the screen, please. So charter flights are there, mentioned from the third bullet point  was a difficult period. There was a lot of self-harm, particularly from the residents, and use of force, which you will see in the statistics that correlate with that.  But our role is to prevent self-harm and support the residents, and we did many functions, and I suppose, at that time, there were quite a number of residents on constant supervisions to supervise and support them as well, plus the staff that spoke their language as well that assisted them.  Q. Overleaf on page 6, under "How fairly and humanely were detainees treated?", the IMB says:  "The detainees were generally treated humanely at Brook House."  But says:  "However, the board's view is that the circumstances</imb000202>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. And were you able to put anything, and, if so, what, in place before they arrived?</li> <li>A. I mean, part of our role was just to ensure we did not decide who were allocated to the centre and whatever. From an enforcement activity, that was decided by the Home Office.</li> <li>What we did do is we were able to bring move</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	It goes on to say this is evidenced by the high-levels of self-harm and suicidal ideation at the time. Do you agree, during this period, Brook House was not a safe place for the detainees?  A. Not particularly it wasn't safe. We made it as safe as possible and cared for the residents we had in our care.
either, you know, Iranian, Iraqi, et cetera, so we had a number of staff that speak Farsi and Arabic, et cetera, and they assisted in keeping them safe and calm, and they also were mediating with them as well. So that assisted, that allowed us to do that part and we did move a lot of staff just to manage that particular aspect of it. Communication was key in that.  Q. Yes. I am going to refer you to the IMB report, 2020, which dealt — part of it deals with this situation. If can ask to be shown on screen, please, <imb000202>, and if we can look at page 5 and just leave that up, that document, on the screen, please. So charter flights are there, mentioned from the third bullet point  you will see in the statistics that correlate with that. But our role is to prevent self-harm and support the residents, and we did many functions, and I suppose, at that time, there were quite a number of residents on constant supervisions to supervise and support them as well, plus the staff that spoke their language as well that assisted them.  Q. Overleaf on page 6, under "How fairly and humanely were detainees treated?", the IMB says:  "The detainees were generally treated humanely at Brook House."  But says:  "However, the board's view is that the circumstances</imb000202>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. And were you able to put anything, and, if so, what, in place before they arrived?</li> <li>A. I mean, part of our role was just to ensure we did not decide who were allocated to the centre and whatever. From an enforcement activity, that was decided by the Home Office.</li> <li>What we did do is we were able to bring move staff around the centres, who could actually</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	It goes on to say this is evidenced by the high-levels of self-harm and suicidal ideation at the time. Do you agree, during this period, Brook House was not a safe place for the detainees?  A. Not particularly it wasn't safe. We made it as safe as possible and cared for the residents we had in our care.  They were obviously allocated, from an Home Office
either, you know, Iranian, Iraqi, et cetera, so we had a number of staff that speak Farsi and Arabic, et cetera, and they assisted in keeping them safe and calm, and they also were mediating with them as well. So that assisted, that allowed us to do that part and we did move a lot of staff just to manage that particular aspect of it. Communication was key in that.  Q. Yes. I am going to refer you to the IMB report, 2020, which dealt — part of it deals with this situation. If can ask to be shown on screen, please, <imb000202>, and if we can look at page 5 and just leave that up, that document, on the screen, please. So charter flights are there, mentioned from the third bullet point  13 you will see in the statistics that correlate with that. But our role is to prevent self-harm and support the residents, and we did many functions, and I suppose, at that time, there were quite a number of residents on constant supervisions to supervise and support them as well, plus the staff that spoke their language as well that assisted them. Q. Overleaf on page 6, under "How fairly and humanely were detainees treated?", the IMB says:  "The detainees were generally treated humanely at Brook House."  But says:  "However, the board's view is that the circumstances</imb000202>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. And were you able to put anything, and, if so, what, in place before they arrived?</li> <li>A. I mean, part of our role was just to ensure we did not decide who were allocated to the centre and whatever. From an enforcement activity, that was decided by the Home Office.</li> <li>What we did do is we were able to bring move staff around the centres, who could actually communication, obviously, is key in these particular</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	It goes on to say this is evidenced by the high-levels of self-harm and suicidal ideation at the time. Do you agree, during this period, Brook House was not a safe place for the detainees?  A. Not particularly it wasn't safe. We made it as safe as possible and cared for the residents we had in our care.  They were obviously allocated, from an Home Office perspective, ready for their flights. I have to say it
a number of staff that speak Farsi and Arabic, et cetera, and they assisted in keeping them safe and calm, and they also were mediating with them as well. So that assisted, that allowed us to do that part and we did move a lot of staff just to manage that particular aspect of it. Communication was key in that.  Q. Yes. I am going to refer you to the IMB report, 2020, which dealt part of it deals with this situation. If I can ask to be shown on screen, please, <imb000202>, and if we can look at page 5 and just leave that up, that document, on the screen, please. So charter flights are there, mentioned from the third bullet point  But our role is to prevent self-harm and support the residents, and we did many functions, and I suppose, at that time, there were quite a number of residents on constant supervisions to supervise and support them as well, plus the staff that spoke their language as well that assisted them.  Q. Overleaf on page 6, under "How fairly and humanely were detainees treated?", the IMB says:  "The detainees were generally treated humanely at Brook House."  But says:  But says:  "However, the board's view is that the circumstances</imb000202>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q. And were you able to put anything, and, if so, what, in place before they arrived?</li> <li>A. I mean, part of our role was just to ensure we did not decide who were allocated to the centre and whatever. From an enforcement activity, that was decided by the Home Office.</li> <li>What we did do is we were able to bring move staff around the centres, who could actually communication, obviously, is key in these particular areas, et cetera, and given that lots of the residents</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	It goes on to say this is evidenced by the high-levels of self-harm and suicidal ideation at the time. Do you agree, during this period, Brook House was not a safe place for the detainees?  A. Not particularly it wasn't safe. We made it as safe as possible and cared for the residents we had in our care.  They were obviously allocated, from an Home Office perspective, ready for their flights. I have to say it was a difficult period. There was a lot of self-harm,
tet cetera, and they assisted in keeping them safe and calm, and they also were mediating with them as well.  So that assisted, that allowed us to do that part and we did move a lot of staff just to manage that particular aspect of it. Communication was key in that.  Q. Yes. I am going to refer you to the IMB report, 2020, which dealt part of it deals with this situation. If I can ask to be shown on screen, please, <imb000202>, and if we can look at page 5 and just leave that up, that document, on the screen, please. So charter flights are there, mentioned from the third bullet point like that situations are there, mentioned from the third bullet point like that time, there were quite a number of residents on constant supervisions to supervise and support them as well, plus the staff that spoke their language as well that assisted them.  Q. Overleaf on page 6, under "How fairly and humanely were detainees treated?", the IMB says:  "The detainees were generally treated humanely at Brook House."  But says:  "However, the board's view is that the circumstances</imb000202>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. And were you able to put anything, and, if so, what, in place before they arrived?</li> <li>A. I mean, part of our role was just to ensure we did not decide who were allocated to the centre and whatever. From an enforcement activity, that was decided by the Home Office.</li> <li>What we did do is we were able to bring move staff around the centres, who could actually communication, obviously, is key in these particular areas, et cetera, and given that lots of the residents on the small boat cases for the Esparto flights were</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	It goes on to say this is evidenced by the high-levels of self-harm and suicidal ideation at the time. Do you agree, during this period, Brook House was not a safe place for the detainees?  A. Not particularly it wasn't safe. We made it as safe as possible and cared for the residents we had in our care.  They were obviously allocated, from an Home Office perspective, ready for their flights. I have to say it was a difficult period. There was a lot of self-harm, particularly from the residents, and use of force, which
calm, and they also were mediating with them as well.  So that assisted, that allowed us to do that part and we did move a lot of staff just to manage that particular aspect of it. Communication was key in that.  Q. Yes. I am going to refer you to the IMB report, 2020, which dealt part of it deals with this situation. If I can ask to be shown on screen, please, <imb000202>, and if we can look at page 5 and just leave that up, that document, on the screen, please. So charter flights are there, mentioned from the third bullet point  16 that time, there were quite a number of residents on constant supervisions to supervise and support them as well, plus the staff that spoke their language as well that assisted them.  Q. Overleaf on page 6, under "How fairly and humanely were detainees treated?", the IMB says:  "The detainees were generally treated humanely at Brook House."  But says:  "However, the board's view is that the circumstances</imb000202>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. And were you able to put anything, and, if so, what, in place before they arrived?</li> <li>A. I mean, part of our role was just to ensure we did not decide who were allocated to the centre and whatever. From an enforcement activity, that was decided by the Home Office.</li> <li>What we did do is we were able to bring move staff around the centres, who could actually communication, obviously, is key in these particular areas, et cetera, and given that lots of the residents on the small boat cases for the Esparto flights were either, you know, Iranian, Iraqi, et cetera, so we had</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	It goes on to say this is evidenced by the high-levels of self-harm and suicidal ideation at the time. Do you agree, during this period, Brook House was not a safe place for the detainees?  A. Not particularly it wasn't safe. We made it as safe as possible and cared for the residents we had in our care.  They were obviously allocated, from an Home Office perspective, ready for their flights. I have to say it was a difficult period. There was a lot of self-harm, particularly from the residents, and use of force, which you will see in the statistics that correlate with that.
So that assisted, that allowed us to do that part and we did move a lot of staff just to manage that particular aspect of it. Communication was key in that.  Q. Yes. I am going to refer you to the IMB report, 2020, which dealt part of it deals with this situation. If I can ask to be shown on screen, please, <imb000202>, and if we can look at page 5 and just leave that up, that document, on the screen, please. So charter flights are there, mentioned from the third bullet point constant supervisions to supervise and support them as well, plus the staff that spoke their language as well that assisted them.  Q. Overleaf on page 6, under "How fairly and humanely were detainees treated?", the IMB says:  "The detainees were generally treated humanely at Brook House."  But says:  "However, the board's view is that the circumstances</imb000202>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. And were you able to put anything, and, if so, what, in place before they arrived?</li> <li>A. I mean, part of our role was just to ensure we did not decide who were allocated to the centre and whatever. From an enforcement activity, that was decided by the Home Office.</li> <li>What we did do is we were able to bring move staff around the centres, who could actually communication, obviously, is key in these particular areas, et cetera, and given that lots of the residents on the small boat cases for the Esparto flights were either, you know, Iranian, Iraqi, et cetera, so we had a number of staff that speak Farsi and Arabic,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	It goes on to say this is evidenced by the high-levels of self-harm and suicidal ideation at the time. Do you agree, during this period, Brook House was not a safe place for the detainees?  A. Not particularly — it wasn't safe. We made it as safe as possible and cared for the residents we had in our care.  They were obviously allocated, from an Home Office perspective, ready for their flights. I have to say it was a difficult period. There was a lot of self-harm, particularly from the residents, and use of force, which you will see in the statistics that correlate with that.  But our role is to prevent self-harm and support the
did move a lot of staff just to manage that particular aspect of it. Communication was key in that.  Q. Yes. I am going to refer you to the IMB report, 2020, which dealt part of it deals with this situation. If I can ask to be shown on screen, please, <imb000202>, and if we can look at page 5 and just leave that up, that document, on the screen, please. So charter flights are there, mentioned from the third bullet point  18 well, plus the staff that spoke their language as well that assisted them. Q. Overleaf on page 6, under "How fairly and humanely were detainees treated?", the IMB says:  "The detainees were generally treated humanely at Brook House."  But says:  "However, the board's view is that the circumstances</imb000202>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. And were you able to put anything, and, if so, what, in place before they arrived?</li> <li>A. I mean, part of our role was just to ensure we did not decide who were allocated to the centre and whatever. From an enforcement activity, that was decided by the Home Office.</li> <li>What we did do is we were able to bring move staff around the centres, who could actually communication, obviously, is key in these particular areas, et cetera, and given that lots of the residents on the small boat cases for the Esparto flights were either, you know, Iranian, Iraqi, et cetera, so we had a number of staff that speak Farsi and Arabic, et cetera, and they assisted in keeping them safe and</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	It goes on to say this is evidenced by the high-levels of self-harm and suicidal ideation at the time. Do you agree, during this period, Brook House was not a safe place for the detainees?  A. Not particularly it wasn't safe. We made it as safe as possible and cared for the residents we had in our care.  They were obviously allocated, from an Home Office perspective, ready for their flights. I have to say it was a difficult period. There was a lot of self-harm, particularly from the residents, and use of force, which you will see in the statistics that correlate with that. But our role is to prevent self-harm and support the residents, and we did many functions, and I suppose, at
19 aspect of it. Communication was key in that. 20 Q. Yes. I am going to refer you to the IMB report, 2020, 21 which dealt part of it deals with this situation. If 22 I can ask to be shown on screen, please, <imb000202>, 23 and if we can look at page 5 and just leave that up, 24 that document, on the screen, please. So charter 25 flights are there, mentioned from the third bullet point 26 that assisted them. 27 Q. Overleaf on page 6, under "How fairly and humanely were detainees treated?", the IMB says: 28 "The detainees were generally treated humanely at Brook House." 29 But says: 20 Under "How fairly and humanely were detainees were generally treated humanely at Brook House." 20 Brook House." 21 But says: 22 "However, the board's view is that the circumstances</imb000202>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. And were you able to put anything, and, if so, what, in place before they arrived?</li> <li>A. I mean, part of our role was just to ensure we did not decide who were allocated to the centre and whatever. From an enforcement activity, that was decided by the Home Office.</li> <li>What we did do is we were able to bring move staff around the centres, who could actually communication, obviously, is key in these particular areas, et cetera, and given that lots of the residents on the small boat cases for the Esparto flights were either, you know, Iranian, Iraqi, et cetera, so we had a number of staff that speak Farsi and Arabic, et cetera, and they assisted in keeping them safe and calm, and they also were mediating with them as well.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	It goes on to say this is evidenced by the high-levels of self-harm and suicidal ideation at the time. Do you agree, during this period, Brook House was not a safe place for the detainees?  A. Not particularly it wasn't safe. We made it as safe as possible and cared for the residents we had in our care.  They were obviously allocated, from an Home Office perspective, ready for their flights. I have to say it was a difficult period. There was a lot of self-harm, particularly from the residents, and use of force, which you will see in the statistics that correlate with that. But our role is to prevent self-harm and support the residents, and we did many functions, and I suppose, at that time, there were quite a number of residents on
Q. Yes. I am going to refer you to the IMB report, 2020, which dealt part of it deals with this situation. If I can ask to be shown on screen, please, <imb000202>, and if we can look at page 5 and just leave that up, that document, on the screen, please. So charter flights are there, mentioned from the third bullet point  20 Q. Overleaf on page 6, under "How fairly and humanely were detainees treated?", the IMB says:  21 "The detainees were generally treated humanely at Brook House."  22 But says:  23 "However, the board's view is that the circumstances</imb000202>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. And were you able to put anything, and, if so, what, in place before they arrived?</li> <li>A. I mean, part of our role was just to ensure we did not decide who were allocated to the centre and whatever. From an enforcement activity, that was decided by the Home Office.</li> <li>What we did do is we were able to bring move staff around the centres, who could actually communication, obviously, is key in these particular areas, et cetera, and given that lots of the residents on the small boat cases for the Esparto flights were either, you know, Iranian, Iraqi, et cetera, so we had a number of staff that speak Farsi and Arabic, et cetera, and they assisted in keeping them safe and calm, and they also were mediating with them as well. So that assisted, that allowed us to do that part and we</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	It goes on to say this is evidenced by the high-levels of self-harm and suicidal ideation at the time. Do you agree, during this period, Brook House was not a safe place for the detainees?  A. Not particularly it wasn't safe. We made it as safe as possible and cared for the residents we had in our care.  They were obviously allocated, from an Home Office perspective, ready for their flights. I have to say it was a difficult period. There was a lot of self-harm, particularly from the residents, and use of force, which you will see in the statistics that correlate with that. But our role is to prevent self-harm and support the residents, and we did many functions, and I suppose, at that time, there were quite a number of residents on constant supervisions to supervise and support them as
which dealt part of it deals with this situation. If  I can ask to be shown on screen, please, <imb000202>,  and if we can look at page 5 and just leave that up,  that document, on the screen, please. So charter  flights are there, mentioned from the third bullet point  21 detainees treated?", the IMB says:  22 "The detainees were generally treated humanely at  Brook House."  23 But says:  24 But says:  Thowever, the board's view is that the circumstances</imb000202>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. And were you able to put anything, and, if so, what, in place before they arrived?</li> <li>A. I mean, part of our role was just to ensure we did not decide who were allocated to the centre and whatever. From an enforcement activity, that was decided by the Home Office.</li> <li>What we did do is we were able to bring move staff around the centres, who could actually communication, obviously, is key in these particular areas, et cetera, and given that lots of the residents on the small boat cases for the Esparto flights were either, you know, Iranian, Iraqi, et cetera, so we had a number of staff that speak Farsi and Arabic, et cetera, and they assisted in keeping them safe and calm, and they also were mediating with them as well. So that assisted, that allowed us to do that part and we did move a lot of staff just to manage that particular</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	It goes on to say this is evidenced by the high-levels of self-harm and suicidal ideation at the time. Do you agree, during this period, Brook House was not a safe place for the detainees?  A. Not particularly — it wasn't safe. We made it as safe as possible and cared for the residents we had in our care.  They were obviously allocated, from an Home Office perspective, ready for their flights. I have to say it was a difficult period. There was a lot of self-harm, particularly from the residents, and use of force, which you will see in the statistics that correlate with that. But our role is to prevent self-harm and support the residents, and we did many functions, and I suppose, at that time, there were quite a number of residents on constant supervisions to supervise and support them as well, plus the staff that spoke their language as well
I can ask to be shown on screen, please, <imb000202>, and if we can look at page 5 and just leave that up, that document, on the screen, please. So charter flights are there, mentioned from the third bullet point  "The detainees were generally treated humanely at Brook House."  But says: "However, the board's view is that the circumstances</imb000202>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. And were you able to put anything, and, if so, what, in place before they arrived?</li> <li>A. I mean, part of our role was just to ensure we did not decide who were allocated to the centre and whatever. From an enforcement activity, that was decided by the Home Office.</li> <li>What we did do is we were able to bring move staff around the centres, who could actually communication, obviously, is key in these particular areas, et cetera, and given that lots of the residents on the small boat cases for the Esparto flights were either, you know, Iranian, Iraqi, et cetera, so we had a number of staff that speak Farsi and Arabic, et cetera, and they assisted in keeping them safe and calm, and they also were mediating with them as well. So that assisted, that allowed us to do that part and we did move a lot of staff just to manage that particular aspect of it. Communication was key in that.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	It goes on to say this is evidenced by the high-levels of self-harm and suicidal ideation at the time. Do you agree, during this period, Brook House was not a safe place for the detainees?  A. Not particularly — it wasn't safe. We made it as safe as possible and cared for the residents we had in our care.  They were obviously allocated, from an Home Office perspective, ready for their flights. I have to say it was a difficult period. There was a lot of self-harm, particularly from the residents, and use of force, which you will see in the statistics that correlate with that. But our role is to prevent self-harm and support the residents, and we did many functions, and I suppose, at that time, there were quite a number of residents on constant supervisions to supervise and support them as well, plus the staff that spoke their language as well that assisted them.
23 and if we can look at page 5 and just leave that up, 24 that document, on the screen, please. So charter 25 flights are there, mentioned from the third bullet point 28 Brook House." 29 But says: 29 "However, the board's view is that the circumstances	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. And were you able to put anything, and, if so, what, in place before they arrived?</li> <li>A. I mean, part of our role was just to ensure we did not decide who were allocated to the centre and whatever. From an enforcement activity, that was decided by the Home Office.</li> <li>What we did do is we were able to bring move staff around the centres, who could actually communication, obviously, is key in these particular areas, et cetera, and given that lots of the residents on the small boat cases for the Esparto flights were either, you know, Iranian, Iraqi, et cetera, so we had a number of staff that speak Farsi and Arabic, et cetera, and they assisted in keeping them safe and calm, and they also were mediating with them as well. So that assisted, that allowed us to do that part and we did move a lot of staff just to manage that particular aspect of it. Communication was key in that.</li> <li>Q. Yes. I am going to refer you to the IMB report, 2020,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	It goes on to say this is evidenced by the high-levels of self-harm and suicidal ideation at the time. Do you agree, during this period, Brook House was not a safe place for the detainees?  A. Not particularly it wasn't safe. We made it as safe as possible and cared for the residents we had in our care.  They were obviously allocated, from an Home Office perspective, ready for their flights. I have to say it was a difficult period. There was a lot of self-harm, particularly from the residents, and use of force, which you will see in the statistics that correlate with that. But our role is to prevent self-harm and support the residents, and we did many functions, and I suppose, at that time, there were quite a number of residents on constant supervisions to supervise and support them as well, plus the staff that spoke their language as well that assisted them.  Q. Overleaf on page 6, under "How fairly and humanely were
that document, on the screen, please. So charter 24 But says: 25 flights are there, mentioned from the third bullet point 26 But says: 27 "However, the board's view is that the circumstances	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. And were you able to put anything, and, if so, what, in place before they arrived?</li> <li>A. I mean, part of our role was just to ensure we did not decide who were allocated to the centre and whatever. From an enforcement activity, that was decided by the Home Office.</li> <li>What we did do is we were able to bring move staff around the centres, who could actually communication, obviously, is key in these particular areas, et cetera, and given that lots of the residents on the small boat cases for the Esparto flights were either, you know, Iranian, Iraqi, et cetera, so we had a number of staff that speak Farsi and Arabic, et cetera, and they assisted in keeping them safe and calm, and they also were mediating with them as well. So that assisted, that allowed us to do that part and we did move a lot of staff just to manage that particular aspect of it. Communication was key in that.</li> <li>Q. Yes. I am going to refer you to the IMB report, 2020, which dealt part of it deals with this situation. If</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	It goes on to say this is evidenced by the high-levels of self-harm and suicidal ideation at the time. Do you agree, during this period, Brook House was not a safe place for the detainees?  A. Not particularly it wasn't safe. We made it as safe as possible and cared for the residents we had in our care.  They were obviously allocated, from an Home Office perspective, ready for their flights. I have to say it was a difficult period. There was a lot of self-harm, particularly from the residents, and use of force, which you will see in the statistics that correlate with that. But our role is to prevent self-harm and support the residents, and we did many functions, and I suppose, at that time, there were quite a number of residents on constant supervisions to supervise and support them as well, plus the staff that spoke their language as well that assisted them.  Q. Overleaf on page 6, under "How fairly and humanely were detainees treated?", the IMB says:
25 flights are there, mentioned from the third bullet point 25 "However, the board's view is that the circumstances	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. And were you able to put anything, and, if so, what, in place before they arrived?  A. I mean, part of our role was just to ensure we did not decide who were allocated to the centre and whatever. From an enforcement activity, that was decided by the Home Office.  What we did do is we were able to bring move staff around the centres, who could actually communication, obviously, is key in these particular areas, et cetera, and given that lots of the residents on the small boat cases for the Esparto flights were either, you know, Iranian, Iraqi, et cetera, so we had a number of staff that speak Farsi and Arabic, et cetera, and they assisted in keeping them safe and calm, and they also were mediating with them as well. So that assisted, that allowed us to do that part and we did move a lot of staff just to manage that particular aspect of it. Communication was key in that.  Q. Yes. I am going to refer you to the IMB report, 2020, which dealt part of it deals with this situation. If I can ask to be shown on screen, please, <imb000202>,</imb000202>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	It goes on to say this is evidenced by the high-levels of self-harm and suicidal ideation at the time. Do you agree, during this period, Brook House was not a safe place for the detainees?  A. Not particularly — it wasn't safe. We made it as safe as possible and cared for the residents we had in our care.  They were obviously allocated, from an Home Office perspective, ready for their flights. I have to say it was a difficult period. There was a lot of self-harm, particularly from the residents, and use of force, which you will see in the statistics that correlate with that. But our role is to prevent self-harm and support the residents, and we did many functions, and I suppose, at that time, there were quite a number of residents on constant supervisions to supervise and support them as well, plus the staff that spoke their language as well that assisted them.  Q. Overleaf on page 6, under "How fairly and humanely were detainees treated?", the IMB says:  "The detainees were generally treated humanely at
Page 102 Page 104	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. And were you able to put anything, and, if so, what, in place before they arrived?</li> <li>A. I mean, part of our role was just to ensure we did not decide who were allocated to the centre and whatever. From an enforcement activity, that was decided by the Home Office.</li> <li>What we did do is we were able to bring move staff around the centres, who could actually communication, obviously, is key in these particular areas, et cetera, and given that lots of the residents on the small boat cases for the Esparto flights were either, you know, Iranian, Iraqi, et cetera, so we had a number of staff that speak Farsi and Arabic, et cetera, and they assisted in keeping them safe and calm, and they also were mediating with them as well. So that assisted, that allowed us to do that part and we did move a lot of staff just to manage that particular aspect of it. Communication was key in that.</li> <li>Q. Yes. I am going to refer you to the IMB report, 2020, which dealt part of it deals with this situation. If I can ask to be shown on screen, please, <imb000202>, and if we can look at page 5 and just leave that up,</imb000202></li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	It goes on to say this is evidenced by the high-levels of self-harm and suicidal ideation at the time. Do you agree, during this period, Brook House was not a safe place for the detainees?  A. Not particularly it wasn't safe. We made it as safe as possible and cared for the residents we had in our care.  They were obviously allocated, from an Home Office perspective, ready for their flights. I have to say it was a difficult period. There was a lot of self-harm, particularly from the residents, and use of force, which you will see in the statistics that correlate with that. But our role is to prevent self-harm and support the residents, and we did many functions, and I suppose, at that time, there were quite a number of residents on constant supervisions to supervise and support them as well, plus the staff that spoke their language as well that assisted them.  Q. Overleaf on page 6, under "How fairly and humanely were detainees treated?", the IMB says:  "The detainees were generally treated humanely at Brook House."
Page 102   Page 104	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. And were you able to put anything, and, if so, what, in place before they arrived?</li> <li>A. I mean, part of our role was just to ensure we did not decide who were allocated to the centre and whatever. From an enforcement activity, that was decided by the Home Office.</li> <li>What we did do is we were able to bring move staff around the centres, who could actually communication, obviously, is key in these particular areas, et cetera, and given that lots of the residents on the small boat cases for the Esparto flights were either, you know, Iranian, Iraqi, et cetera, so we had a number of staff that speak Farsi and Arabic, et cetera, and they assisted in keeping them safe and calm, and they also were mediating with them as well. So that assisted, that allowed us to do that part and we did move a lot of staff just to manage that particular aspect of it. Communication was key in that.</li> <li>Q. Yes. I am going to refer you to the IMB report, 2020, which dealt part of it deals with this situation. If I can ask to be shown on screen, please, <imb000202>, and if we can look at page 5 and just leave that up, that document, on the screen, please. So charter</imb000202></li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	It goes on to say this is evidenced by the high-levels of self-harm and suicidal ideation at the time. Do you agree, during this period, Brook House was not a safe place for the detainees?  A. Not particularly it wasn't safe. We made it as safe as possible and cared for the residents we had in our care.  They were obviously allocated, from an Home Office perspective, ready for their flights. I have to say it was a difficult period. There was a lot of self-harm, particularly from the residents, and use of force, which you will see in the statistics that correlate with that. But our role is to prevent self-harm and support the residents, and we did many functions, and I suppose, at that time, there were quite a number of residents on constant supervisions to supervise and support them as well, plus the staff that spoke their language as well that assisted them.  Q. Overleaf on page 6, under "How fairly and humanely were detainees treated?", the IMB says:  "The detainees were generally treated humanely at Brook House."  But says:
I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. And were you able to put anything, and, if so, what, in place before they arrived?</li> <li>A. I mean, part of our role was just to ensure we did not decide who were allocated to the centre and whatever. From an enforcement activity, that was decided by the Home Office.</li> <li>What we did do is we were able to bring move staff around the centres, who could actually communication, obviously, is key in these particular areas, et cetera, and given that lots of the residents on the small boat cases for the Esparto flights were either, you know, Iranian, Iraqi, et cetera, so we had a number of staff that speak Farsi and Arabic, et cetera, and they assisted in keeping them safe and calm, and they also were mediating with them as well. So that assisted, that allowed us to do that part and we did move a lot of staff just to manage that particular aspect of it. Communication was key in that.</li> <li>Q. Yes. I am going to refer you to the IMB report, 2020, which dealt part of it deals with this situation. If I can ask to be shown on screen, please, <imb000202>, and if we can look at page 5 and just leave that up, that document, on the screen, please. So charter flights are there, mentioned from the third bullet point</imb000202></li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	It goes on to say this is evidenced by the high-levels of self-harm and suicidal ideation at the time. Do you agree, during this period, Brook House was not a safe place for the detainees?  A. Not particularly it wasn't safe. We made it as safe as possible and cared for the residents we had in our care.  They were obviously allocated, from an Home Office perspective, ready for their flights. I have to say it was a difficult period. There was a lot of self-harm, particularly from the residents, and use of force, which you will see in the statistics that correlate with that. But our role is to prevent self-harm and support the residents, and we did many functions, and I suppose, at that time, there were quite a number of residents on constant supervisions to supervise and support them as well, plus the staff that spoke their language as well that assisted them.  Q. Overleaf on page 6, under "How fairly and humanely were detainees treated?", the IMB says:  "The detainees were generally treated humanely at Brook House."  But says:  "However, the board's view is that the circumstances

1	in Brook House relating to the Dublin Convention charter	1	people had heard. I know they had heard from Serco
2	programme amounted to inhumane treatment of the whole	2	concerns about the numbers and the numbers of self-harm.
3	detainee population by the Home Office in the latter	3	In spite of that, numbers kept coming through from the
4	months of 2020."	4	charter flights."
5	Do you agree or disagree with?	5	Is that correct?
6	A. Yes, that that would be for the Home Office to answer,	6	A. Yes, yes.
7	I suppose. It is they are best placed to answer	7	Q. And the IMB's report notes some of the specific issues
8	that. From my perspective, my staff did a fantastic job	8	in more detail throughout. So if I ask to go to
9	in caring and supporting the people in their care.	9	page 10 we won't go through all of them, but page 10
10	Q. So in terms of the responsibility which you, on behalf	10	has a graph and you have already alluded to this, as to
11	of Serco, and also as director at the time, take from	11	the spike, so it is the graph there. The blue line is
12	these findings, that Brook House was not a safe place to	12	the number of people on ACDT, and we see a really
13	be for these detainees and that the circumstances	13	significant jump, obviously, from August, which is when
14	amounted to inhuman treatment of the whole population,	14	you mentioned it started?
15	your answer was you made it as safe as you could?	15	A. Yes.
16	A. As safe as possible, yes. I mean, we cared our role	16	Q. And acts of self-harm is the orange line. Again,
17	is to care and support our residents in our care and	17	a significant jump?
18	make it as humane as possible, and that is what we did.	18	A. Yes.
19	And give them what, in the environment, we possibly	19	Q. And overleaf there, at page 11, there is a table.
20	could do and the support we can.	20	It is headed:
21	Q. Despite making it as safe as you possibly could, it is	21	"The response to serious incidents of self-harm and
22	correct to say that there was inhumane treatment. Where	22	threats of suicide was often constant supervision by
23	would the responsibility for that lie?	23	officers to prevent further harm. The table below shows
24	A. I mean using the term "inhumane", whether it is	24	the number of detainees placed on constant supervision
25	inhumane, that is a matter of perspective; from my	25	in the months of the charter programme."
	D 10F		D 107
	Page 105		Page 107
_			
1	perspective, it wasn't any treatment was not inhumane	1	Obviously, I won't not read it all out, but, for
2	perspective, it wasn't any treatment was not inhumane from my staff or Serco. I can't comment for the	1 2	Obviously, I won't not read it all out, but, for example, in August, against the daily population on
		1	-
2	from my staff or Serco. I can't comment for the	2	example, in August, against the daily population on
2 3	from my staff or Serco. I can't comment for the Home Office.	2 3	example, in August, against the daily population on average of 93, 32 of those people were on constant
2 3 4	from my staff or Serco. I can't comment for the Home Office.  Q. I put these findings to Mr Castle, who is from the	2 3 4	example, in August, against the daily population on average of 93, 32 of those people were on constant supervision during that month.
2 3 4 5	from my staff or Serco. I can't comment for the Home Office.  Q. I put these findings to Mr Castle, who is from the Home Office, or he was at the time, he's moved on now.	2 3 4 5	example, in August, against the daily population on average of 93, 32 of those people were on constant supervision during that month.  And constant supervision, for those who have not
2 3 4 5 6	from my staff or Serco. I can't comment for the Home Office.  Q. I put these findings to Mr Castle, who is from the Home Office, or he was at the time, he's moved on now. He was the DES area manager for the IRCs.	2 3 4 5 6	example, in August, against the daily population on average of 93, 32 of those people were on constant supervision during that month.  And constant supervision, for those who have not heard it, are people who are always being watched,
2 3 4 5 6 7	from my staff or Serco. I can't comment for the Home Office.  Q. I put these findings to Mr Castle, who is from the Home Office, or he was at the time, he's moved on now. He was the DES area manager for the IRCs.  A. That's right.	2 3 4 5 6 7	example, in August, against the daily population on average of 93, 32 of those people were on constant supervision during that month.  And constant supervision, for those who have not heard it, are people who are always being watched, because the concern is, in layman's terms, if you look
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	from my staff or Serco. I can't comment for the Home Office.  Q. I put these findings to Mr Castle, who is from the Home Office, or he was at the time, he's moved on now. He was the DES area manager for the IRCs.  A. That's right.  Q. I asked him where responsibility lay and he mentioned	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	example, in August, against the daily population on average of 93, 32 of those people were on constant supervision during that month.  And constant supervision, for those who have not heard it, are people who are always being watched, because the concern is, in layman's terms, if you look away, they will try and hurt themselves.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	from my staff or Serco. I can't comment for the Home Office.  Q. I put these findings to Mr Castle, who is from the Home Office, or he was at the time, he's moved on now. He was the DES area manager for the IRCs.  A. That's right.  Q. I asked him where responsibility lay and he mentioned that Serco and Home Office staff based at Brook House	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	example, in August, against the daily population on average of 93, 32 of those people were on constant supervision during that month.  And constant supervision, for those who have not heard it, are people who are always being watched, because the concern is, in layman's terms, if you look away, they will try and hurt themselves.  A. Correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	from my staff or Serco. I can't comment for the Home Office.  Q. I put these findings to Mr Castle, who is from the Home Office, or he was at the time, he's moved on now. He was the DES area manager for the IRCs.  A. That's right.  Q. I asked him where responsibility lay and he mentioned that Serco and Home Office staff based at Brook House were doing a difficult job to the best of their	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	example, in August, against the daily population on average of 93, 32 of those people were on constant supervision during that month.  And constant supervision, for those who have not heard it, are people who are always being watched, because the concern is, in layman's terms, if you look away, they will try and hurt themselves.  A. Correct.  Q. It carries on:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	from my staff or Serco. I can't comment for the Home Office.  Q. I put these findings to Mr Castle, who is from the Home Office, or he was at the time, he's moved on now. He was the DES area manager for the IRCs.  A. That's right.  Q. I asked him where responsibility lay and he mentioned that Serco and Home Office staff based at Brook House were doing a difficult job to the best of their abilities, and he said you all made the best of, in his	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	example, in August, against the daily population on average of 93, 32 of those people were on constant supervision during that month.  And constant supervision, for those who have not heard it, are people who are always being watched, because the concern is, in layman's terms, if you look away, they will try and hurt themselves.  A. Correct.  Q. It carries on:  "In writing this report, the board struggles to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	from my staff or Serco. I can't comment for the Home Office.  Q. I put these findings to Mr Castle, who is from the Home Office, or he was at the time, he's moved on now. He was the DES area manager for the IRCs.  A. That's right.  Q. I asked him where responsibility lay and he mentioned that Serco and Home Office staff based at Brook House were doing a difficult job to the best of their abilities, and he said you all made the best of, in his words, "an incredibly bad job". I asked him about what	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	example, in August, against the daily population on average of 93, 32 of those people were on constant supervision during that month.  And constant supervision, for those who have not heard it, are people who are always being watched, because the concern is, in layman's terms, if you look away, they will try and hurt themselves.  A. Correct.  Q. It carries on:  "In writing this report, the board struggles to convey how disturbing these numbers of detainees on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	from my staff or Serco. I can't comment for the Home Office.  Q. I put these findings to Mr Castle, who is from the Home Office, or he was at the time, he's moved on now. He was the DES area manager for the IRCs.  A. That's right.  Q. I asked him where responsibility lay and he mentioned that Serco and Home Office staff based at Brook House were doing a difficult job to the best of their abilities, and he said you all made the best of, in his words, "an incredibly bad job". I asked him about what difficulties or constraints there were, and he said that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	example, in August, against the daily population on average of 93, 32 of those people were on constant supervision during that month.  And constant supervision, for those who have not heard it, are people who are always being watched, because the concern is, in layman's terms, if you look away, they will try and hurt themselves.  A. Correct.  Q. It carries on:  "In writing this report, the board struggles to convey how disturbing these numbers of detainees on constant supervision are. Concerns about a detainee's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	from my staff or Serco. I can't comment for the Home Office.  Q. I put these findings to Mr Castle, who is from the Home Office, or he was at the time, he's moved on now. He was the DES area manager for the IRCs.  A. That's right.  Q. I asked him where responsibility lay and he mentioned that Serco and Home Office staff based at Brook House were doing a difficult job to the best of their abilities, and he said you all made the best of, in his words, "an incredibly bad job". I asked him about what difficulties or constraints there were, and he said that the political drive to remove people who had crossed the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	example, in August, against the daily population on average of 93, 32 of those people were on constant supervision during that month.  And constant supervision, for those who have not heard it, are people who are always being watched, because the concern is, in layman's terms, if you look away, they will try and hurt themselves.  A. Correct.  Q. It carries on:  "In writing this report, the board struggles to convey how disturbing these numbers of detainees on constant supervision are. Concerns about a detainee's state of mind must be very high indeed to justify
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	from my staff or Serco. I can't comment for the Home Office.  Q. I put these findings to Mr Castle, who is from the Home Office, or he was at the time, he's moved on now. He was the DES area manager for the IRCs.  A. That's right.  Q. I asked him where responsibility lay and he mentioned that Serco and Home Office staff based at Brook House were doing a difficult job to the best of their abilities, and he said you all made the best of, in his words, "an incredibly bad job". I asked him about what difficulties or constraints there were, and he said that the political drive to remove people who had crossed the channel in small boats was difficult to keep up with.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	example, in August, against the daily population on average of 93, 32 of those people were on constant supervision during that month.  And constant supervision, for those who have not heard it, are people who are always being watched, because the concern is, in layman's terms, if you look away, they will try and hurt themselves.  A. Correct.  Q. It carries on:  "In writing this report, the board struggles to convey how disturbing these numbers of detainees on constant supervision are. Concerns about a detainee's state of mind must be very high indeed to justify assigning staff to watch them at all times. Moreover,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	from my staff or Serco. I can't comment for the Home Office.  Q. I put these findings to Mr Castle, who is from the Home Office, or he was at the time, he's moved on now. He was the DES area manager for the IRCs.  A. That's right.  Q. I asked him where responsibility lay and he mentioned that Serco and Home Office staff based at Brook House were doing a difficult job to the best of their abilities, and he said you all made the best of, in his words, "an incredibly bad job". I asked him about what difficulties or constraints there were, and he said that the political drive to remove people who had crossed the channel in small boats was difficult to keep up with. Would you agree with that?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	example, in August, against the daily population on average of 93, 32 of those people were on constant supervision during that month.  And constant supervision, for those who have not heard it, are people who are always being watched, because the concern is, in layman's terms, if you look away, they will try and hurt themselves.  A. Correct.  Q. It carries on:  "In writing this report, the board struggles to convey how disturbing these numbers of detainees on constant supervision are. Concerns about a detainee's state of mind must be very high indeed to justify assigning staff to watch them at all times. Moreover, these are only the most extreme cases. More detainees
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	from my staff or Serco. I can't comment for the Home Office.  Q. I put these findings to Mr Castle, who is from the Home Office, or he was at the time, he's moved on now. He was the DES area manager for the IRCs.  A. That's right.  Q. I asked him where responsibility lay and he mentioned that Serco and Home Office staff based at Brook House were doing a difficult job to the best of their abilities, and he said you all made the best of, in his words, "an incredibly bad job". I asked him about what difficulties or constraints there were, and he said that the political drive to remove people who had crossed the channel in small boats was difficult to keep up with. Would you agree with that?  A. Yes, yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	example, in August, against the daily population on average of 93, 32 of those people were on constant supervision during that month.  And constant supervision, for those who have not heard it, are people who are always being watched, because the concern is, in layman's terms, if you look away, they will try and hurt themselves.  A. Correct.  Q. It carries on:  "In writing this report, the board struggles to convey how disturbing these numbers of detainees on constant supervision are. Concerns about a detainee's state of mind must be very high indeed to justify assigning staff to watch them at all times. Moreover, these are only the most extreme cases. More detainees were, at the same time, on hourly, overnight or less
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	from my staff or Serco. I can't comment for the Home Office.  Q. I put these findings to Mr Castle, who is from the Home Office, or he was at the time, he's moved on now. He was the DES area manager for the IRCs.  A. That's right.  Q. I asked him where responsibility lay and he mentioned that Serco and Home Office staff based at Brook House were doing a difficult job to the best of their abilities, and he said you all made the best of, in his words, "an incredibly bad job". I asked him about what difficulties or constraints there were, and he said that the political drive to remove people who had crossed the channel in small boats was difficult to keep up with. Would you agree with that?  A. Yes, yes.  Q. I also asked Ms Molyneux of the IMB where responsibility	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	example, in August, against the daily population on average of 93, 32 of those people were on constant supervision during that month.  And constant supervision, for those who have not heard it, are people who are always being watched, because the concern is, in layman's terms, if you look away, they will try and hurt themselves.  A. Correct.  Q. It carries on:  "In writing this report, the board struggles to convey how disturbing these numbers of detainees on constant supervision are. Concerns about a detainee's state of mind must be very high indeed to justify assigning staff to watch them at all times. Moreover, these are only the most extreme cases. More detainees were, at the same time, on hourly, overnight or less frequent watch."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	from my staff or Serco. I can't comment for the Home Office.  Q. I put these findings to Mr Castle, who is from the Home Office, or he was at the time, he's moved on now. He was the DES area manager for the IRCs.  A. That's right.  Q. I asked him where responsibility lay and he mentioned that Serco and Home Office staff based at Brook House were doing a difficult job to the best of their abilities, and he said you all made the best of, in his words, "an incredibly bad job". I asked him about what difficulties or constraints there were, and he said that the political drive to remove people who had crossed the channel in small boats was difficult to keep up with. Would you agree with that?  A. Yes, yes.  Q. I also asked Ms Molyneux of the IMB where responsibility lay for these findings, and she said:  "I think the problem was more that the Home Office	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	example, in August, against the daily population on average of 93, 32 of those people were on constant supervision during that month.  And constant supervision, for those who have not heard it, are people who are always being watched, because the concern is, in layman's terms, if you look away, they will try and hurt themselves.  A. Correct.  Q. It carries on:  "In writing this report, the board struggles to convey how disturbing these numbers of detainees on constant supervision are. Concerns about a detainee's state of mind must be very high indeed to justify assigning staff to watch them at all times. Moreover, these are only the most extreme cases. More detainees were, at the same time, on hourly, overnight or less frequent watch."  So 32, for example, out of 93, is only the people
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	from my staff or Serco. I can't comment for the Home Office.  Q. I put these findings to Mr Castle, who is from the Home Office, or he was at the time, he's moved on now. He was the DES area manager for the IRCs.  A. That's right.  Q. I asked him where responsibility lay and he mentioned that Serco and Home Office staff based at Brook House were doing a difficult job to the best of their abilities, and he said you all made the best of, in his words, "an incredibly bad job". I asked him about what difficulties or constraints there were, and he said that the political drive to remove people who had crossed the channel in small boats was difficult to keep up with. Would you agree with that?  A. Yes, yes.  Q. I also asked Ms Molyneux of the IMB where responsibility lay for these findings, and she said:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	example, in August, against the daily population on average of 93, 32 of those people were on constant supervision during that month.  And constant supervision, for those who have not heard it, are people who are always being watched, because the concern is, in layman's terms, if you look away, they will try and hurt themselves.  A. Correct.  Q. It carries on:  "In writing this report, the board struggles to convey how disturbing these numbers of detainees on constant supervision are. Concerns about a detainee's state of mind must be very high indeed to justify assigning staff to watch them at all times. Moreover, these are only the most extreme cases. More detainees were, at the same time, on hourly, overnight or less frequent watch."  So 32, for example, out of 93, is only the people who were on that very highest level of round-the-clock
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	from my staff or Serco. I can't comment for the Home Office.  Q. I put these findings to Mr Castle, who is from the Home Office, or he was at the time, he's moved on now. He was the DES area manager for the IRCs.  A. That's right.  Q. I asked him where responsibility lay and he mentioned that Serco and Home Office staff based at Brook House were doing a difficult job to the best of their abilities, and he said you all made the best of, in his words, "an incredibly bad job". I asked him about what difficulties or constraints there were, and he said that the political drive to remove people who had crossed the channel in small boats was difficult to keep up with. Would you agree with that?  A. Yes, yes.  Q. I also asked Ms Molyneux of the IMB where responsibility lay for these findings, and she said:  "I think the problem was more that the Home Office kept bringing these people in. The Home Office were aware of the problem. So when a safeguard failure	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	example, in August, against the daily population on average of 93, 32 of those people were on constant supervision during that month.  And constant supervision, for those who have not heard it, are people who are always being watched, because the concern is, in layman's terms, if you look away, they will try and hurt themselves.  A. Correct.  Q. It carries on:  "In writing this report, the board struggles to convey how disturbing these numbers of detainees on constant supervision are. Concerns about a detainee's state of mind must be very high indeed to justify assigning staff to watch them at all times. Moreover, these are only the most extreme cases. More detainees were, at the same time, on hourly, overnight or less frequent watch."  So 32, for example, out of 93, is only the people who were on that very highest level of round-the-clock watch?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	from my staff or Serco. I can't comment for the Home Office.  Q. I put these findings to Mr Castle, who is from the Home Office, or he was at the time, he's moved on now. He was the DES area manager for the IRCs.  A. That's right.  Q. I asked him where responsibility lay and he mentioned that Serco and Home Office staff based at Brook House were doing a difficult job to the best of their abilities, and he said you all made the best of, in his words, "an incredibly bad job". I asked him about what difficulties or constraints there were, and he said that the political drive to remove people who had crossed the channel in small boats was difficult to keep up with. Would you agree with that?  A. Yes, yes.  Q. I also asked Ms Molyneux of the IMB where responsibility lay for these findings, and she said:  "I think the problem was more that the Home Office kept bringing these people in. The Home Office were	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	example, in August, against the daily population on average of 93, 32 of those people were on constant supervision during that month.  And constant supervision, for those who have not heard it, are people who are always being watched, because the concern is, in layman's terms, if you look away, they will try and hurt themselves.  A. Correct.  Q. It carries on:  "In writing this report, the board struggles to convey how disturbing these numbers of detainees on constant supervision are. Concerns about a detainee's state of mind must be very high indeed to justify assigning staff to watch them at all times. Moreover, these are only the most extreme cases. More detainees were, at the same time, on hourly, overnight or less frequent watch."  So 32, for example, out of 93, is only the people who were on that very highest level of round-the-clock watch?  A. Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	from my staff or Serco. I can't comment for the Home Office.  Q. I put these findings to Mr Castle, who is from the Home Office, or he was at the time, he's moved on now. He was the DES area manager for the IRCs.  A. That's right.  Q. I asked him where responsibility lay and he mentioned that Serco and Home Office staff based at Brook House were doing a difficult job to the best of their abilities, and he said you all made the best of, in his words, "an incredibly bad job". I asked him about what difficulties or constraints there were, and he said that the political drive to remove people who had crossed the channel in small boats was difficult to keep up with. Would you agree with that?  A. Yes, yes.  Q. I also asked Ms Molyneux of the IMB where responsibility lay for these findings, and she said:  "I think the problem was more that the Home Office kept bringing these people in. The Home Office were aware of the problem. So when a safeguard failure—and when I say 'overloaded', the Home Office knew this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	example, in August, against the daily population on average of 93, 32 of those people were on constant supervision during that month.  And constant supervision, for those who have not heard it, are people who are always being watched, because the concern is, in layman's terms, if you look away, they will try and hurt themselves.  A. Correct.  Q. It carries on:  "In writing this report, the board struggles to convey how disturbing these numbers of detainees on constant supervision are. Concerns about a detainee's state of mind must be very high indeed to justify assigning staff to watch them at all times. Moreover, these are only the most extreme cases. More detainees were, at the same time, on hourly, overnight or less frequent watch."  So 32, for example, out of 93, is only the people who were on that very highest level of round-the-clock watch?  A. Yes.  Q. This was obviously highly distressing for the detainee?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	from my staff or Serco. I can't comment for the Home Office.  Q. I put these findings to Mr Castle, who is from the Home Office, or he was at the time, he's moved on now. He was the DES area manager for the IRCs.  A. That's right.  Q. I asked him where responsibility lay and he mentioned that Serco and Home Office staff based at Brook House were doing a difficult job to the best of their abilities, and he said you all made the best of, in his words, "an incredibly bad job". I asked him about what difficulties or constraints there were, and he said that the political drive to remove people who had crossed the channel in small boats was difficult to keep up with. Would you agree with that?  A. Yes, yes.  Q. I also asked Ms Molyneux of the IMB where responsibility lay for these findings, and she said:  "I think the problem was more that the Home Office kept bringing these people in. The Home Office were aware of the problem. So when a safeguard failure and when I say 'overloaded', the Home Office knew this happening. This wasn't the first they had heard of it, you know, they had heard the minister I mean, senior	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	example, in August, against the daily population on average of 93, 32 of those people were on constant supervision during that month.  And constant supervision, for those who have not heard it, are people who are always being watched, because the concern is, in layman's terms, if you look away, they will try and hurt themselves.  A. Correct.  Q. It carries on:  "In writing this report, the board struggles to convey how disturbing these numbers of detainees on constant supervision are. Concerns about a detainee's state of mind must be very high indeed to justify assigning staff to watch them at all times. Moreover, these are only the most extreme cases. More detainees were, at the same time, on hourly, overnight or less frequent watch."  So 32, for example, out of 93, is only the people who were on that very highest level of round-the-clock watch?  A. Yes.  Q. This was obviously highly distressing for the detainee?  A. Yes.  Q. And not just for the ones who were being watched, but
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	from my staff or Serco. I can't comment for the Home Office.  Q. I put these findings to Mr Castle, who is from the Home Office, or he was at the time, he's moved on now. He was the DES area manager for the IRCs.  A. That's right.  Q. I asked him where responsibility lay and he mentioned that Serco and Home Office staff based at Brook House were doing a difficult job to the best of their abilities, and he said you all made the best of, in his words, "an incredibly bad job". I asked him about what difficulties or constraints there were, and he said that the political drive to remove people who had crossed the channel in small boats was difficult to keep up with. Would you agree with that?  A. Yes, yes.  Q. I also asked Ms Molyneux of the IMB where responsibility lay for these findings, and she said:  "I think the problem was more that the Home Office kept bringing these people in. The Home Office were aware of the problem. So when a safeguard failure and when I say 'overloaded', the Home Office knew this happening. This wasn't the first they had heard of it,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	example, in August, against the daily population on average of 93, 32 of those people were on constant supervision during that month.  And constant supervision, for those who have not heard it, are people who are always being watched, because the concern is, in layman's terms, if you look away, they will try and hurt themselves.  A. Correct.  Q. It carries on:  "In writing this report, the board struggles to convey how disturbing these numbers of detainees on constant supervision are. Concerns about a detainee's state of mind must be very high indeed to justify assigning staff to watch them at all times. Moreover, these are only the most extreme cases. More detainees were, at the same time, on hourly, overnight or less frequent watch."  So 32, for example, out of 93, is only the people who were on that very highest level of round-the-clock watch?  A. Yes.  Q. This was obviously highly distressing for the detainee?  A. Yes.

1	for everyone who was in this environment?	1	to the meetings or is it different people at different
2	A. Yes, it were an extremely busy period and yeah,	2	things?
3	particularly for the residents, and for the staff as	3	A. Simon and his deputy, who, at this point, is the area
4	well, so I am extremely grateful to the staff. They	4	manager who took over from Ian Castle.
5	were doing a fantastic job to care and support the	5	Q. I see. When you raised these concerns with the
6	residents in a difficult time. Really difficult.	6	Home Office, as you say you did, what was their
7	Q. That was my next question was going to be about the	7	response?
8	staff.	8	A. They acknowledged, obviously, the concerns and the risks
9	A. Yes.	9	associated with it.
10	Q. So what, if anything, could you do to support your staff	10	Q. Do you think, looking back, that when you were raising
11	at this time?	11	these concerns, you made it clear that the actions or
12	A. I mean lots of things we did for the staff, particularly	12	the fact of these people being detained was raising
13	with the Mental Health First Aid trained staff and the	13	really serious risks of these people hurting themselves
14	care team, and that was checking in on all the staff,	14	or dying?
15	particularly, and making sure and the difficulty,	15	A. Yes, there is a full acknowledgment of that.
16	sometimes, for staff is doing a constant watch is quite	16	Q. Did there come a point when you believed you simply
17	a hard task as well, and giving frequent breaks and	17	couldn't provide a safe detention setting environment
18	supporting in that nature as well, and as much	18	for these people?
19	supervision as possible.	19	A. We never came to that point, no. And I had no control
20	Q. I read to what you Ms Molyneux had said and she noted	20	on what were allocated to us when. From a Home Office
21	that Serco had made the Home Office aware of the levels	21	perspective, they decided on who they allocated as part
22	of self-harming and the concerns. But maybe you can	22	of their enforcement activity.
23	help us a bit more with what steps, if any, did you take	23	Q. And one thing that can be done when you cannot comply
24	to raise concerns about the nature of the detainees and	24	with certain provisions of the contract for example, is
25	their vulnerabilities?	25	derogate from certain provisions of the contract. Can
	Dagg 100		Page 111
	Page 109		rage III
1	A. I mean, it is fair to say that, because of the spike in	1	you also refuse to take more people?
1 2	A. I mean, it is fair to say that, because of the spike in self-harm and the use of force, all the there was	1 2	you also refuse to take more people?  A. No. No, there would be certain probably, under no
	•		• •
2	self-harm and the use of force, all the there was	2	A. No. No, there would be certain probably, under no
2 3	self-harm and the use of force, all the there was a lot of discussion with the Home Office and the IMB and	2 3	A. No. No, there would be certain probably, under no circumstances, have I ever refused to take anybody at
2 3 4	self-harm and the use of force, all the there was a lot of discussion with the Home Office and the IMB and other stakeholders as well. And it was discussed on	2 3 4	A. No. No, there would be certain probably, under no circumstances, have I ever refused to take anybody at this point in time, if I have the availability, but
2 3 4 5	self-harm and the use of force, all the there was a lot of discussion with the Home Office and the IMB and other stakeholders as well. And it was discussed on a weekly basis at the a monthly basis at the Safer	2 3 4 5	A. No. No, there would be certain probably, under no circumstances, have I ever refused to take anybody at this point in time, if I have the availability, but Q. If you have got a bed?
2 3 4 5 6	self-harm and the use of force, all the there was a lot of discussion with the Home Office and the IMB and other stakeholders as well. And it was discussed on a weekly basis at the a monthly basis at the Safer Custody meetings as well, and on a daily basis at	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A. No. No, there would be certain probably, under no circumstances, have I ever refused to take anybody at this point in time, if I have the availability, but Q. If you have got a bed?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	self-harm and the use of force, all the — there was a lot of discussion with the Home Office and the IMB and other stakeholders as well. And it was discussed on a weekly basis at the — a monthly basis at the Safer Custody meetings as well, and on a daily basis at operational meetings every morning as well. So I think	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A. No. No, there would be certain probably, under no circumstances, have I ever refused to take anybody at this point in time, if I have the availability, but</li> <li>Q. If you have got a bed?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. While we are in this document, can we go, please, to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	self-harm and the use of force, all the — there was a lot of discussion with the Home Office and the IMB and other stakeholders as well. And it was discussed on a weekly basis at the — a monthly basis at the Safer Custody meetings as well, and on a daily basis at operational meetings every morning as well. So I think the Home Office, ourselves and the IMB had got concerns	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A. No. No, there would be certain probably, under no circumstances, have I ever refused to take anybody at this point in time, if I have the availability, but</li> <li>Q. If you have got a bed?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. While we are in this document, can we go, please, to page 22, this is a slightly different issue, but while</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	self-harm and the use of force, all the there was a lot of discussion with the Home Office and the IMB and other stakeholders as well. And it was discussed on a weekly basis at the a monthly basis at the Safer Custody meetings as well, and on a daily basis at operational meetings every morning as well. So I think the Home Office, ourselves and the IMB had got concerns about some of the issues and the spike as well. So	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. No. No, there would be certain probably, under no circumstances, have I ever refused to take anybody at this point in time, if I have the availability, but</li> <li>Q. If you have got a bed?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. While we are in this document, can we go, please, to page 22, this is a slightly different issue, but while we have it on screen, we might as well deal with it</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	self-harm and the use of force, all the — there was a lot of discussion with the Home Office and the IMB and other stakeholders as well. And it was discussed on a weekly basis at the — a monthly basis at the Safer Custody meetings as well, and on a daily basis at operational meetings every morning as well. So I think the Home Office, ourselves and the IMB had got concerns about some of the issues and the spike as well. So everybody was aware of it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. No. No, there would be certain probably, under no circumstances, have I ever refused to take anybody at this point in time, if I have the availability, but Q. If you have got a bed?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. While we are in this document, can we go, please, to page 22, this is a slightly different issue, but while we have it on screen, we might as well deal with it here. The last paragraph of this, states:</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	self-harm and the use of force, all the — there was a lot of discussion with the Home Office and the IMB and other stakeholders as well. And it was discussed on a weekly basis at the — a monthly basis at the Safer Custody meetings as well, and on a daily basis at operational meetings every morning as well. So I think the Home Office, ourselves and the IMB had got concerns about some of the issues and the spike as well. So everybody was aware of it.  Q. Where Ms Molyneux says that Serco raised concerns with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A. No. No, there would be certain probably, under no circumstances, have I ever refused to take anybody at this point in time, if I have the availability, but</li> <li>Q. If you have got a bed?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. While we are in this document, can we go, please, to page 22, this is a slightly different issue, but while we have it on screen, we might as well deal with it here. The last paragraph of this, states:  "The board also questioned the"</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	self-harm and the use of force, all the — there was a lot of discussion with the Home Office and the IMB and other stakeholders as well. And it was discussed on a weekly basis at the — a monthly basis at the Safer Custody meetings as well, and on a daily basis at operational meetings every morning as well. So I think the Home Office, ourselves and the IMB had got concerns about some of the issues and the spike as well. So everybody was aware of it.  Q. Where Ms Molyneux says that Serco raised concerns with the Home Office, do you know if she means just the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. No. No, there would be certain probably, under no circumstances, have I ever refused to take anybody at this point in time, if I have the availability, but</li> <li>Q. If you have got a bed?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. While we are in this document, can we go, please, to page 22, this is a slightly different issue, but while we have it on screen, we might as well deal with it here. The last paragraph of this, states:  "The board also questioned the"  It is about ACDT reviews:</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	self-harm and the use of force, all the there was a lot of discussion with the Home Office and the IMB and other stakeholders as well. And it was discussed on a weekly basis at the a monthly basis at the Safer Custody meetings as well, and on a daily basis at operational meetings every morning as well. So I think the Home Office, ourselves and the IMB had got concerns about some of the issues and the spike as well. So everybody was aware of it.  Q. Where Ms Molyneux says that Serco raised concerns with the Home Office, do you know if she means just the Home Office who were based at Brook House?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. No. No, there would be certain probably, under no circumstances, have I ever refused to take anybody at this point in time, if I have the availability, but</li> <li>Q. If you have got a bed?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. While we are in this document, can we go, please, to page 22, this is a slightly different issue, but while we have it on screen, we might as well deal with it here. The last paragraph of this, states:  "The board also questioned the"  It is about ACDT reviews:  "The board also questioned the absence of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	self-harm and the use of force, all the — there was a lot of discussion with the Home Office and the IMB and other stakeholders as well. And it was discussed on a weekly basis at the — a monthly basis at the Safer Custody meetings as well, and on a daily basis at operational meetings every morning as well. So I think the Home Office, ourselves and the IMB had got concerns about some of the issues and the spike as well. So everybody was aware of it. Q. Where Ms Molyneux says that Serco raised concerns with the Home Office, do you know if she means just the Home Office who were based at Brook House?  A. We would have raised — I had discussions with the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. No. No, there would be certain probably, under no circumstances, have I ever refused to take anybody at this point in time, if I have the availability, but</li> <li>Q. If you have got a bed?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. While we are in this document, can we go, please, to page 22, this is a slightly different issue, but while we have it on screen, we might as well deal with it here. The last paragraph of this, states:  "The board also questioned the"  It is about ACDT reviews:  "The board also questioned the absence of Home Office personnel in ACDT or constant supervision</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	self-harm and the use of force, all the — there was a lot of discussion with the Home Office and the IMB and other stakeholders as well. And it was discussed on a weekly basis at the — a monthly basis at the Safer Custody meetings as well, and on a daily basis at operational meetings every morning as well. So I think the Home Office, ourselves and the IMB had got concerns about some of the issues and the spike as well. So everybody was aware of it. Q. Where Ms Molyneux says that Serco raised concerns with the Home Office, do you know if she means just the Home Office who were based at Brook House?  A. We would have raised — I had discussions with the Home Office and — I mean, there is weekly meetings,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. No. No, there would be certain probably, under no circumstances, have I ever refused to take anybody at this point in time, if I have the availability, but Q. If you have got a bed?  A. Yes.  Q. While we are in this document, can we go, please, to page 22, this is a slightly different issue, but while we have it on screen, we might as well deal with it here. The last paragraph of this, states:  "The board also questioned the"  It is about ACDT reviews:  "The board also questioned the absence of Home Office personnel in ACDT or constant supervision reviews, being of the view that it would be fair and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	self-harm and the use of force, all the — there was a lot of discussion with the Home Office and the IMB and other stakeholders as well. And it was discussed on a weekly basis at the — a monthly basis at the Safer Custody meetings as well, and on a daily basis at operational meetings every morning as well. So I think the Home Office, ourselves and the IMB had got concerns about some of the issues and the spike as well. So everybody was aware of it. Q. Where Ms Molyneux says that Serco raised concerns with the Home Office, do you know if she means just the Home Office who were based at Brook House?  A. We would have raised — I had discussions with the Home Office and — I mean, there is weekly meetings, I have a monthly operational meeting with the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. No. No, there would be certain probably, under no circumstances, have I ever refused to take anybody at this point in time, if I have the availability, but Q. If you have got a bed?  A. Yes.  Q. While we are in this document, can we go, please, to page 22, this is a slightly different issue, but while we have it on screen, we might as well deal with it here. The last paragraph of this, states:  "The board also questioned the"  It is about ACDT reviews:  "The board also questioned the absence of Home Office personnel in ACDT or constant supervision reviews, being of the view that it would be fair and respectful to detainees to have a presence, given the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	self-harm and the use of force, all the — there was a lot of discussion with the Home Office and the IMB and other stakeholders as well. And it was discussed on a weekly basis at the — a monthly basis at the Safer Custody meetings as well, and on a daily basis at operational meetings every morning as well. So I think the Home Office, ourselves and the IMB had got concerns about some of the issues and the spike as well. So everybody was aware of it. Q. Where Ms Molyneux says that Serco raised concerns with the Home Office, do you know if she means just the Home Office who were based at Brook House?  A. We would have raised — I had discussions with the Home Office and — I mean, there is weekly meetings, I have a monthly operational meeting with the Home Office, and quarterly meetings as well, so they are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. No. No, there would be certain probably, under no circumstances, have I ever refused to take anybody at this point in time, if I have the availability, but Q. If you have got a bed?  A. Yes. Q. While we are in this document, can we go, please, to page 22, this is a slightly different issue, but while we have it on screen, we might as well deal with it here. The last paragraph of this, states:  "The board also questioned the"  It is about ACDT reviews:  "The board also questioned the absence of Home Office personnel in ACDT or constant supervision reviews, being of the view that it would be fair and respectful to detainees to have a presence, given the impact of Home Office decisions on their lives. We have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	self-harm and the use of force, all the — there was a lot of discussion with the Home Office and the IMB and other stakeholders as well. And it was discussed on a weekly basis at the — a monthly basis at the Safer Custody meetings as well, and on a daily basis at operational meetings every morning as well. So I think the Home Office, ourselves and the IMB had got concerns about some of the issues and the spike as well. So everybody was aware of it. Q. Where Ms Molyneux says that Serco raised concerns with the Home Office, do you know if she means just the Home Office who were based at Brook House?  A. We would have raised — I had discussions with the Home Office and — I mean, there is weekly meetings, I have a monthly operational meeting with the Home Office, and quarterly meetings as well, so they are in the minutes of those meetings as well.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. No. No, there would be certain probably, under no circumstances, have I ever refused to take anybody at this point in time, if I have the availability, but Q. If you have got a bed?  A. Yes. Q. While we are in this document, can we go, please, to page 22, this is a slightly different issue, but while we have it on screen, we might as well deal with it here. The last paragraph of this, states:  "The board also questioned the"  It is about ACDT reviews:  "The board also questioned the absence of Home Office personnel in ACDT or constant supervision reviews, being of the view that it would be fair and respectful to detainees to have a presence, given the impact of Home Office decisions on their lives. We have been told by the Home Office that it is the decision of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	self-harm and the use of force, all the — there was a lot of discussion with the Home Office and the IMB and other stakeholders as well. And it was discussed on a weekly basis at the — a monthly basis at the Safer Custody meetings as well, and on a daily basis at operational meetings every morning as well. So I think the Home Office, ourselves and the IMB had got concerns about some of the issues and the spike as well. So everybody was aware of it. Q. Where Ms Molyneux says that Serco raised concerns with the Home Office, do you know if she means just the Home Office who were based at Brook House?  A. We would have raised — I had discussions with the Home Office and — I mean, there is weekly meetings, I have a monthly operational meeting with the Home Office, and quarterly meetings as well, so they are in the minutes of those meetings as well.  Q. Who from the Home Office attends the monthly meetings,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. No. No, there would be certain — probably, under no circumstances, have I ever refused to take anybody at this point in time, if I have the availability, but — Q. If you have got a bed?  A. Yes.  Q. While we are in this document, can we go, please, to page 22, this is a slightly different issue, but while we have it on screen, we might as well deal with it here. The last paragraph of this, states:  "The board also questioned the"  It is about ACDT reviews:  "The board also questioned the absence of Home Office personnel in ACDT or constant supervision reviews, being of the view that it would be fair and respectful to detainees to have a presence, given the impact of Home Office decisions on their lives. We have been told by the Home Office that it is the decision of the Serco manager to request Home Office presence if
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	self-harm and the use of force, all the — there was a lot of discussion with the Home Office and the IMB and other stakeholders as well. And it was discussed on a weekly basis at the — a monthly basis at the Safer Custody meetings as well, and on a daily basis at operational meetings every morning as well. So I think the Home Office, ourselves and the IMB had got concerns about some of the issues and the spike as well. So everybody was aware of it.  Q. Where Ms Molyneux says that Serco raised concerns with the Home Office, do you know if she means just the Home Office who were based at Brook House?  A. We would have raised — I had discussions with the Home Office and — I mean, there is weekly meetings, I have a monthly operational meeting with the Home Office, and quarterly meetings as well, so they are in the minutes of those meetings as well.  Q. Who from the Home Office attends the monthly meetings, for example?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. No. No, there would be certain — probably, under no circumstances, have I ever refused to take anybody at this point in time, if I have the availability, but — Q. If you have got a bed?  A. Yes.  Q. While we are in this document, can we go, please, to page 22, this is a slightly different issue, but while we have it on screen, we might as well deal with it here. The last paragraph of this, states:  "The board also questioned the"  It is about ACDT reviews:  "The board also questioned the absence of Home Office personnel in ACDT or constant supervision reviews, being of the view that it would be fair and respectful to detainees to have a presence, given the impact of Home Office decisions on their lives. We have been told by the Home Office that it is the decision of the Serco manager to request Home Office presence if they wish."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	self-harm and the use of force, all the — there was a lot of discussion with the Home Office and the IMB and other stakeholders as well. And it was discussed on a weekly basis at the — a monthly basis at the Safer Custody meetings as well, and on a daily basis at operational meetings every morning as well. So I think the Home Office, ourselves and the IMB had got concerns about some of the issues and the spike as well. So everybody was aware of it.  Q. Where Ms Molyneux says that Serco raised concerns with the Home Office, do you know if she means just the Home Office who were based at Brook House?  A. We would have raised — I had discussions with the Home Office and — I mean, there is weekly meetings, I have a monthly operational meeting with the Home Office, and quarterly meetings as well, so they are in the minutes of those meetings as well.  Q. Who from the Home Office attends the monthly meetings, for example?  A. It would be the service delivery manager, G7, from the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. No. No, there would be certain probably, under no circumstances, have I ever refused to take anybody at this point in time, if I have the availability, but Q. If you have got a bed?  A. Yes. Q. While we are in this document, can we go, please, to page 22, this is a slightly different issue, but while we have it on screen, we might as well deal with it here. The last paragraph of this, states:  "The board also questioned the"  It is about ACDT reviews:  "The board also questioned the absence of Home Office personnel in ACDT or constant supervision reviews, being of the view that it would be fair and respectful to detainees to have a presence, given the impact of Home Office decisions on their lives. We have been told by the Home Office that it is the decision of the Serco manager to request Home Office presence if they wish."  And it says that their presence might have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	self-harm and the use of force, all the — there was a lot of discussion with the Home Office and the IMB and other stakeholders as well. And it was discussed on a weekly basis at the — a monthly basis at the Safer Custody meetings as well, and on a daily basis at operational meetings every morning as well. So I think the Home Office, ourselves and the IMB had got concerns about some of the issues and the spike as well. So everybody was aware of it. Q. Where Ms Molyneux says that Serco raised concerns with the Home Office, do you know if she means just the Home Office who were based at Brook House?  A. We would have raised — I had discussions with the Home Office and — I mean, there is weekly meetings, I have a monthly operational meeting with the Home Office, and quarterly meetings as well, so they are in the minutes of those meetings as well.  Q. Who from the Home Office attends the monthly meetings, for example?  A. It would be the service delivery manager, G7, from the Home Office, who is on site.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. No. No, there would be certain probably, under no circumstances, have I ever refused to take anybody at this point in time, if I have the availability, but Q. If you have got a bed? A. Yes. Q. While we are in this document, can we go, please, to page 22, this is a slightly different issue, but while we have it on screen, we might as well deal with it here. The last paragraph of this, states:  "The board also questioned the"  It is about ACDT reviews:  "The board also questioned the absence of Home Office personnel in ACDT or constant supervision reviews, being of the view that it would be fair and respectful to detainees to have a presence, given the impact of Home Office decisions on their lives. We have been told by the Home Office that it is the decision of the Serco manager to request Home Office presence if they wish."  And it says that their presence might have a detrimental as well as a beneficial effect.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	self-harm and the use of force, all the — there was a lot of discussion with the Home Office and the IMB and other stakeholders as well. And it was discussed on a weekly basis at the — a monthly basis at the Safer Custody meetings as well, and on a daily basis at operational meetings every morning as well. So I think the Home Office, ourselves and the IMB had got concerns about some of the issues and the spike as well. So everybody was aware of it. Q. Where Ms Molyneux says that Serco raised concerns with the Home Office, do you know if she means just the Home Office who were based at Brook House?  A. We would have raised — I had discussions with the Home Office and — I mean, there is weekly meetings, I have a monthly operational meeting with the Home Office, and quarterly meetings as well, so they are in the minutes of those meetings as well. Q. Who from the Home Office attends the monthly meetings, for example?  A. It would be the service delivery manager, G7, from the Home Office, who is on site. Q. Who is that?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. No. No, there would be certain — probably, under no circumstances, have I ever refused to take anybody at this point in time, if I have the availability, but — Q. If you have got a bed?  A. Yes.  Q. While we are in this document, can we go, please, to page 22, this is a slightly different issue, but while we have it on screen, we might as well deal with it here. The last paragraph of this, states:  "The board also questioned the"  It is about ACDT reviews:  "The board also questioned the absence of Home Office personnel in ACDT or constant supervision reviews, being of the view that it would be fair and respectful to detainees to have a presence, given the impact of Home Office decisions on their lives. We have been told by the Home Office that it is the decision of the Serco manager to request Home Office presence if they wish."  And it says that their presence might have a detrimental as well as a beneficial effect.  Is this correct, do you know that Home Office,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	self-harm and the use of force, all the — there was a lot of discussion with the Home Office and the IMB and other stakeholders as well. And it was discussed on a weekly basis at the — a monthly basis at the Safer Custody meetings as well, and on a daily basis at operational meetings every morning as well. So I think the Home Office, ourselves and the IMB had got concerns about some of the issues and the spike as well. So everybody was aware of it.  Q. Where Ms Molyneux says that Serco raised concerns with the Home Office, do you know if she means just the Home Office who were based at Brook House?  A. We would have raised — I had discussions with the Home Office and — I mean, there is weekly meetings, I have a monthly operational meeting with the Home Office, and quarterly meetings as well, so they are in the minutes of those meetings as well.  Q. Who from the Home Office attends the monthly meetings, for example?  A. It would be the service delivery manager, G7, from the Home Office, who is on site.  Q. Who is that?  A. Currently, now, that is Simon Murrell.  Q. Okay. And is that the only Home Office person who went	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. No. No, there would be certain — probably, under no circumstances, have I ever refused to take anybody at this point in time, if I have the availability, but — Q. If you have got a bed?  A. Yes.  Q. While we are in this document, can we go, please, to page 22, this is a slightly different issue, but while we have it on screen, we might as well deal with it here. The last paragraph of this, states:  "The board also questioned the"  It is about ACDT reviews:  "The board also questioned the absence of Home Office personnel in ACDT or constant supervision reviews, being of the view that it would be fair and respectful to detainees to have a presence, given the impact of Home Office decisions on their lives. We have been told by the Home Office that it is the decision of the Serco manager to request Home Office presence if they wish."  And it says that their presence might have a detrimental as well as a beneficial effect.  Is this correct, do you know that Home Office, firstly, are not present at ACDT reviews?  A. I am not aware they are. They are invited to ACDT
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	self-harm and the use of force, all the — there was a lot of discussion with the Home Office and the IMB and other stakeholders as well. And it was discussed on a weekly basis at the — a monthly basis at the Safer Custody meetings as well, and on a daily basis at operational meetings every morning as well. So I think the Home Office, ourselves and the IMB had got concerns about some of the issues and the spike as well. So everybody was aware of it.  Q. Where Ms Molyneux says that Serco raised concerns with the Home Office, do you know if she means just the Home Office who were based at Brook House?  A. We would have raised — I had discussions with the Home Office and — I mean, there is weekly meetings, I have a monthly operational meeting with the Home Office, and quarterly meetings as well, so they are in the minutes of those meetings as well.  Q. Who from the Home Office attends the monthly meetings, for example?  A. It would be the service delivery manager, G7, from the Home Office, who is on site.  Q. Who is that?  A. Currently, now, that is Simon Murrell.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. No. No, there would be certain — probably, under no circumstances, have I ever refused to take anybody at this point in time, if I have the availability, but — Q. If you have got a bed?  A. Yes.  Q. While we are in this document, can we go, please, to page 22, this is a slightly different issue, but while we have it on screen, we might as well deal with it here. The last paragraph of this, states:  "The board also questioned the"  It is about ACDT reviews:  "The board also questioned the absence of Home Office personnel in ACDT or constant supervision reviews, being of the view that it would be fair and respectful to detainees to have a presence, given the impact of Home Office decisions on their lives. We have been told by the Home Office that it is the decision of the Serco manager to request Home Office presence if they wish."  And it says that their presence might have a detrimental as well as a beneficial effect.  Is this correct, do you know that Home Office, firstly, are not present at ACDT reviews?

1	reviews. Some of them sometimes they will send	1	Q. How many of those are on constant watch?
2	a report or some information. I am not aware I don't	2	A. Two.
3	attend them myself, so I am not 100 per cent sure	3	Q. Out of a total population of how many?
4	whether it is sporadic or they don't attend at all, to	4	A. 169.
5	be honest.	5	Q. That is the data from this morning, I understand?
6	Q. We also heard from Ms Molyneux that she thought it would	6	A. This morning's meeting, yes.
7	be a good idea for case workers in general to be present	7	Q. Okay. Let's turn back to 2020 then.
8	at Brook House because she said there was potentially	8	So leaving this report on the screen, please, last
9	a disconnect between the detained person and the	9	week we also heard from Ms Molyneux about a letter she
10	decision maker because you have a kind of a go-between.	10	sent on behalf of the IMB to the immigration minister
11	Do you agree with that, that that might be	11	and many others at the Home Office on 2 October 2020.
12	beneficial?	12	It sets out many of the same concerns that we see in
13	A. It would be beneficial because most of the questions of	13	more detail in the 2020 report, so it set out evidence
14	the residents are related to their case. If there was	14	about the number of men on ACDT, it included a graph,
15	easier or better access, it would be better for them,	15	the number of people who were at risk if removal
16	yes.	16	directions were served, the number of men on food and
17	Q. Have you ever raised that as a possibility?	17	fluid refusal, and it gave examples of people
18	A. I haven't raised it, no.	18	self-harming before removal, so a man who poured boiling
19	Q. We will come to more of Mr Collier's recommendations, so	19	water on his legs, someone who was hospitalised for
20	our use of force expert. But while we're on it, one he	20	self-harm and then on returning to Brook House was put
21	does make is that Home Office staff should be the ones	21	on a flight. And it summarised, the letter did, that
22	to inform detainees of removal orders. So he said the	22	the cumulative effect of these concerns amounts to
23	Home Office staff should inform the detainee, in the	23	inhumane treatment. Ms Molyneux told us she sent a copy
24	presence of a DCM, to support and familiarise themselves	24	to you after she had sent it to the minister for your
25	with the individual case.	25	information. Do you recall receiving it?
	Page 113		Page 115
		l .	
1	Lunderstand that doesn't hannen at the moment, or	1	A Vos indood
1	I understand that doesn't happen at the moment, or	1	A. Yes, indeed.  O. At the time did you garee with its contents insofar as
2	does it?	2	Q. At the time did you agree with its contents insofar as
2 3	does it?  A. It does happen. It has been a for the past	2 3	Q. At the time did you agree with its contents insofar as you were able to?
2 3 4	does it?  A. It does happen. It has been a for the past  18 months, in between, obviously, the Covid and the	2 3 4	<ul><li>Q. At the time did you agree with its contents insofar as you were able to?</li><li>A. Yes, factually the information was correct.</li></ul>
2 3 4 5	does it?  A. It does happen. It has been a for the past 18 months, in between, obviously, the Covid and the outbreaks, et cetera, it has been sporadic, so	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>Q. At the time did you agree with its contents insofar as you were able to?</li> <li>A. Yes, factually the information was correct.</li> <li>Q. Did you take any steps to endorse those concerns, so to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	does it?  A. It does happen. It has been a for the past 18 months, in between, obviously, the Covid and the outbreaks, et cetera, it has been sporadic, so A lot of the time, they do inform them. Sometimes	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Q. At the time did you agree with its contents insofar as you were able to?</li> <li>A. Yes, factually the information was correct.</li> <li>Q. Did you take any steps to endorse those concerns, so to tell the Home Office you agreed with them?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	does it?  A. It does happen. It has been a for the past 18 months, in between, obviously, the Covid and the outbreaks, et cetera, it has been sporadic, so A lot of the time, they do inform them. Sometimes it is done by letter, sometimes by telephone, it is done	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. At the time did you agree with its contents insofar as you were able to?</li> <li>A. Yes, factually the information was correct.</li> <li>Q. Did you take any steps to endorse those concerns, so to tell the Home Office you agreed with them?</li> <li>A. No, no, I didn't.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	does it?  A. It does happen. It has been a for the past 18 months, in between, obviously, the Covid and the outbreaks, et cetera, it has been sporadic, so  A lot of the time, they do inform them. Sometimes it is done by letter, sometimes by telephone, it is done by a mixture of medium of communications.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. At the time did you agree with its contents insofar as you were able to?</li> <li>A. Yes, factually the information was correct.</li> <li>Q. Did you take any steps to endorse those concerns, so to tell the Home Office you agreed with them?</li> <li>A. No, no, I didn't.</li> <li>Q. Turning, please, to page 13 of this report, so this is</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	does it?  A. It does happen. It has been a for the past  18 months, in between, obviously, the Covid and the outbreaks, et cetera, it has been sporadic, so  A lot of the time, they do inform them. Sometimes it is done by letter, sometimes by telephone, it is done by a mixture of medium of communications.  Q. And if you can do it face to face, then	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. At the time did you agree with its contents insofar as you were able to?</li> <li>A. Yes, factually the information was correct.</li> <li>Q. Did you take any steps to endorse those concerns, so to tell the Home Office you agreed with them?</li> <li>A. No, no, I didn't.</li> <li>Q. Turning, please, to page 13 of this report, so this is still the IMB 2020 report, I want to ask about what it</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	does it?  A. It does happen. It has been a for the past 18 months, in between, obviously, the Covid and the outbreaks, et cetera, it has been sporadic, so  A lot of the time, they do inform them. Sometimes it is done by letter, sometimes by telephone, it is done by a mixture of medium of communications.  Q. And if you can do it face to face, then  A. If you can do it face to face, we will do it face to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. At the time did you agree with its contents insofar as you were able to?</li> <li>A. Yes, factually the information was correct.</li> <li>Q. Did you take any steps to endorse those concerns, so to tell the Home Office you agreed with them?</li> <li>A. No, no, I didn't.</li> <li>Q. Turning, please, to page 13 of this report, so this is still the IMB 2020 report, I want to ask about what it says here about Adults at Risk, so the second paragraph</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	does it?  A. It does happen. It has been a for the past 18 months, in between, obviously, the Covid and the outbreaks, et cetera, it has been sporadic, so  A lot of the time, they do inform them. Sometimes it is done by letter, sometimes by telephone, it is done by a mixture of medium of communications.  Q. And if you can do it face to face, then  A. If you can do it face to face, we will do it face to face.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q. At the time did you agree with its contents insofar as you were able to?</li> <li>A. Yes, factually the information was correct.</li> <li>Q. Did you take any steps to endorse those concerns, so to tell the Home Office you agreed with them?</li> <li>A. No, no, I didn't.</li> <li>Q. Turning, please, to page 13 of this report, so this is still the IMB 2020 report, I want to ask about what it says here about Adults at Risk, so the second paragraph under the heading "Adults at Risk" it says "These</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	does it?  A. It does happen. It has been a for the past 18 months, in between, obviously, the Covid and the outbreaks, et cetera, it has been sporadic, so  A lot of the time, they do inform them. Sometimes it is done by letter, sometimes by telephone, it is done by a mixture of medium of communications.  Q. And if you can do it face to face, then  A. If you can do it face to face, we will do it face to face.  Q. And sometimes the Home Office attend?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. At the time did you agree with its contents insofar as you were able to?</li> <li>A. Yes, factually the information was correct.</li> <li>Q. Did you take any steps to endorse those concerns, so to tell the Home Office you agreed with them?</li> <li>A. No, no, I didn't.</li> <li>Q. Turning, please, to page 13 of this report, so this is still the IMB 2020 report, I want to ask about what it says here about Adults at Risk, so the second paragraph under the heading "Adults at Risk" it says "These issues", so some issues from a previous report:</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	does it?  A. It does happen. It has been a for the past 18 months, in between, obviously, the Covid and the outbreaks, et cetera, it has been sporadic, so  A lot of the time, they do inform them. Sometimes it is done by letter, sometimes by telephone, it is done by a mixture of medium of communications.  Q. And if you can do it face to face, then  A. If you can do it face to face, we will do it face to face.  Q. And sometimes the Home Office attend?  A. Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. At the time did you agree with its contents insofar as you were able to?</li> <li>A. Yes, factually the information was correct.</li> <li>Q. Did you take any steps to endorse those concerns, so to tell the Home Office you agreed with them?</li> <li>A. No, no, I didn't.</li> <li>Q. Turning, please, to page 13 of this report, so this is still the IMB 2020 report, I want to ask about what it says here about Adults at Risk, so the second paragraph under the heading "Adults at Risk" it says "These issues", so some issues from a previous report:  " were not resolved in 2020 and indeed were</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	does it?  A. It does happen. It has been a for the past 18 months, in between, obviously, the Covid and the outbreaks, et cetera, it has been sporadic, so  A lot of the time, they do inform them. Sometimes it is done by letter, sometimes by telephone, it is done by a mixture of medium of communications.  Q. And if you can do it face to face, then  A. If you can do it face to face, we will do it face to face.  Q. And sometimes the Home Office attend?  A. Yes.  Q. But, again, it wouldn't be the case worker, obviously,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. At the time did you agree with its contents insofar as you were able to?</li> <li>A. Yes, factually the information was correct.</li> <li>Q. Did you take any steps to endorse those concerns, so to tell the Home Office you agreed with them?</li> <li>A. No, no, I didn't.</li> <li>Q. Turning, please, to page 13 of this report, so this is still the IMB 2020 report, I want to ask about what it says here about Adults at Risk, so the second paragraph under the heading "Adults at Risk" it says "These issues", so some issues from a previous report:  " were not resolved in 2020 and indeed were arguably worsened with the large numbers of detainees</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	does it?  A. It does happen. It has been a for the past 18 months, in between, obviously, the Covid and the outbreaks, et cetera, it has been sporadic, so  A lot of the time, they do inform them. Sometimes it is done by letter, sometimes by telephone, it is done by a mixture of medium of communications.  Q. And if you can do it face to face, then  A. If you can do it face to face, we will do it face to face.  Q. And sometimes the Home Office attend?  A. Yes.  Q. But, again, it wouldn't be the case worker, obviously, it would be the representative?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. At the time did you agree with its contents insofar as you were able to?</li> <li>A. Yes, factually the information was correct.</li> <li>Q. Did you take any steps to endorse those concerns, so to tell the Home Office you agreed with them?</li> <li>A. No, no, I didn't.</li> <li>Q. Turning, please, to page 13 of this report, so this is still the IMB 2020 report, I want to ask about what it says here about Adults at Risk, so the second paragraph under the heading "Adults at Risk" it says "These issues", so some issues from a previous report:  " were not resolved in 2020 and indeed were arguably worsened with the large numbers of detainees with vulnerable mental health status on ACDTs and</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	does it?  A. It does happen. It has been a for the past 18 months, in between, obviously, the Covid and the outbreaks, et cetera, it has been sporadic, so  A lot of the time, they do inform them. Sometimes it is done by letter, sometimes by telephone, it is done by a mixture of medium of communications.  Q. And if you can do it face to face, then A. If you can do it face to face, we will do it face to face.  Q. And sometimes the Home Office attend?  A. Yes.  Q. But, again, it wouldn't be the case worker, obviously, it would be the DET, yes, the detainee engagement	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. At the time did you agree with its contents insofar as you were able to?</li> <li>A. Yes, factually the information was correct.</li> <li>Q. Did you take any steps to endorse those concerns, so to tell the Home Office you agreed with them?</li> <li>A. No, no, I didn't.</li> <li>Q. Turning, please, to page 13 of this report, so this is still the IMB 2020 report, I want to ask about what it says here about Adults at Risk, so the second paragraph under the heading "Adults at Risk" it says "These issues", so some issues from a previous report:  " were not resolved in 2020 and indeed were arguably worsened with the large numbers of detainees with vulnerable mental health status on ACDTs and self-harming but not all being added to the Adults at</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	does it?  A. It does happen. It has been a for the past 18 months, in between, obviously, the Covid and the outbreaks, et cetera, it has been sporadic, so  A lot of the time, they do inform them. Sometimes it is done by letter, sometimes by telephone, it is done by a mixture of medium of communications.  Q. And if you can do it face to face, then A. If you can do it face to face, we will do it face to face.  Q. And sometimes the Home Office attend?  A. Yes.  Q. But, again, it wouldn't be the case worker, obviously, it would be the representative?  A. It would be the DET, yes, the detainee engagement officer.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. At the time did you agree with its contents insofar as you were able to?</li> <li>A. Yes, factually the information was correct.</li> <li>Q. Did you take any steps to endorse those concerns, so to tell the Home Office you agreed with them?</li> <li>A. No, no, I didn't.</li> <li>Q. Turning, please, to page 13 of this report, so this is still the IMB 2020 report, I want to ask about what it says here about Adults at Risk, so the second paragraph under the heading "Adults at Risk" it says "These issues", so some issues from a previous report: <ul> <li>" were not resolved in 2020 and indeed were arguably worsened with the large numbers of detainees with vulnerable mental health status on ACDTs and self-harming but not all being added to the Adults at Risk log."</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	does it?  A. It does happen. It has been a for the past 18 months, in between, obviously, the Covid and the outbreaks, et cetera, it has been sporadic, so  A lot of the time, they do inform them. Sometimes it is done by letter, sometimes by telephone, it is done by a mixture of medium of communications.  Q. And if you can do it face to face, then  A. If you can do it face to face, we will do it face to face.  Q. And sometimes the Home Office attend?  A. Yes.  Q. But, again, it wouldn't be the case worker, obviously, it would be the representative?  A. It would be the DET, yes, the detainee engagement officer.  Q. On ACDTs, I know you don't do them yourselves, so tell	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. At the time did you agree with its contents insofar as you were able to?</li> <li>A. Yes, factually the information was correct.</li> <li>Q. Did you take any steps to endorse those concerns, so to tell the Home Office you agreed with them?</li> <li>A. No, no, I didn't.</li> <li>Q. Turning, please, to page 13 of this report, so this is still the IMB 2020 report, I want to ask about what it says here about Adults at Risk, so the second paragraph under the heading "Adults at Risk" it says "These issues", so some issues from a previous report:  " were not resolved in 2020 and indeed were arguably worsened with the large numbers of detainees with vulnerable mental health status on ACDTs and self-harming but not all being added to the Adults at Risk log."  Did you know at the time that this was not being</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	does it?  A. It does happen. It has been a for the past 18 months, in between, obviously, the Covid and the outbreaks, et cetera, it has been sporadic, so  A lot of the time, they do inform them. Sometimes it is done by letter, sometimes by telephone, it is done by a mixture of medium of communications.  Q. And if you can do it face to face, then  A. If you can do it face to face, we will do it face to face.  Q. And sometimes the Home Office attend?  A. Yes.  Q. But, again, it wouldn't be the case worker, obviously, it would be the PET, yes, the detainee engagement officer.  Q. On ACDTs, I know you don't do them yourselves, so tell me if you don't know, but do healthcare attend ACDT	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. At the time did you agree with its contents insofar as you were able to?</li> <li>A. Yes, factually the information was correct.</li> <li>Q. Did you take any steps to endorse those concerns, so to tell the Home Office you agreed with them?</li> <li>A. No, no, I didn't.</li> <li>Q. Turning, please, to page 13 of this report, so this is still the IMB 2020 report, I want to ask about what it says here about Adults at Risk, so the second paragraph under the heading "Adults at Risk" it says "These issues", so some issues from a previous report: <ul> <li>" were not resolved in 2020 and indeed were arguably worsened with the large numbers of detainees with vulnerable mental health status on ACDTs and self-harming but not all being added to the Adults at Risk log."</li> <li>Did you know at the time that this was not being done in the case of every detainee with vulnerable</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	does it?  A. It does happen. It has been a for the past 18 months, in between, obviously, the Covid and the outbreaks, et cetera, it has been sporadic, so  A lot of the time, they do inform them. Sometimes it is done by letter, sometimes by telephone, it is done by a mixture of medium of communications.  Q. And if you can do it face to face, then  A. If you can do it face to face, we will do it face to face.  Q. And sometimes the Home Office attend?  A. Yes.  Q. But, again, it wouldn't be the case worker, obviously, it would be the PET, yes, the detainee engagement officer.  Q. On ACDTs, I know you don't do them yourselves, so tell me if you don't know, but do healthcare attend ACDT reviews?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. At the time did you agree with its contents insofar as you were able to?</li> <li>A. Yes, factually the information was correct.</li> <li>Q. Did you take any steps to endorse those concerns, so to tell the Home Office you agreed with them?</li> <li>A. No, no, I didn't.</li> <li>Q. Turning, please, to page 13 of this report, so this is still the IMB 2020 report, I want to ask about what it says here about Adults at Risk, so the second paragraph under the heading "Adults at Risk" it says "These issues", so some issues from a previous report: <ul> <li>" were not resolved in 2020 and indeed were arguably worsened with the large numbers of detainees with vulnerable mental health status on ACDTs and self-harming but not all being added to the Adults at Risk log."</li> <li>Did you know at the time that this was not being done in the case of every detainee with vulnerable mental health status?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	does it?  A. It does happen. It has been a for the past 18 months, in between, obviously, the Covid and the outbreaks, et cetera, it has been sporadic, so  A lot of the time, they do inform them. Sometimes it is done by letter, sometimes by telephone, it is done by a mixture of medium of communications.  Q. And if you can do it face to face, then  A. If you can do it face to face, we will do it face to face.  Q. And sometimes the Home Office attend?  A. Yes.  Q. But, again, it wouldn't be the case worker, obviously, it would be the DET, yes, the detainee engagement officer.  Q. On ACDTs, I know you don't do them yourselves, so tell me if you don't know, but do healthcare attend ACDT reviews?  A. Yes, they do.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. At the time did you agree with its contents insofar as you were able to?  A. Yes, factually the information was correct.  Q. Did you take any steps to endorse those concerns, so to tell the Home Office you agreed with them?  A. No, no, I didn't.  Q. Turning, please, to page 13 of this report, so this is still the IMB 2020 report, I want to ask about what it says here about Adults at Risk, so the second paragraph under the heading "Adults at Risk" it says "These issues", so some issues from a previous report:  " were not resolved in 2020 and indeed were arguably worsened with the large numbers of detainees with vulnerable mental health status on ACDTs and self-harming but not all being added to the Adults at Risk log."  Did you know at the time that this was not being done in the case of every detainee with vulnerable mental health status?  A. No, I can't recall.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	does it?  A. It does happen. It has been a for the past 18 months, in between, obviously, the Covid and the outbreaks, et cetera, it has been sporadic, so  A lot of the time, they do inform them. Sometimes it is done by letter, sometimes by telephone, it is done by a mixture of medium of communications.  Q. And if you can do it face to face, then  A. If you can do it face to face, we will do it face to face.  Q. And sometimes the Home Office attend?  A. Yes.  Q. But, again, it wouldn't be the case worker, obviously, it would be the DET, yes, the detainee engagement officer.  Q. On ACDTs, I know you don't do them yourselves, so tell me if you don't know, but do healthcare attend ACDT reviews?  A. Yes, they do.  Q. I am asked to ask you about today's situation, so if you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. At the time did you agree with its contents insofar as you were able to?</li> <li>A. Yes, factually the information was correct.</li> <li>Q. Did you take any steps to endorse those concerns, so to tell the Home Office you agreed with them?</li> <li>A. No, no, I didn't.</li> <li>Q. Turning, please, to page 13 of this report, so this is still the IMB 2020 report, I want to ask about what it says here about Adults at Risk, so the second paragraph under the heading "Adults at Risk" it says "These issues", so some issues from a previous report: <ul> <li>" were not resolved in 2020 and indeed were arguably worsened with the large numbers of detainees with vulnerable mental health status on ACDTs and self-harming but not all being added to the Adults at Risk log."</li> <li>Did you know at the time that this was not being done in the case of every detainee with vulnerable mental health status?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. No, I can't recall.</li> <li>Q. When you read this report, did you then become aware of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	does it?  A. It does happen. It has been a for the past 18 months, in between, obviously, the Covid and the outbreaks, et cetera, it has been sporadic, so  A lot of the time, they do inform them. Sometimes it is done by letter, sometimes by telephone, it is done by a mixture of medium of communications.  Q. And if you can do it face to face, then  A. If you can do it face to face, we will do it face to face.  Q. And sometimes the Home Office attend?  A. Yes.  Q. But, again, it wouldn't be the case worker, obviously, it would be the PET, yes, the detainee engagement officer.  Q. On ACDTs, I know you don't do them yourselves, so tell me if you don't know, but do healthcare attend ACDT reviews?  A. Yes, they do.  Q. I am asked to ask you about today's situation, so if you can give us statistics about the number of people on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. At the time did you agree with its contents insofar as you were able to?</li> <li>A. Yes, factually the information was correct.</li> <li>Q. Did you take any steps to endorse those concerns, so to tell the Home Office you agreed with them?</li> <li>A. No, no, I didn't.</li> <li>Q. Turning, please, to page 13 of this report, so this is still the IMB 2020 report, I want to ask about what it says here about Adults at Risk, so the second paragraph under the heading "Adults at Risk" it says "These issues", so some issues from a previous report:  " were not resolved in 2020 and indeed were arguably worsened with the large numbers of detainees with vulnerable mental health status on ACDTs and self-harming but not all being added to the Adults at Risk log."  Did you know at the time that this was not being done in the case of every detainee with vulnerable mental health status?  A. No, I can't recall.</li> <li>Q. When you read this report, did you then become aware of it?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	does it?  A. It does happen. It has been a for the past 18 months, in between, obviously, the Covid and the outbreaks, et cetera, it has been sporadic, so  A lot of the time, they do inform them. Sometimes it is done by letter, sometimes by telephone, it is done by a mixture of medium of communications.  Q. And if you can do it face to face, then  A. If you can do it face to face, we will do it face to face.  Q. And sometimes the Home Office attend?  A. Yes.  Q. But, again, it wouldn't be the case worker, obviously, it would be the DET, yes, the detainee engagement officer.  Q. On ACDTs, I know you don't do them yourselves, so tell me if you don't know, but do healthcare attend ACDT reviews?  A. Yes, they do.  Q. I am asked to ask you about today's situation, so if you can give us statistics about the number of people on ACDTs today at Brook House?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. At the time did you agree with its contents insofar as you were able to?</li> <li>A. Yes, factually the information was correct.</li> <li>Q. Did you take any steps to endorse those concerns, so to tell the Home Office you agreed with them?</li> <li>A. No, no, I didn't.</li> <li>Q. Turning, please, to page 13 of this report, so this is still the IMB 2020 report, I want to ask about what it says here about Adults at Risk, so the second paragraph under the heading "Adults at Risk" it says "These issues", so some issues from a previous report:  " were not resolved in 2020 and indeed were arguably worsened with the large numbers of detainees with vulnerable mental health status on ACDTs and self-harming but not all being added to the Adults at Risk log."  Did you know at the time that this was not being done in the case of every detainee with vulnerable mental health status?</li> <li>A. No, I can't recall.</li> <li>Q. When you read this report, did you then become aware of it?</li> <li>A. When I read the report, yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	does it?  A. It does happen. It has been a for the past 18 months, in between, obviously, the Covid and the outbreaks, et cetera, it has been sporadic, so  A lot of the time, they do inform them. Sometimes it is done by letter, sometimes by telephone, it is done by a mixture of medium of communications.  Q. And if you can do it face to face, then  A. If you can do it face to face, we will do it face to face.  Q. And sometimes the Home Office attend?  A. Yes.  Q. But, again, it wouldn't be the case worker, obviously, it would be the PET, yes, the detainee engagement officer.  Q. On ACDTs, I know you don't do them yourselves, so tell me if you don't know, but do healthcare attend ACDT reviews?  A. Yes, they do.  Q. I am asked to ask you about today's situation, so if you can give us statistics about the number of people on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. At the time did you agree with its contents insofar as you were able to?</li> <li>A. Yes, factually the information was correct.</li> <li>Q. Did you take any steps to endorse those concerns, so to tell the Home Office you agreed with them?</li> <li>A. No, no, I didn't.</li> <li>Q. Turning, please, to page 13 of this report, so this is still the IMB 2020 report, I want to ask about what it says here about Adults at Risk, so the second paragraph under the heading "Adults at Risk" it says "These issues", so some issues from a previous report:  " were not resolved in 2020 and indeed were arguably worsened with the large numbers of detainees with vulnerable mental health status on ACDTs and self-harming but not all being added to the Adults at Risk log."  Did you know at the time that this was not being done in the case of every detainee with vulnerable mental health status?  A. No, I can't recall.</li> <li>Q. When you read this report, did you then become aware of it?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	does it?  A. It does happen. It has been a for the past 18 months, in between, obviously, the Covid and the outbreaks, et cetera, it has been sporadic, so  A lot of the time, they do inform them. Sometimes it is done by letter, sometimes by telephone, it is done by a mixture of medium of communications.  Q. And if you can do it face to face, then  A. If you can do it face to face, we will do it face to face.  Q. And sometimes the Home Office attend?  A. Yes.  Q. But, again, it wouldn't be the case worker, obviously, it would be the DET, yes, the detainee engagement officer.  Q. On ACDTs, I know you don't do them yourselves, so tell me if you don't know, but do healthcare attend ACDT reviews?  A. Yes, they do.  Q. I am asked to ask you about today's situation, so if you can give us statistics about the number of people on ACDTs today at Brook House?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. At the time did you agree with its contents insofar as you were able to?</li> <li>A. Yes, factually the information was correct.</li> <li>Q. Did you take any steps to endorse those concerns, so to tell the Home Office you agreed with them?</li> <li>A. No, no, I didn't.</li> <li>Q. Turning, please, to page 13 of this report, so this is still the IMB 2020 report, I want to ask about what it says here about Adults at Risk, so the second paragraph under the heading "Adults at Risk" it says "These issues", so some issues from a previous report:  " were not resolved in 2020 and indeed were arguably worsened with the large numbers of detainees with vulnerable mental health status on ACDTs and self-harming but not all being added to the Adults at Risk log."  Did you know at the time that this was not being done in the case of every detainee with vulnerable mental health status?</li> <li>A. No, I can't recall.</li> <li>Q. When you read this report, did you then become aware of it?</li> <li>A. When I read the report, yes.</li> </ul>

1	people on the log are added to the Adults at Risk log?	1	Q. And release should have been considered if the
2	A. Well, I don't manage from an Adults at Risk	2	requirements were met. So are you able to help us with
3	perspective on the levels, 1, 2 and 3, that is managed	3	why the safeguards of Adults at Risk and rule 35 were
4	by the Home Office so I don't set those levels, it's	4	not necessarily being employed or being employed
5	something the Home Office and the case workers	5	properly to lead to that decision to release or not
6	Q. It is an issue though, isn't it, that people get placed	6	release?
7	on ACDTs, which is something that's managed by Serco	7	A. I can't assist with that because it would be answered by
8	staff?	8	the Home Office why they're not complying with some of
9	A. Yes, it is managed by us, yes.	9	it.
10	Q. And then they need to be added to the log?	10	Q. You state at 101, I don't need that on screen anymore
11	A. Yes.	11	you state in your statement at 101, you said similar to
12	Q. So how does Serco make sure that	12	us just now, that you "supported those individuals in
13	A. We share that detail by a note to the Home Office and to	13	line with resources available to us and to the best of
14	the case worker.	14	our ability" and you have told us that you kept them as
15	Q. So the Home Office knows that they are on ACDT?	15	safe as you could.
16	A. Yes.	16	The resources available to you though and the best
17	Q. And that therefore they should be added to the log?	17	of your ability were not enough to keep them safe, were
18	A. Yes, we don't manage the log.	18	they, if we look at the levels of self-harm for example?
19	Q. Is that detail shared by way of a part C?	19	A. Well, we'll follow process with ACDT in supporting that,
20	A. It is, yes.	20	when we talk about process and the fact that everyone is
21	Q. Finally on that page, rule 35 claims, you said that	21	supported, yes, high level of self-harm, but everyone
22	rule 35 by way of process is for healthcare and	22	was supported from a social work perspective, from
23	Home Office?	23	a healthcare perspective and in that manner
24	A. Yes.	24	Q. So processes sorry, go on.
25	Q. But were you aware that the increase in rule 35 claims	25	A. We follow process basically, yes.
	D 447		D 440
	Page 117		Page 119
1	for a while here overwhelmed the capacity for	1	Q. Processes were all followed, appropriately?
2	appointments such that there was a 21-day waiting list	2	A. Yes, yes, and care.
3	and a back log of 60 people?	3	Q. And care, and you did the best that you could. And so
4	A. Only by I have a monthly meeting with the healthcare	4	did
5	provider and on that day obviously a level of detail was	5	A. In a very difficult situation, I might add, yes.
6	shared at the meeting, so I was aware of the concerns	6	Q. And yet there were these levels of self-harm?
7	over that.	7	A. Yes.
8	Q. Did you do anything about that?	8	Q. In terms of improving detainee welfare at Brook House,
9	A. No, not at that point in time because it were being	9	your statement has some focus on increasing staffing
10	addressed with addressing trying to bring additional	10	levels and how that is, I think from what you have said,
11	doctors in, so I was given assurance that they were	11	a key factor in improving welfare, is that fair?
12	addressing the issues at that point in time.	12	A. Yes.
13	Q. And Serco doesn't contract, does it, with healthcare or	13	Q. But you would agree, wouldn't you that even increased
14	with the doctors?	14	staffing levels in 2020 couldn't alleviate all of the
15	A. None at all, no.	15	pressures that were placed on the centre?
16	Q. They separately contract?	16	A. I think we managed the situation, managed the concerns,
17	A. Yes, it's commissioned by NHS England.	17	managed the self-harm rises and the use of force to
18	Q. This though, rule 35, and Adults at Risk are the roots	18	control the self-harm at that point in time, with the
19	by which the very vulnerable people might be released by	19	resource that we had.
20	the Home Office, although of course the decision is for	20	At that point in time, this were a time we'd
21	the Home Office?	21	obviously taken over the contract in May 2020, and we
22	A. Yes.	22	were still bringing in new staff, training new staff,
23	Q. And you would agree from what you said that they were	23	part of the transformation of the contract and ramp up
24	vulnerable people?	24	of the staffing as well. So, yes, it was a difficult
25	A. Yes.	25	period, I'll say that on record. A very difficult
	Daga 118		Page 120
	Page 118		Page 120
			30 (Pages 117 to 120)

1	period for everybody involved. Not only all the staff	1	41, an officer can use force which is necessary and
2	and the managers at that point in time but, as I say,	2	proportionate in the circumstances and one is to prevent
3	I were immensely proud of the work they did.	3	self-harm.
4	Q. I suppose the simple question is: just more staff cannot	4	That is to prevent people hurting themselves.
5	be the only response?	5	Q. And can I ask for <lib000176> to be shown, please.</lib000176>
6	A. No, no, it's not a	6	This is a Serco use of force presentation
7	Q. Even, I think, at the time there was quite a low	7	from November 2020.
8	population compared to the capacity?	8	So towards the end of that period. If we go to
9	A. There was, yes.	9	page 2, please, it says there at the top:
10	Q. How else can detainee welfare be ensured if more staff	10	"Charter flights continue to be going well and the
11	is not the answer? The processes you have described of	11	main focus of business."
12	course?	12	In what sense were they going well?
13	A. The processes and the culture, that we care and support	13	A. In the sense that we were managing the process. I mean,
14	our residents. Unfortunately I you know, I don't	14	part of our contract is to present people to perform
15	dictate the policy in it is done by government and	15	a removal and that is the part of the business that
16	Home Office on who is brought to us within the centre.	16	was we were managing and supporting them.
17	Our role is quite distinct in that we're caring,	17	Q. The penultimate bullet point there says:
18	advising and supporting people.	18	"The level of self-harm in November remained high.
19	Q. You don't control the policy that leads to people coming	19	This resulted in force being used on 14 occasions out of
20	in?	20	26."
21	A. Correct.	21	We see on the next slide, reflecting what you have
22	Q. And you also cannot control the decisions on whether or	22	told us, force was used 26 times at Brook House and 14
23	not to release them?	23	of those were to prevent self-harm.
24	A. That's correct.	24	A. To prevent harm, yes.
25	Q. But you can, I suppose, have some control, within	25	Q. If we flip to page 18, we see the third heading there
	Page 121		Page 123
			<u> </u>
1	Brook House there could be some control over allowing	1	the 3 in 3 use of force system which you have already
2	them to get to the point where their release is	2	told us about?
3	considered?	3	A. Yes, correct.
4	A. Yes.	4	Q. So you thank someone for setting it up and you note that
5	Q. I think you have just alluded to it as well, along with	5	36 out of 36 3 in 3s have been completed. And then the
6	the IMB 2020 report and letter, we have asked you about	6	next slide, obviously all the names of staff have been
7	another document that raises concern about Brook House	7	redacted, but it tells you how many people had been
8	both in 2020 and 2021, which is an article in The	8	involved: planned, spontaneous, grand total, and then it
9	Observer that referred to the use of force and	9	says "status "Y". What does that mean? Do you know?
10	dispensation that you have just mentioned?	10	You may not have made this table.
11	A. Yes.  O. This was an artisla published on Paying Day 2021 in The	11 12	A. I think that's stated: is completed.
12	Q. This was an article published on Boxing Day 2021 in The Observer entitled "Suicidal asylum seekers subjected to	13	<ul><li>Q. So there 3 in 3 processes have happened?</li><li>A. It is completed, yes.</li></ul>
13 14	'dangerous' use of force by guards at detention centre"	13	A. It is completed, yes.     Q. I appreciate I am asking you about a table that I don't
15	and you comment on that in your statement. Do you	15	know whether or not you completed so it may just be
16	remember if you read it at the time?	16	a guess.
17	A. I think I did. It was shared with me from a Serco	17	a guess.  The last slide, 20, I will read it:
18	perspective, yes.	18	"Over the month of November we have seen a recurring
19	Q. It is based on some 180 documents obtained by The	19	problem with prevention of self-harm which has been the
20	Observer and by Liberty Investigates and it notes	20	biggest issue we have faced since August 2020 and I can
21	an uptick in the use of force around the charter	21	project this will be the biggest mitigation for use of
22	programme. In brief, why was there an increased use of	22	force while we're running rolling charter operation."
23	force that went with that?	23	What does mitigation mean there?
24	A. In brief, there was use of force because there was	24	A. I think it is just a justification of the high rising
25	a rise in self-harm and, as per detention centre rule	25	force more than anything, I think that is what the
	, , p		
	Page 122		Page 124
			31 (Pages 121 to 124)

1	intention of that word is.	1	used on planned use of force but they could use
2	Q. So the biggest reason for use of force, in other words?	2	spontaneous force and still do their role. That were
3	A. The biggest reason, yes.	3	part of the dispensation.
4	Q. And the IMB found that use of force had doubled from	4	Q. So only people who were out of ticket could be used in
5	what it was in 2019 and 2018, with about 17 per cent of	5	unplanned use of force, you wouldn't use them for
6	detained people subjected to force in each month in	6	a planned event? They wouldn't be used for a planned
7	2020, compared with about 7 or 8 per cent in 2019 and	7	event?
8	2018.	8	A. That's correct.
9	So there is the correlation with the increased use	9	Q. Being used in unplanned events, they are more reactive
10	of force, with higher levels of self-harm and suicidal	10	and unpredictable events though, aren't they?
11	attempts.	11	A. Correct, yes.
12	A. Yes.	12	Q. Was there a concern about that?
13	Q. And this reflected, didn't it, the change in the	13	A. No, no concern about it.
14	detainee profile?	14	Q. Did you consider or do you consider now that the
15	A. Correct.	15	deployment of officers out of ticket to these incidents,
16	Q. So the people who arrived on small boats, mainly asylum	16	unplanned incidents, might have presented a risk of the
17	seekers, as you have said, and therefore increased	17	misuse of force against these vulnerable detainees?
18	vulnerable detainees?	18	A. No, no. I had no risk whatsoever. We caught up
19	A. Yes.	19	straight away afterwards, from August-wise, so
20	Q. Did you raise specifically the concern about the	20	I think by Christmas we were back up to about 96,
21	increased use of force with the Home Office?	21	98 per cent compliance on all our staff training use of
22	A. Yes, it were discussed at every meeting to be honest.	22	force. The only percentage were people who were off
23	Q. In the same meetings that we have already referred to?	23	maternity or long term absence.
24	A. Yes.	24	Q. So you think there was no risk. What is the point then
25	Q. We can take that down now, thank you. A key matter	25	in having refresher training at all?
	D 405		D 407
	Page 125		Page 127
1	discussed in the article was the fact that officers at	1	A. The point in refresher training is to make sure that
2	Brook House were working while out of ticket, so they	2	people are up to date and up to date with any new
3	didn't have update up-to-date use of force training. So	3	changes. I am not aware of any new changes or anything.
4	I understand use of force training is done before you	4	Staff would not be deployed on any planned use of
5	join, before you can start?	5	force if they were out of the term used out of
6	A. Yes.	6	ticket.
7	Q. And then every year there's a refresher course?	7	Q. Do you consider then that you only need to update
8	A. Every 12 months a full refresher, yes.	8	people's use of force training if there has been
9	Q. And the purpose is of course to keep skills and	9	a change in use of force policy?
10	knowledge up to date?	10	A. No, it is mandatory every 12 months.
11	A. Correct.	11	Q. More generally then on the use of force, have you read
12	Q. And ultimately, I assume, to ensure that force is used	12	the three reports of Mr Collier, the use of force expert
13	in a safe and lawful way?	13	to the inquiry?
14	A. Yes.	14	A. Yes, I have seen a number of recommendations from
15	Q. You received a dispensation to use officers who didn't	15	Mr Collier, yes.
16	have the updated training?	16	Q. Have you read the full reports or just the
17	A. That's right, yes, correct. That were a national	17	recommendations?
		17 18	recommendations?  A. Just the recommendations.
17	A. That's right, yes, correct. That were a national		
17 18	A. That's right, yes, correct. That were a national dispensation across all IRCs, it wasn't just specific to	18	A. Just the recommendations.
17 18 19	A. That's right, yes, correct. That were a national dispensation across all IRCs, it wasn't just specific to Gatwick and in was relation to Covid.  Q. Did you seek it then or was it granted to all IRCs?	18 19	A. Just the recommendations.  Q. That is what I am going to ask you about.
17 18 19 20	A. That's right, yes, correct. That were a national dispensation across all IRCs, it wasn't just specific to Gatwick and in was relation to Covid.	18 19 20	A. Just the recommendations.     Q. That is what I am going to ask you about.     Did you see his live evidence on Wednesday this
17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. That's right, yes, correct. That were a national dispensation across all IRCs, it wasn't just specific to Gatwick and in was relation to Covid.</li> <li>Q. Did you seek it then or was it granted to all IRCs?</li> <li>A. It was granted across all IRCs and at that point in time</li> </ul>	18 19 20 21	A. Just the recommendations.  Q. That is what I am going to ask you about.  Did you see his live evidence on Wednesday this week?
17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. That's right, yes, correct. That were a national dispensation across all IRCs, it wasn't just specific to Gatwick and in was relation to Covid.</li> <li>Q. Did you seek it then or was it granted to all IRCs?</li> <li>A. It was granted across all IRCs and at that point in time we resumed our force, use of force training</li> </ul>	18 19 20 21 22	<ul><li>A. Just the recommendations.</li><li>Q. That is what I am going to ask you about.</li><li>Did you see his live evidence on Wednesday this week?</li><li>A. No.</li></ul>
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. That's right, yes, correct. That were a national dispensation across all IRCs, it wasn't just specific to Gatwick and in was relation to Covid.</li> <li>Q. Did you seek it then or was it granted to all IRCs?</li> <li>A. It was granted across all IRCs and at that point in time we resumed our force, use of force training in August 2020, and caught up all our people that were</li> </ul>	18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. Just the recommendations.</li> <li>Q. That is what I am going to ask you about.</li> <li>Did you see his live evidence on Wednesday this week?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. I can tell you what he said to the inquiry. Is there</li> </ul>
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. That's right, yes, correct. That were a national dispensation across all IRCs, it wasn't just specific to Gatwick and in was relation to Covid.</li> <li>Q. Did you seek it then or was it granted to all IRCs?</li> <li>A. It was granted across all IRCs and at that point in time we resumed our force, use of force training in August 2020, and caught up all our people that were out of date or out of the the term is out of ticket. Even though they were out of ticket they could not be</li> </ul>	18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. Just the recommendations.</li> <li>Q. That is what I am going to ask you about.     Did you see his live evidence on Wednesday this week?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. I can tell you what he said to the inquiry. Is there any reason why you didn't watch Mr Collier's live evidence?</li> </ul>
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. That's right, yes, correct. That were a national dispensation across all IRCs, it wasn't just specific to Gatwick and in was relation to Covid.</li> <li>Q. Did you seek it then or was it granted to all IRCs?</li> <li>A. It was granted across all IRCs and at that point in time we resumed our force, use of force training in August 2020, and caught up all our people that were out of date or out of the the term is out of ticket.</li> </ul>	18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. Just the recommendations.</li> <li>Q. That is what I am going to ask you about.</li> <li>Did you see his live evidence on Wednesday this week?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. I can tell you what he said to the inquiry. Is there any reason why you didn't watch Mr Collier's live</li> </ul>

1	A. Because I were busy in meetings at — in my operation,	1	A. Not particularly, but, I mean, there these aspects of
2	unfortunately. I would love to have watched it but	2	the training, even on the initial training and the
3	I didn't have the capacity.	3	one-day refresher, a percentage of that covers
4	Q. Do you intend to catch up on it?	4	medical a medical presentation, shall I say. And it
5	A. Yes. Yes.	5	talks about a little bit about mental illness and
6	Q. Obviously he wasn't asked to comment on any incidents	6	concerns around that, and part of the other is a lot
7	which occurred during your time at Brook House	7	around inter-personal skills and managing conflict
8	A. Yes, it's all in the relevant period, I believe, is it?	8	resolution as well, that is part of the syllabus of the
9	Q. All while Serco ran the centre, but I understand from	9	day.
10	others, including Mr Haughton, that other staff he	10	Q. So there is a medical element?
11	mentioned he had read the report and the recommendations	11	A. Yes.
12	as well. I want to ask you first about training, so	12	Q. Is it delivered by anyone with clinical expertise?
13	Mr Connolly, you will be aware, was dismissed by G4S in	13	A. It is delivered by a doctor. The medical element is
14	2017, you may be aware, and he was	14	a pre-loaded video that has been probably not updated
15	A. I don't know who Mr Connolly is, sorry.	15	for three or four years to the best of my knowledge,
16	Q. He was a person who was dismissed after Panorama and he	16	Dr Ian Maconochie his name is and he presents that and
17	was seen using the N word about a detainee, which he	17	before every use of force refresher you have to watch
18	accepted when he gave evidence to the inquiry.	18	his video and it talks about the medical aspects and
19	A. Okay.	19	asphyxiation et cetera and that part of it, so it's
20	Q. And he was formally a use of force instructor at	20	a medical video.
21	Brook House.	21	Q. Mr Collier has recommended that all DCMs have incident
22	A. Right.	22	scene management training before taking up the post,
23	Q. It is necessary, isn't it, as a general principle, to	23	which would focus on scene control and defensible
24	ensure that the appropriate people are involved in use	24	decision-making using the model within the use of force
25	of force from the top down, so from training down to the	25	training manual along with negotiation skills and staff
	Page 129		Page 131
1	manla who community but the force?	1	management. This is his recommendation number 1
1	people who carry out the force?	2	management. This is his recommendation number 1.
2 3	A. Yes.  Q. And that training is adequate.	3	A. Yes, and all my staff, all my DOMs now, or new appointed
4	Mr Collier recommends internal and external quality	4	DOMs as well, have all gone through scene bronze
5	assurance of locally delivered training in the use of	5	training and gone through that process delivered by an external provider accredited up to the Prison Service
6	force, including peer observations and independent	6	as well.
7	external body observations of training.	7	Q. Is that before they can start working as a DOM?
8	Is this done at the moment?	8	A. Not before they can start working but they've all gone
9	A. It is done at the moment, yes.	9	through it and unless we've refreshed new DOMs et cetera
10	Q. In what way is that done?	10	that would be the next role or part of it as well.
11	A. So all our trainers, SENAR(?) trainers, who deliver our	11	Q. So refreshing the people who are already in post?
	23. So an our trainers, SELVAIN(.) trainers, who denvel our		2. So remeating the people who are already in post:
12	un-skilling and refreshers, they go for an annual	1 12	A. Ves. ves.
12 13	up-skilling and refreshers, they go for an annual revalidation with the Prison Service or HMPPS and	12	A. Yes, yes.  O. As I mentioned within that training and negotiation
13	revalidation with the Prison Service or HMPPS and	13	Q. As I mentioned within that training and negotiation,
13 14	revalidation with the Prison Service or HMPPS and externally we have the part of the Home Office, they	13 14	Q. As I mentioned within that training and negotiation, this is further developed at recommendation number 10,
13 14 15	revalidation with the Prison Service or HMPPS and externally we have the part of the Home Office, they come and view our delivery of training as well, so they	13 14 15	Q. As I mentioned within that training and negotiation, this is further developed at recommendation number 10, where Mr Collier says in his view Brook House should
13 14 15 16	revalidation with the Prison Service or HMPPS and externally we have the part of the Home Office, they come and view our delivery of training as well, so they have a use of force expert in the Home Office who will	13 14 15 16	Q. As I mentioned within that training and negotiation, this is further developed at recommendation number 10, where Mr Collier says in his view Brook House should have trained negotiators to assist with the resolution
13 14 15 16 17	revalidation with the Prison Service or HMPPS and externally we have the part of the Home Office, they come and view our delivery of training as well, so they have a use of force expert in the Home Office who will come and revalidate and do observations on our training	13 14 15 16 17	Q. As I mentioned within that training and negotiation, this is further developed at recommendation number 10, where Mr Collier says in his view Brook House should have trained negotiators to assist with the resolution of serious incidents who are available 24/7 on a rota.
13 14 15 16 17 18	revalidation with the Prison Service or HMPPS and externally we have the part of the Home Office, they come and view our delivery of training as well, so they have a use of force expert in the Home Office who will come and revalidate and do observations on our training delivery as well.	13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. As I mentioned within that training and negotiation, this is further developed at recommendation number 10, where Mr Collier says in his view Brook House should have trained negotiators to assist with the resolution of serious incidents who are available 24/7 on a rota. He said they should be deployed before resorting to use
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	revalidation with the Prison Service or HMPPS and externally we have the part of the Home Office, they come and view our delivery of training as well, so they have a use of force expert in the Home Office who will come and revalidate and do observations on our training delivery as well.  Q. So the Home Office person who comes is the independent	13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. As I mentioned within that training and negotiation, this is further developed at recommendation number 10, where Mr Collier says in his view Brook House should have trained negotiators to assist with the resolution of serious incidents who are available 24/7 on a rota.
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	revalidation with the Prison Service or HMPPS and externally we have the part of the Home Office, they come and view our delivery of training as well, so they have a use of force expert in the Home Office who will come and revalidate and do observations on our training delivery as well.  Q. So the Home Office person who comes is the independent external body?	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. As I mentioned within that training and negotiation, this is further developed at recommendation number 10, where Mr Collier says in his view Brook House should have trained negotiators to assist with the resolution of serious incidents who are available 24/7 on a rota. He said they should be deployed before resorting to use of force unless there is an imminent risk that requires
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	revalidation with the Prison Service or HMPPS and externally we have the part of the Home Office, they come and view our delivery of training as well, so they have a use of force expert in the Home Office who will come and revalidate and do observations on our training delivery as well.  Q. So the Home Office person who comes is the independent external body?  A. Yes.	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. As I mentioned within that training and negotiation, this is further developed at recommendation number 10, where Mr Collier says in his view Brook House should have trained negotiators to assist with the resolution of serious incidents who are available 24/7 on a rota. He said they should be deployed before resorting to use of force unless there is an imminent risk that requires   A. Yes, that's completed. We have 22, I think, trained
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	revalidation with the Prison Service or HMPPS and externally we have the part of the Home Office, they come and view our delivery of training as well, so they have a use of force expert in the Home Office who will come and revalidate and do observations on our training delivery as well.  Q. So the Home Office person who comes is the independent external body?  A. Yes.  Q. Then the training itself, I don't understand that it	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. As I mentioned within that training and negotiation, this is further developed at recommendation number 10, where Mr Collier says in his view Brook House should have trained negotiators to assist with the resolution of serious incidents who are available 24/7 on a rota. He said they should be deployed before resorting to use of force unless there is an imminent risk that requires   A. Yes, that's completed. We have 22, I think, trained hostage negotiators within the contract, all trained by
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	revalidation with the Prison Service or HMPPS and externally we have the part of the Home Office, they come and view our delivery of training as well, so they have a use of force expert in the Home Office who will come and revalidate and do observations on our training delivery as well.  Q. So the Home Office person who comes is the independent external body?  A. Yes.  Q. Then the training itself, I don't understand that it covers specific guidance on the use of force in the	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. As I mentioned within that training and negotiation, this is further developed at recommendation number 10, where Mr Collier says in his view Brook House should have trained negotiators to assist with the resolution of serious incidents who are available 24/7 on a rota. He said they should be deployed before resorting to use of force unless there is an imminent risk that requires   A. Yes, that's completed. We have 22, I think, trained hostage negotiators within the contract, all trained by HMPPS.
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	revalidation with the Prison Service or HMPPS and externally we have the part of the Home Office, they come and view our delivery of training as well, so they have a use of force expert in the Home Office who will come and revalidate and do observations on our training delivery as well.  Q. So the Home Office person who comes is the independent external body?  A. Yes.  Q. Then the training itself, I don't understand that it covers specific guidance on the use of force in the context of detainees with mental illness or, for	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. As I mentioned within that training and negotiation, this is further developed at recommendation number 10, where Mr Collier says in his view Brook House should have trained negotiators to assist with the resolution of serious incidents who are available 24/7 on a rota. He said they should be deployed before resorting to use of force unless there is an imminent risk that requires</li> <li>A. Yes, that's completed. We have 22, I think, trained hostage negotiators within the contract, all trained by HMPPS.</li> <li>Q. Is there one there 24/7 on a rota basis?</li> </ul>
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	revalidation with the Prison Service or HMPPS and externally we have the part of the Home Office, they come and view our delivery of training as well, so they have a use of force expert in the Home Office who will come and revalidate and do observations on our training delivery as well.  Q. So the Home Office person who comes is the independent external body?  A. Yes.  Q. Then the training itself, I don't understand that it covers specific guidance on the use of force in the	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. As I mentioned within that training and negotiation, this is further developed at recommendation number 10, where Mr Collier says in his view Brook House should have trained negotiators to assist with the resolution of serious incidents who are available 24/7 on a rota. He said they should be deployed before resorting to use of force unless there is an imminent risk that requires   A. Yes, that's completed. We have 22, I think, trained hostage negotiators within the contract, all trained by HMPPS.
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	revalidation with the Prison Service or HMPPS and externally we have the part of the Home Office, they come and view our delivery of training as well, so they have a use of force expert in the Home Office who will come and revalidate and do observations on our training delivery as well.  Q. So the Home Office person who comes is the independent external body?  A. Yes.  Q. Then the training itself, I don't understand that it covers specific guidance on the use of force in the context of detainees with mental illness or, for	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. As I mentioned within that training and negotiation, this is further developed at recommendation number 10, where Mr Collier says in his view Brook House should have trained negotiators to assist with the resolution of serious incidents who are available 24/7 on a rota. He said they should be deployed before resorting to use of force unless there is an imminent risk that requires</li> <li>A. Yes, that's completed. We have 22, I think, trained hostage negotiators within the contract, all trained by HMPPS.</li> <li>Q. Is there one there 24/7 on a rota basis?</li> </ul>

1	24 hours but they're on shift basis.	1	review it, and review the footage, CCTV and body-worn
2	Q. Sorry, did you say they are trained by HMPPS?	2	video as well.
3	A. That's correct, so a recognised training provider, yes.	3	Q. When would healthcare be required?
4	Q. When did that come in?	4	A. If there is any concern, they would be part of it, yes.
5	A. I've had a number of staff that have recently been for	5	Q. If there was an injury?
6	training, it has been in place a number of years but we	6	A. Yes. We irrespective of that, any use of force will
7	are talking particularly about hostage negotiator	7	be what they call a 2123 form completed by healthcare
8	training, that is what I am talking about.	8	and submitted as part of the pack.
9	Q. Hostage negotiator training, is that just for when	9	Q. That is injury to detainee form?
10	somebody is taken hostage?	10	A. Correct.
11	A. Yes.	11	Q. Would a healthcare representative also attend the review
12	Q. What about negotiations, as Mr Collier recommends it,	12	if there was potentially an underlying mental health
13	who assist with serious incidents before force is used	13	problem with a detainee even if they were not injured?
14	more generally, so negotiations against someone who's	14	A. Yes, I mean, separately we may have a separate case
15	maybe	15	review or MDT, multidisciplinary team, meeting on that
16	A. Other than specifically on the refresher training, there	16	aspect.
17	is a conflict resolution, there is that part of	17	Q. I understand you have set up also a use of force review
18	negotiation, but there is no other particular thing	18	committee which meets monthly?
19	that's delivered package-wise other than the refresher	19	A. Correct.
20	at this point in time.	20	Q. Chaired by the assistant director of security?
21	Q. You don't understand there to be an available different	21	A. Yes.
22	type of negotiation training?	22	Q. Who is that at the moment?
23	A. Not that I am aware of, no.	23	A. Well, it is currently chaired by the assistant director
24	Q. Still on training, Mr Collier recommends that local use	24	of operations, use of force comes under, which currently
25	of force training should include a scenario-based	25	is Steve Skitt.
	Page 133		Page 135
	1 agc 133		1 age 133
1	element which is regularly reviewed and focuses on real	1	Q. Mr Skitt, is currently operations?
_			
2	incidents and is designed to cascade good practice and	2	A. Yes.
3	incidents and is designed to cascade good practice and identify potential issues. Is a scenario-based	2 3	<ul><li>A. Yes.</li><li>Q. Mr Collier recommends that a detainee representative</li></ul>
3	identify potential issues. Is a scenario-based	3	Q. Mr Collier recommends that a detainee representative
3 4	identify potential issues. Is a scenario-based real-incident-based training used?	3 4	Q. Mr Collier recommends that a detainee representative should be included and he said on Wednesday:
3 4 5	identify potential issues. Is a scenario-based real-incident-based training used?  A. Yes, as part of the full five day initial C&R course	3 4 5	<ul><li>Q. Mr Collier recommends that a detainee representative should be included and he said on Wednesday:</li><li>"I think provides transparency, I think it allows</li></ul>
3 4 5 6	identify potential issues. Is a scenario-based real-incident-based training used?  A. Yes, as part of the full five day initial C&R course there is a full scenario-based training element. I was	3 4 5 6	<ul><li>Q. Mr Collier recommends that a detainee representative should be included and he said on Wednesday:</li><li>"I think provides transparency, I think it allows the detainee group to have knowledge of how incidents</li></ul>
3 4 5 6 7	identify potential issues. Is a scenario-based real-incident-based training used?  A. Yes, as part of the full five day initial C&R course there is a full scenario-based training element. I was a little confused with that recommendation because	3 4 5 6 7	Q. Mr Collier recommends that a detainee representative should be included and he said on Wednesday:  "I think provides transparency, I think it allows the detainee group to have knowledge of how incidents are reviewed, that if force is used against them, that
3 4 5 6 7 8	identify potential issues. Is a scenario-based real-incident-based training used?  A. Yes, as part of the full five day initial C&R course there is a full scenario-based training element. I was a little confused with that recommendation because I know there is one.	3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. Mr Collier recommends that a detainee representative should be included and he said on Wednesday:  "I think provides transparency, I think it allows the detainee group to have knowledge of how incidents are reviewed, that if force is used against them, that it is properly scrutinised, that if is any inappropriate
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	identify potential issues. Is a scenario-based real-incident-based training used?  A. Yes, as part of the full five day initial C&R course there is a full scenario-based training element. I was a little confused with that recommendation because I know there is one.  Q. Does that look at real incidents that have happened in	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. Mr Collier recommends that a detainee representative should be included and he said on Wednesday:  "I think provides transparency, I think it allows the detainee group to have knowledge of how incidents are reviewed, that if force is used against them, that it is properly scrutinised, that if is any inappropriate actions or anything that's come out of it, it's being
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	identify potential issues. Is a scenario-based real-incident-based training used?  A. Yes, as part of the full five day initial C&R course there is a full scenario-based training element. I was a little confused with that recommendation because I know there is one.  Q. Does that look at real incidents that have happened in Brook House and how they could be appropriately managed?	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. Mr Collier recommends that a detainee representative should be included and he said on Wednesday:  "I think provides transparency, I think it allows the detainee group to have knowledge of how incidents are reviewed, that if force is used against them, that it is properly scrutinised, that if is any inappropriate actions or anything that's come out of it, it's being addressed at the correct level."
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	identify potential issues. Is a scenario-based real-incident-based training used?  A. Yes, as part of the full five day initial C&R course there is a full scenario-based training element. I was a little confused with that recommendation because I know there is one.  Q. Does that look at real incidents that have happened in Brook House and how they could be appropriately managed?  A. No, they're just scenario-based incidents that could	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. Mr Collier recommends that a detainee representative should be included and he said on Wednesday:  "I think provides transparency, I think it allows the detainee group to have knowledge of how incidents are reviewed, that if force is used against them, that it is properly scrutinised, that if is any inappropriate actions or anything that's come out of it, it's being addressed at the correct level."  What is your view on that?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	identify potential issues. Is a scenario-based real-incident-based training used?  A. Yes, as part of the full five day initial C&R course there is a full scenario-based training element. I was a little confused with that recommendation because I know there is one.  Q. Does that look at real incidents that have happened in Brook House and how they could be appropriately managed?  A. No, they're just scenario-based incidents that could happen.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. Mr Collier recommends that a detainee representative should be included and he said on Wednesday:  "I think provides transparency, I think it allows the detainee group to have knowledge of how incidents are reviewed, that if force is used against them, that it is properly scrutinised, that if is any inappropriate actions or anything that's come out of it, it's being addressed at the correct level."  What is your view on that?  A. In some cases there may be an advantage but there is not
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	identify potential issues. Is a scenario-based real-incident-based training used?  A. Yes, as part of the full five day initial C&R course there is a full scenario-based training element. I was a little confused with that recommendation because I know there is one.  Q. Does that look at real incidents that have happened in Brook House and how they could be appropriately managed?  A. No, they're just scenario-based incidents that could happen.  Q. Does it look at real incidents or just scenarios?	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. Mr Collier recommends that a detainee representative should be included and he said on Wednesday:  "I think provides transparency, I think it allows the detainee group to have knowledge of how incidents are reviewed, that if force is used against them, that it is properly scrutinised, that if is any inappropriate actions or anything that's come out of it, it's being addressed at the correct level."  What is your view on that?  A. In some cases there may be an advantage but there is not always the ability to allow them to attend a meeting of
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	identify potential issues. Is a scenario-based real-incident-based training used?  A. Yes, as part of the full five day initial C&R course there is a full scenario-based training element. I was a little confused with that recommendation because I know there is one.  Q. Does that look at real incidents that have happened in Brook House and how they could be appropriately managed?  A. No, they're just scenario-based incidents that could happen.  Q. Does it look at real incidents or just scenarios?  A. No, it doesn't.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. Mr Collier recommends that a detainee representative should be included and he said on Wednesday:  "I think provides transparency, I think it allows the detainee group to have knowledge of how incidents are reviewed, that if force is used against them, that it is properly scrutinised, that if is any inappropriate actions or anything that's come out of it, it's being addressed at the correct level."  What is your view on that?  A. In some cases there may be an advantage but there is not always the ability to allow them to attend a meeting of that nature, because — where the meeting takes place,
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	identify potential issues. Is a scenario-based real-incident-based training used?  A. Yes, as part of the full five day initial C&R course there is a full scenario-based training element. I was a little confused with that recommendation because I know there is one.  Q. Does that look at real incidents that have happened in Brook House and how they could be appropriately managed?  A. No, they're just scenario-based incidents that could happen.  Q. Does it look at real incidents or just scenarios?  A. No, it doesn't.  Q. Just scenarios?	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. Mr Collier recommends that a detainee representative should be included and he said on Wednesday:  "I think provides transparency, I think it allows the detainee group to have knowledge of how incidents are reviewed, that if force is used against them, that it is properly scrutinised, that if is any inappropriate actions or anything that's come out of it, it's being addressed at the correct level."  What is your view on that?  A. In some cases there may be an advantage but there is not always the ability to allow them to attend a meeting of that nature, because where the meeting takes place, looking at footage et cetera, things like that, they are
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	identify potential issues. Is a scenario-based real-incident-based training used?  A. Yes, as part of the full five day initial C&R course there is a full scenario-based training element. I was a little confused with that recommendation because I know there is one.  Q. Does that look at real incidents that have happened in Brook House and how they could be appropriately managed?  A. No, they're just scenario-based incidents that could happen.  Q. Does it look at real incidents or just scenarios?  A. No, it doesn't.  Q. Just scenarios?  A. Yes.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. Mr Collier recommends that a detainee representative should be included and he said on Wednesday:  "I think provides transparency, I think it allows the detainee group to have knowledge of how incidents are reviewed, that if force is used against them, that it is properly scrutinised, that if is any inappropriate actions or anything that's come out of it, it's being addressed at the correct level."  What is your view on that?  A. In some cases there may be an advantage but there is not always the ability to allow them to attend a meeting of that nature, because — where the meeting takes place, looking at footage et cetera, things like that, they are in staff areas, so they wouldn't be able to attend that
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	identify potential issues. Is a scenario-based real-incident-based training used?  A. Yes, as part of the full five day initial C&R course there is a full scenario-based training element. I was a little confused with that recommendation because I know there is one.  Q. Does that look at real incidents that have happened in Brook House and how they could be appropriately managed?  A. No, they're just scenario-based incidents that could happen.  Q. Does it look at real incidents or just scenarios?  A. No, it doesn't.  Q. Just scenarios?  A. Yes.  Q. In terms of reviewing and auditing force, you discuss	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. Mr Collier recommends that a detainee representative should be included and he said on Wednesday:  "I think provides transparency, I think it allows the detainee group to have knowledge of how incidents are reviewed, that if force is used against them, that it is properly scrutinised, that if is any inappropriate actions or anything that's come out of it, it's being addressed at the correct level."  What is your view on that?  A. In some cases there may be an advantage but there is not always the ability to allow them to attend a meeting of that nature, because where the meeting takes place, looking at footage et cetera, things like that, they are in staff areas, so they wouldn't be able to attend that type of meeting.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	identify potential issues. Is a scenario-based real-incident-based training used?  A. Yes, as part of the full five day initial C&R course there is a full scenario-based training element. I was a little confused with that recommendation because I know there is one.  Q. Does that look at real incidents that have happened in Brook House and how they could be appropriately managed?  A. No, they're just scenario-based incidents that could happen.  Q. Does it look at real incidents or just scenarios?  A. No, it doesn't.  Q. Just scenarios?  A. Yes.  Q. In terms of reviewing and auditing force, you discuss this in your statement at 58 to 65, you say every use of	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. Mr Collier recommends that a detainee representative should be included and he said on Wednesday:  "I think provides transparency, I think it allows the detainee group to have knowledge of how incidents are reviewed, that if force is used against them, that it is properly scrutinised, that if is any inappropriate actions or anything that's come out of it, it's being addressed at the correct level."  What is your view on that?  A. In some cases there may be an advantage but there is not always the ability to allow them to attend a meeting of that nature, because where the meeting takes place, looking at footage et cetera, things like that, they are in staff areas, so they wouldn't be able to attend that type of meeting.  Q. It could be held somewhere else though, couldn't it?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	identify potential issues. Is a scenario-based real-incident-based training used?  A. Yes, as part of the full five day initial C&R course there is a full scenario-based training element. I was a little confused with that recommendation because I know there is one.  Q. Does that look at real incidents that have happened in Brook House and how they could be appropriately managed?  A. No, they're just scenario-based incidents that could happen.  Q. Does it look at real incidents or just scenarios?  A. No, it doesn't.  Q. Just scenarios?  A. Yes.  Q. In terms of reviewing and auditing force, you discuss this in your statement at 58 to 65, you say every use of force is audited within 24 hours now.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. Mr Collier recommends that a detainee representative should be included and he said on Wednesday:  "I think provides transparency, I think it allows the detainee group to have knowledge of how incidents are reviewed, that if force is used against them, that it is properly scrutinised, that if is any inappropriate actions or anything that's come out of it, it's being addressed at the correct level."  What is your view on that?  A. In some cases there may be an advantage but there is not always the ability to allow them to attend a meeting of that nature, because where the meeting takes place, looking at footage et cetera, things like that, they are in staff areas, so they wouldn't be able to attend that type of meeting.  Q. It could be held somewhere else though, couldn't it?  A. It could be, yes. It could be. It is a consideration.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	identify potential issues. Is a scenario-based real-incident-based training used?  A. Yes, as part of the full five day initial C&R course there is a full scenario-based training element. I was a little confused with that recommendation because I know there is one.  Q. Does that look at real incidents that have happened in Brook House and how they could be appropriately managed?  A. No, they're just scenario-based incidents that could happen.  Q. Does it look at real incidents or just scenarios?  A. No, it doesn't.  Q. Just scenarios?  A. Yes.  Q. In terms of reviewing and auditing force, you discuss this in your statement at 58 to 65, you say every use of force is audited within 24 hours now.  A. Yes.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. Mr Collier recommends that a detainee representative should be included and he said on Wednesday:  "I think provides transparency, I think it allows the detainee group to have knowledge of how incidents are reviewed, that if force is used against them, that it is properly scrutinised, that if is any inappropriate actions or anything that's come out of it, it's being addressed at the correct level."  What is your view on that?  A. In some cases there may be an advantage but there is not always the ability to allow them to attend a meeting of that nature, because — where the meeting takes place, looking at footage et cetera, things like that, they are in staff areas, so they wouldn't be able to attend that type of meeting.  Q. It could be held somewhere else though, couldn't it?  A. It could be, yes. It could be. It is a consideration.  I think the model is probably looking at it, regarding
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	identify potential issues. Is a scenario-based real-incident-based training used?  A. Yes, as part of the full five day initial C&R course there is a full scenario-based training element. I was a little confused with that recommendation because I know there is one.  Q. Does that look at real incidents that have happened in Brook House and how they could be appropriately managed?  A. No, they're just scenario-based incidents that could happen.  Q. Does it look at real incidents or just scenarios?  A. No, it doesn't.  Q. Just scenarios?  A. Yes.  Q. In terms of reviewing and auditing force, you discuss this in your statement at 58 to 65, you say every use of force is audited within 24 hours now.  A. Yes.  Q. Who is that done by?	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. Mr Collier recommends that a detainee representative should be included and he said on Wednesday:  "I think provides transparency, I think it allows the detainee group to have knowledge of how incidents are reviewed, that if force is used against them, that it is properly scrutinised, that if is any inappropriate actions or anything that's come out of it, it's being addressed at the correct level."  What is your view on that?  A. In some cases there may be an advantage but there is not always the ability to allow them to attend a meeting of that nature, because where the meeting takes place, looking at footage et cetera, things like that, they are in staff areas, so they wouldn't be able to attend that type of meeting.  Q. It could be held somewhere else though, couldn't it?  A. It could be, yes. It could be. It is a consideration.  I think the model is probably looking at it, regarding MMPR, which is managing minimising physical restraint,
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	identify potential issues. Is a scenario-based real-incident-based training used?  A. Yes, as part of the full five day initial C&R course there is a full scenario-based training element. I was a little confused with that recommendation because I know there is one.  Q. Does that look at real incidents that have happened in Brook House and how they could be appropriately managed?  A. No, they're just scenario-based incidents that could happen.  Q. Does it look at real incidents or just scenarios?  A. No, it doesn't.  Q. Just scenarios?  A. Yes.  Q. In terms of reviewing and auditing force, you discuss this in your statement at 58 to 65, you say every use of force is audited within 24 hours now.  A. Yes.  Q. Who is that done by?  A. That's done by the assistant director of operations or	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. Mr Collier recommends that a detainee representative should be included and he said on Wednesday:  "I think provides transparency, I think it allows the detainee group to have knowledge of how incidents are reviewed, that if force is used against them, that it is properly scrutinised, that if is any inappropriate actions or anything that's come out of it, it's being addressed at the correct level."  What is your view on that?  A. In some cases there may be an advantage but there is not always the ability to allow them to attend a meeting of that nature, because where the meeting takes place, looking at footage et cetera, things like that, they are in staff areas, so they wouldn't be able to attend that type of meeting.  Q. It could be held somewhere else though, couldn't it?  A. It could be, yes. It could be. It is a consideration.  I think the model is probably looking at it, regarding MMPR, which is managing minimising physical restraint, which is some of my staff are trained in, that is the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	identify potential issues. Is a scenario-based real-incident-based training used?  A. Yes, as part of the full five day initial C&R course there is a full scenario-based training element. I was a little confused with that recommendation because I know there is one.  Q. Does that look at real incidents that have happened in Brook House and how they could be appropriately managed?  A. No, they're just scenario-based incidents that could happen.  Q. Does it look at real incidents or just scenarios?  A. No, it doesn't.  Q. Just scenarios?  A. Yes.  Q. In terms of reviewing and auditing force, you discuss this in your statement at 58 to 65, you say every use of force is audited within 24 hours now.  A. Yes.  Q. Who is that done by?  A. That's done by the assistant director of operations or another assistant director, use of force coordinator and	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. Mr Collier recommends that a detainee representative should be included and he said on Wednesday:  "I think provides transparency, I think it allows the detainee group to have knowledge of how incidents are reviewed, that if force is used against them, that it is properly scrutinised, that if is any inappropriate actions or anything that's come out of it, it's being addressed at the correct level."  What is your view on that?  A. In some cases there may be an advantage but there is not always the ability to allow them to attend a meeting of that nature, because where the meeting takes place, looking at footage et cetera, things like that, they are in staff areas, so they wouldn't be able to attend that type of meeting.</li> <li>Q. It could be held somewhere else though, couldn't it?</li> <li>A. It could be, yes. It could be. It is a consideration.  I think the model is probably looking at it, regarding MMPR, which is managing minimising physical restraint, which is some of my staff are trained in, that is the model they're using with young people and children.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	identify potential issues. Is a scenario-based real-incident-based training used?  A. Yes, as part of the full five day initial C&R course there is a full scenario-based training element. I was a little confused with that recommendation because I know there is one.  Q. Does that look at real incidents that have happened in Brook House and how they could be appropriately managed?  A. No, they're just scenario-based incidents that could happen.  Q. Does it look at real incidents or just scenarios?  A. No, it doesn't.  Q. Just scenarios?  A. Yes.  Q. In terms of reviewing and auditing force, you discuss this in your statement at 58 to 65, you say every use of force is audited within 24 hours now.  A. Yes.  Q. Who is that done by?  A. That's done by the assistant director of operations or another assistant director, use of force coordinator and the Home Office as well for full transparency, they will — and healthcare if required, they will sit in and	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. Mr Collier recommends that a detainee representative should be included and he said on Wednesday:  "I think provides transparency, I think it allows the detainee group to have knowledge of how incidents are reviewed, that if force is used against them, that it is properly scrutinised, that if is any inappropriate actions or anything that's come out of it, it's being addressed at the correct level."  What is your view on that? </li> <li>A. In some cases there may be an advantage but there is not always the ability to allow them to attend a meeting of that nature, because — where the meeting takes place, looking at footage et cetera, things like that, they are in staff areas, so they wouldn't be able to attend that type of meeting.</li> <li>Q. It could be held somewhere else though, couldn't it?</li> <li>A. It could be, yes. It could be. It is a consideration.  I think the model is probably looking at it, regarding MMPR, which is managing minimising physical restraint, which is some of my staff are trained in, that is the model they're using with young people and children.</li> <li>Q. I see.</li> <li>A. So they will allow them to attend the meeting and</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	identify potential issues. Is a scenario-based real-incident-based training used?  A. Yes, as part of the full five day initial C&R course there is a full scenario-based training element. I was a little confused with that recommendation because I know there is one.  Q. Does that look at real incidents that have happened in Brook House and how they could be appropriately managed?  A. No, they're just scenario-based incidents that could happen.  Q. Does it look at real incidents or just scenarios?  A. No, it doesn't.  Q. Just scenarios?  A. Yes.  Q. In terms of reviewing and auditing force, you discuss this in your statement at 58 to 65, you say every use of force is audited within 24 hours now.  A. Yes.  Q. Who is that done by?  A. That's done by the assistant director of operations or another assistant director, use of force coordinator and the Home Office as well for full transparency, they	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. Mr Collier recommends that a detainee representative should be included and he said on Wednesday:  "I think provides transparency, I think it allows the detainee group to have knowledge of how incidents are reviewed, that if force is used against them, that it is properly scrutinised, that if is any inappropriate actions or anything that's come out of it, it's being addressed at the correct level."  What is your view on that?  A. In some cases there may be an advantage but there is not always the ability to allow them to attend a meeting of that nature, because — where the meeting takes place, looking at footage et cetera, things like that, they are in staff areas, so they wouldn't be able to attend that type of meeting.</li> <li>Q. It could be held somewhere else though, couldn't it?</li> <li>A. It could be, yes. It could be. It is a consideration.  I think the model is probably looking at it, regarding MMPR, which is managing minimising physical restraint, which is some of my staff are trained in, that is the model they're using with young people and children.</li> <li>Q. I see.</li> </ul>

1	review so they understand the reasons, the rationale	1	management of the IRCs. This issue was subsequently
2	for the force as well.	2	clarified with staff and they were informed that the
3	Q. Is that something that is used at Tinsley House, for	3	wording used was incorrect. Staff were aware that they
4	example?	4	have the right to add to their reports rather than amend
5	A. Not currently because we have not had any children in	5	them."
6	for a long while actually.	6	Before that clarification, if you know, did staff
7	Q. I see. You said it is something that could be	7	believe that they were entitled to amend their reports?
8	considered, is it something you are going to consider?	8	A. I think the staff believed differently, yes, contrary to
9	A. We will after the inquiry has finished, we will look at	9	what the correct advice that is, that's why it were
10	all the considerations and recommendations.	10	addressed and advised correctly: you can amend.
11	Q. He notes here that at these monthly meetings one	11	Q. You can amend?
12	incident per month is reviewed and he says it should be	12	A. The right to add to, sorry, the right to add to the
13	more than that. Why is it only one?	13	report if need be.
14	A. Just time permitting and that is picked at random, so we	14	Q. So previously they
15	will look at any particular incident, a health concern	15	A. If latterly you feel there is something you've missed or
16	or some are quite routine incidents, so it is just	16	remembered.
17	relying on the type that are in, we can't see everyone,	17	Q. Previously they believed that you could amend and then,
18	it depends on the numbers basically.	18	from, say, 2020
19	Q. Can you tell me quickly about the storage of footage and	19	A. It were just a clarification, yes.
20	documents received. How long does Brook House keep body	20	Q you said no, actually, you to have to leave it as it
21	worn video camera footage?	21	is but you can add to it?
22	A. Contractually, all CCTV and body-worn footage is	22	A. Add to it, yes.
23	contractually we keep it for 120 days. If there is	23	Q. Mr Collier was asked about that yesterday and his view
24	an incident, if it is related, if the footage is related	24	was that staff should not amend their reports and
25	to an incident, use of force, et cetera, anything like	25	secondly he noted that the Prison Service model was to
	, , , , , ,		,
	Page 137		Page 139
1	that, the footage it is all downloaded and retained in	1	write those reports within 72 hours of the event. He
2	security indefinitely. So if it's required again in the	2	said that he doesn't think 24 hours gives sufficient
3	future, downloaded to a USB.	3	time and he notes that it can be hard during a shift to
4	Q. By "if there is an incident", you mean if there is	4	complete the paperwork to the requisite standard.
5	a concern about it?	5	He said 72 hours would be ideal, although 48 would
6	A. Concern. If any concern or anything of that nature that	6	still be better.
7	is raised to us, even if it's a complaint by a resident	7	What is your view on the time period?
8	raising a concern, and we don't believe there is any	8	A. We have to support I mean, contractually we have to
9	incident, we will download all the footage and it will	9	submit all the reports of the incident within 24 hours
10	all be retained indefinitely on a storage hard drive and	10	to the Home Office. So that is part of why we do it
11	retained in security.	11	within 24 hours.
12	Q. Chair, I'm aware it is 12.55, I have only probably got	12	Q. I see. Do you think, if you have any knowledge of it,
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		
13	10 more minutes, so it probably makes sense to continue	13	it does raise issues with people in maybe a busy
13 14	10 more minutes, so it probably makes sense to continue with Mr Hewer until just after 1.00 if that suits you?		it does raise issues with people in maybe a busy
14	with Mr Hewer until just after 1.00 if that suits you?	14	it does raise issues with people in maybe a busy shift trying to
14 15	with Mr Hewer until just after 1.00 if that suits you? THE CHAIR: That is fine, thank you very much.	14 15	it does raise issues with people in maybe a busy shift trying to  A. It does, yes, and sometimes it is challenging. It is
14 15 16	with Mr Hewer until just after 1.00 if that suits you?  THE CHAIR: That is fine, thank you very much.  MS MOORE: On use of force paperwork now, at paragraph 76 of	14 15 16	it does raise issues with people in maybe a busy shift trying to  A. It does, yes, and sometimes it is challenging. It is challenging to get the information and get the right
14 15 16 17	with Mr Hewer until just after 1.00 if that suits you?  THE CHAIR: That is fine, thank you very much.  MS MOORE: On use of force paperwork now, at paragraph 76 of your statement, page 18, you refer to one of the	14 15 16 17	it does raise issues with people in maybe a busy shift trying to  A. It does, yes, and sometimes it is challenging. It is challenging to get the information and get the right information at that point in time.
14 15 16 17 18	with Mr Hewer until just after 1.00 if that suits you?  THE CHAIR: That is fine, thank you very much.  MS MOORE: On use of force paperwork now, at paragraph 76 of your statement, page 18, you refer to one of the documents which was disclosed to Liberty Investigates,	14 15 16 17 18	it does raise issues with people in maybe a busy shift trying to  A. It does, yes, and sometimes it is challenging. It is challenging to get the information and get the right information at that point in time.  Q. As a result of the considerations that you are going to
14 15 16 17 18	with Mr Hewer until just after 1.00 if that suits you?  THE CHAIR: That is fine, thank you very much.  MS MOORE: On use of force paperwork now, at paragraph 76 of your statement, page 18, you refer to one of the documents which was disclosed to Liberty Investigates, the people who were gathering documents before The	14 15 16 17 18 19	it does raise issues with people in maybe a busy shift trying to  A. It does, yes, and sometimes it is challenging. It is challenging to get the information and get the right information at that point in time.  Q. As a result of the considerations that you are going to have after the inquiry, you think longer would be
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	with Mr Hewer until just after 1.00 if that suits you?  THE CHAIR: That is fine, thank you very much.  MS MOORE: On use of force paperwork now, at paragraph 76 of your statement, page 18, you refer to one of the documents which was disclosed to Liberty Investigates, the people who were gathering documents before The Observer article.	14 15 16 17 18 19 20	it does raise issues with people in maybe a busy shift trying to  A. It does, yes, and sometimes it is challenging. It is challenging to get the information and get the right information at that point in time.  Q. As a result of the considerations that you are going to have after the inquiry, you think longer would be better, is it something you could discuss with the
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	with Mr Hewer until just after 1.00 if that suits you?  THE CHAIR: That is fine, thank you very much.  MS MOORE: On use of force paperwork now, at paragraph 76 of your statement, page 18, you refer to one of the documents which was disclosed to Liberty Investigates, the people who were gathering documents before The Observer article.  You say at 76 with reference to that document:	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	it does raise issues with people in maybe a busy shift trying to  A. It does, yes, and sometimes it is challenging. It is challenging to get the information and get the right information at that point in time.  Q. As a result of the considerations that you are going to have after the inquiry, you think longer would be better, is it something you could discuss with the Home Office?
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	with Mr Hewer until just after 1.00 if that suits you?  THE CHAIR: That is fine, thank you very much.  MS MOORE: On use of force paperwork now, at paragraph 76 of your statement, page 18, you refer to one of the documents which was disclosed to Liberty Investigates, the people who were gathering documents before The Observer article.  You say at 76 with reference to that document:  "I have been made aware of an allegation that	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	it does raise issues with people in maybe a busy shift trying to  A. It does, yes, and sometimes it is challenging. It is challenging to get the information and get the right information at that point in time.  Q. As a result of the considerations that you are going to have after the inquiry, you think longer would be better, is it something you could discuss with the Home Office?  A. It would, to make sure we get the correct factual
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	with Mr Hewer until just after 1.00 if that suits you?  THE CHAIR: That is fine, thank you very much.  MS MOORE: On use of force paperwork now, at paragraph 76 of your statement, page 18, you refer to one of the documents which was disclosed to Liberty Investigates, the people who were gathering documents before The Observer article.  You say at 76 with reference to that document:  "I have been made aware of an allegation that officers were reserving their right to later change	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	it does raise issues with people in maybe a busy shift trying to  A. It does, yes, and sometimes it is challenging. It is challenging to get the information and get the right information at that point in time.  Q. As a result of the considerations that you are going to have after the inquiry, you think longer would be better, is it something you could discuss with the Home Office?  A. It would, to make sure we get the correct factual paperwork together, yes.
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	with Mr Hewer until just after 1.00 if that suits you?  THE CHAIR: That is fine, thank you very much.  MS MOORE: On use of force paperwork now, at paragraph 76 of your statement, page 18, you refer to one of the documents which was disclosed to Liberty Investigates, the people who were gathering documents before The Observer article.  You say at 76 with reference to that document:  "I have been made aware of an allegation that officers were reserving their right to later change reports. The minutes referred to were	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	it does raise issues with people in maybe a busy shift trying to  A. It does, yes, and sometimes it is challenging. It is challenging to get the information and get the right information at that point in time.  Q. As a result of the considerations that you are going to have after the inquiry, you think longer would be better, is it something you could discuss with the Home Office?  A. It would, to make sure we get the correct factual paperwork together, yes.  Q. Still at page 18 of your statement, a use of force
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	with Mr Hewer until just after 1.00 if that suits you?  THE CHAIR: That is fine, thank you very much.  MS MOORE: On use of force paperwork now, at paragraph 76 of your statement, page 18, you refer to one of the documents which was disclosed to Liberty Investigates, the people who were gathering documents before The Observer article.  You say at 76 with reference to that document:  "I have been made aware of an allegation that officers were reserving their right to later change	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	it does raise issues with people in maybe a busy shift trying to  A. It does, yes, and sometimes it is challenging. It is challenging to get the information and get the right information at that point in time.  Q. As a result of the considerations that you are going to have after the inquiry, you think longer would be better, is it something you could discuss with the Home Office?  A. It would, to make sure we get the correct factual paperwork together, yes.
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	with Mr Hewer until just after 1.00 if that suits you?  THE CHAIR: That is fine, thank you very much.  MS MOORE: On use of force paperwork now, at paragraph 76 of your statement, page 18, you refer to one of the documents which was disclosed to Liberty Investigates, the people who were gathering documents before The Observer article.  You say at 76 with reference to that document:  "I have been made aware of an allegation that officers were reserving their right to later change reports. The minutes referred to were	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	it does raise issues with people in maybe a busy shift trying to  A. It does, yes, and sometimes it is challenging. It is challenging to get the information and get the right information at that point in time.  Q. As a result of the considerations that you are going to have after the inquiry, you think longer would be better, is it something you could discuss with the Home Office?  A. It would, to make sure we get the correct factual paperwork together, yes.  Q. Still at page 18 of your statement, a use of force

1	reference just for the note is L I B 000176 but I don't	1	Q. Finally on use of force, Mr Collier on a number of
2	need it bringing up, that report states that:	2	occasions in his report into planned use of force
3	"Use of force paperwork had been an issue over the	3	criticises the use of PPE in individual events he has
4	month of November with incorrect paperwork being handed	4	looked at. He told the inquiry this week that there was
5	in and signed off by the time it reaches me.	5	a perception that every planned use of force needs to be
6	Home Office have been in regular contact with me about	6	in PPE but he said that is not the case. He was taken
7	this."	7	to the manual and I don't need to bring it up but for
8	You say in your statement that this was then	8	the note it is NOM 0000001 which says that this is the
9	addressed by the coordinator and through further	9	manual that is applied in the detention centre even
10	training?	10	though I think it is a prison document?
11	A. Yes.	11	A. PSO 1600.
12	Q. There was an issue with incorrect paperwork being handed	12	Q. That's right. It says there may be occasions where
13	in?	13	staff must where suitable PPE and he gives examples such
14	A. It were a training need because we brought lots of new	14	as where a prisoner he refers to prisoners because it
15	staff on, new policies, new procedures, they were	15	is a prison manual is behaving aggressively or where
16	understanding how it it were new to them so we were	16	the prisoner has or is likely to have a weapon but he
17	supporting in that and offered them additional training	17	says in fact every situation should be evaluated on its
18	and updated the ITC.	18	own unique circumstances and he explained, for example,
19	Q. At page 23, at paragraph 97, despite the issues that	19	the difficulty of communicating through helmets, the
20	I just noted, so amending use of force reports and also	20	obvious difficulties in rapport building when in PPE and
21	the paperwork issues that needed clarification through	21	said that if PPE is removed during an incident when it
22	training, you say at paragraph 97 that in the last	22	becomes clear it is not necessary, this can be
23	18 months there has only been one disciplinary	23	deescalating not just to the person on whom force can be
24	investigation carried out against staff relating to	24	used but to other people watching as well. Presumably
25	failure to correctly complete use of force forms. Why	25	you accept Mr Collier's expertise in lawful and
	Page 141		Page 143
1	is there only one investigation when there were	1	appropriate use of force?
	, 8		
2	apparently fairly widespread issues with documentation	2	A. Yes.
3	apparently fairly widespread issues with documentation and amendments?	2 3	<ul><li>A. Yes.</li><li>O. Now that it is clear that PPE is not mandatory for</li></ul>
	and amendments?		Q. Now that it is clear that PPE is not mandatory for
3	and amendments?  A. I think that is one official investigation. Others	3	
3 4	and amendments?  A. I think that is one official investigation. Others would have been addressed formally by a manager. It's	3 4	Q. Now that it is clear that PPE is not mandatory for planned use of force, is this something that will in practice change?
3 4 5 6	and amendments?  A. I think that is one official investigation. Others would have been addressed formally by a manager. It's not gone to a disciplinary issue, obviously this one	3 4 5 6	<ul><li>Q. Now that it is clear that PPE is not mandatory for planned use of force, is this something that will in practice change?</li><li>A. Well, I would have to say it is common practice in</li></ul>
3 4 5 6 7	and amendments?  A. I think that is one official investigation. Others would have been addressed formally by a manager. It's not gone to a disciplinary issue, obviously this one has.	3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. Now that it is clear that PPE is not mandatory for planned use of force, is this something that will in practice change?</li> <li>A. Well, I would have to say it is common practice in I mean, mostly areas and establishments I have worked in</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8	and amendments?  A. I think that is one official investigation. Others would have been addressed formally by a manager. It's not gone to a disciplinary issue, obviously this one has.  I am not sure exactly which one that one is.	3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Q. Now that it is clear that PPE is not mandatory for planned use of force, is this something that will in practice change?</li> <li>A. Well, I would have to say it is common practice in I mean, mostly areas and establishments I have worked in is common practice, if you are requesting staff to do</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	and amendments?  A. I think that is one official investigation. Others would have been addressed formally by a manager. It's not gone to a disciplinary issue, obviously this one has.  I am not sure exactly which one that one is.  Q. Something like late paperwork or amending paperwork	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. Now that it is clear that PPE is not mandatory for planned use of force, is this something that will in practice change?</li> <li>A. Well, I would have to say it is common practice in I mean, mostly areas and establishments I have worked in is common practice, if you are requesting staff to do a planned use of force within into a bedroom, where</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8	and amendments?  A. I think that is one official investigation. Others would have been addressed formally by a manager. It's not gone to a disciplinary issue, obviously this one has.  I am not sure exactly which one that one is.  Q. Something like late paperwork or amending paperwork wouldn't necessarily be official?	3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. Now that it is clear that PPE is not mandatory for planned use of force, is this something that will in practice change?</li> <li>A. Well, I would have to say it is common practice in — I mean, mostly areas and establishments I have worked in is common practice, if you are requesting staff to do a planned use of force within into a bedroom, where you're uncertain if there is any weapons or visible</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	and amendments?  A. I think that is one official investigation. Others would have been addressed formally by a manager. It's not gone to a disciplinary issue, obviously this one has.  I am not sure exactly which one that one is.  Q. Something like late paperwork or amending paperwork wouldn't necessarily be official?  A. No, no. It is — that could be obviously a disciplinary	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. Now that it is clear that PPE is not mandatory for planned use of force, is this something that will in practice change?</li> <li>A. Well, I would have to say it is common practice in I mean, mostly areas and establishments I have worked in is common practice, if you are requesting staff to do a planned use of force within into a bedroom, where you're uncertain if there is any weapons or visible threats to those staff, you will then I mean, as</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	and amendments?  A. I think that is one official investigation. Others would have been addressed formally by a manager. It's not gone to a disciplinary issue, obviously this one has.  I am not sure exactly which one that one is.  Q. Something like late paperwork or amending paperwork wouldn't necessarily be official?	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q. Now that it is clear that PPE is not mandatory for planned use of force, is this something that will in practice change?</li> <li>A. Well, I would have to say it is common practice in I mean, mostly areas and establishments I have worked in is common practice, if you are requesting staff to do a planned use of force within into a bedroom, where you're uncertain if there is any weapons or visible threats to those staff, you will then I mean, as a responsible employee, employer, and under the Health</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	and amendments?  A. I think that is one official investigation. Others would have been addressed formally by a manager. It's not gone to a disciplinary issue, obviously this one has.  I am not sure exactly which one that one is.  Q. Something like late paperwork or amending paperwork wouldn't necessarily be official?  A. No, no. It is — that could be obviously a disciplinary matter against our code of ethics.  Q. Mr Collier recommends at recommendation 7 that line	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. Now that it is clear that PPE is not mandatory for planned use of force, is this something that will in practice change?</li> <li>A. Well, I would have to say it is common practice in I mean, mostly areas and establishments I have worked in is common practice, if you are requesting staff to do a planned use of force within into a bedroom, where you're uncertain if there is any weapons or visible threats to those staff, you will then I mean, as a responsible employee, employer, and under the Health and Safety At Work Act, I have the responsibility to</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	and amendments?  A. I think that is one official investigation. Others would have been addressed formally by a manager. It's not gone to a disciplinary issue, obviously this one has.  I am not sure exactly which one that one is.  Q. Something like late paperwork or amending paperwork wouldn't necessarily be official?  A. No, no. It is — that could be obviously a disciplinary matter against our code of ethics.  Q. Mr Collier recommends at recommendation 7 that line managers, assisted by the use of force instructor,	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. Now that it is clear that PPE is not mandatory for planned use of force, is this something that will in practice change?</li> <li>A. Well, I would have to say it is common practice in —  I mean, mostly areas and establishments I have worked in is common practice, if you are requesting staff to do a planned use of force within into a bedroom, where you're uncertain if there is any weapons or visible threats to those staff, you will then — I mean, as a responsible employee, employer, and under the Health and Safety At Work Act, I have the responsibility to protect my staff as well, so I would not knowingly send</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	and amendments?  A. I think that is one official investigation. Others would have been addressed formally by a manager. It's not gone to a disciplinary issue, obviously this one has.  I am not sure exactly which one that one is.  Q. Something like late paperwork or amending paperwork wouldn't necessarily be official?  A. No, no. It is — that could be obviously a disciplinary matter against our code of ethics.  Q. Mr Collier recommends at recommendation 7 that line managers, assisted by the use of force instructor, should carry out random quality assurance checks on use	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. Now that it is clear that PPE is not mandatory for planned use of force, is this something that will in practice change?</li> <li>A. Well, I would have to say it is common practice in I mean, mostly areas and establishments I have worked in is common practice, if you are requesting staff to do a planned use of force within into a bedroom, where you're uncertain if there is any weapons or visible threats to those staff, you will then I mean, as a responsible employee, employer, and under the Health and Safety At Work Act, I have the responsibility to protect my staff as well, so I would not knowingly send them into an area it's a risk assessment into an</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	and amendments?  A. I think that is one official investigation. Others would have been addressed formally by a manager. It's not gone to a disciplinary issue, obviously this one has.  I am not sure exactly which one that one is.  Q. Something like late paperwork or amending paperwork wouldn't necessarily be official?  A. No, no. It is — that could be obviously a disciplinary matter against our code of ethics.  Q. Mr Collier recommends at recommendation 7 that line managers, assisted by the use of force instructor,	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. Now that it is clear that PPE is not mandatory for planned use of force, is this something that will in practice change?</li> <li>A. Well, I would have to say it is common practice in — I mean, mostly areas and establishments I have worked in is common practice, if you are requesting staff to do a planned use of force within into a bedroom, where you're uncertain if there is any weapons or visible threats to those staff, you will then — I mean, as a responsible employee, employer, and under the Health and Safety At Work Act, I have the responsibility to protect my staff as well, so I would not knowingly send them into an area — it's a risk assessment — into an area where they could be injured without the proper PPE</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	and amendments?  A. I think that is one official investigation. Others would have been addressed formally by a manager. It's not gone to a disciplinary issue, obviously this one has.  I am not sure exactly which one that one is.  Q. Something like late paperwork or amending paperwork wouldn't necessarily be official?  A. No, no. It is — that could be obviously a disciplinary matter against our code of ethics.  Q. Mr Collier recommends at recommendation 7 that line managers, assisted by the use of force instructor, should carry out random quality assurance checks on use of force statements submitted by their direct reports.  Is that done?	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. Now that it is clear that PPE is not mandatory for planned use of force, is this something that will in practice change?</li> <li>A. Well, I would have to say it is common practice in — I mean, mostly areas and establishments I have worked in is common practice, if you are requesting staff to do a planned use of force within into a bedroom, where you're uncertain if there is any weapons or visible threats to those staff, you will then — I mean, as a responsible employee, employer, and under the Health and Safety At Work Act, I have the responsibility to protect my staff as well, so I would not knowingly send them into an area — it's a risk assessment — into an area where they could be injured without the proper PPE as well, so it is — I would say it is a discussion,</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	and amendments?  A. I think that is one official investigation. Others would have been addressed formally by a manager. It's not gone to a disciplinary issue, obviously this one has.  I am not sure exactly which one that one is.  Q. Something like late paperwork or amending paperwork wouldn't necessarily be official?  A. No, no. It is — that could be obviously a disciplinary matter against our code of ethics.  Q. Mr Collier recommends at recommendation 7 that line managers, assisted by the use of force instructor, should carry out random quality assurance checks on use of force statements submitted by their direct reports.  Is that done?  A. We quality check the use of force coordinator and the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. Now that it is clear that PPE is not mandatory for planned use of force, is this something that will in practice change?  A. Well, I would have to say it is common practice in I mean, mostly areas and establishments I have worked in is common practice, if you are requesting staff to do a planned use of force within into a bedroom, where you're uncertain if there is any weapons or visible threats to those staff, you will then I mean, as a responsible employee, employer, and under the Health and Safety At Work Act, I have the responsibility to protect my staff as well, so I would not knowingly send them into an area it's a risk assessment into an area where they could be injured without the proper PPE as well, so it is I would say it is a discussion, a contentious issue, and I don't fully agree with
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	and amendments?  A. I think that is one official investigation. Others would have been addressed formally by a manager. It's not gone to a disciplinary issue, obviously this one has.  I am not sure exactly which one that one is.  Q. Something like late paperwork or amending paperwork wouldn't necessarily be official?  A. No, no. It is — that could be obviously a disciplinary matter against our code of ethics.  Q. Mr Collier recommends at recommendation 7 that line managers, assisted by the use of force instructor, should carry out random quality assurance checks on use of force statements submitted by their direct reports.  Is that done?  A. We quality check the use of force coordinator and the team quality check all the statements.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. Now that it is clear that PPE is not mandatory for planned use of force, is this something that will in practice change?  A. Well, I would have to say it is common practice in — I mean, mostly areas and establishments I have worked in is common practice, if you are requesting staff to do a planned use of force within into a bedroom, where you're uncertain if there is any weapons or visible threats to those staff, you will then — I mean, as a responsible employee, employer, and under the Health and Safety At Work Act, I have the responsibility to protect my staff as well, so I would not knowingly send them into an area — it's a risk assessment — into an area where they could be injured without the proper PPE as well, so it is — I would say it is a discussion, a contentious issue, and I don't fully agree with Mr Collier's views on that.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	and amendments?  A. I think that is one official investigation. Others would have been addressed formally by a manager. It's not gone to a disciplinary issue, obviously this one has.  I am not sure exactly which one that one is.  Q. Something like late paperwork or amending paperwork wouldn't necessarily be official?  A. No, no. It is — that could be obviously a disciplinary matter against our code of ethics.  Q. Mr Collier recommends at recommendation 7 that line managers, assisted by the use of force instructor, should carry out random quality assurance checks on use of force statements submitted by their direct reports.  Is that done?  A. We quality check the use of force coordinator and the team quality check all the statements.  So, I mean, announcement of this contract is we have	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. Now that it is clear that PPE is not mandatory for planned use of force, is this something that will in practice change?</li> <li>A. Well, I would have to say it is common practice in — I mean, mostly areas and establishments I have worked in is common practice, if you are requesting staff to do a planned use of force within into a bedroom, where you're uncertain if there is any weapons or visible threats to those staff, you will then — I mean, as a responsible employee, employer, and under the Health and Safety At Work Act, I have the responsibility to protect my staff as well, so I would not knowingly send them into an area — it's a risk assessment — into an area where they could be injured without the proper PPE as well, so it is — I would say it is a discussion, a contentious issue, and I don't fully agree with Mr Collier's views on that.</li> <li>Q. There is not a risk assessment, though, is there, it is</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	and amendments?  A. I think that is one official investigation. Others would have been addressed formally by a manager. It's not gone to a disciplinary issue, obviously this one has.  I am not sure exactly which one that one is.  Q. Something like late paperwork or amending paperwork wouldn't necessarily be official?  A. No, no. It is — that could be obviously a disciplinary matter against our code of ethics.  Q. Mr Collier recommends at recommendation 7 that line managers, assisted by the use of force instructor, should carry out random quality assurance checks on use of force statements submitted by their direct reports.  Is that done?  A. We quality check the use of force coordinator and the team quality check all the statements.  So, I mean, announcement of this contract is we have two dedicated use of force coordinators and part of that	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. Now that it is clear that PPE is not mandatory for planned use of force, is this something that will in practice change?</li> <li>A. Well, I would have to say it is common practice in — I mean, mostly areas and establishments I have worked in is common practice, if you are requesting staff to do a planned use of force within into a bedroom, where you're uncertain if there is any weapons or visible threats to those staff, you will then — I mean, as a responsible employee, employer, and under the Health and Safety At Work Act, I have the responsibility to protect my staff as well, so I would not knowingly send them into an area — it's a risk assessment — into an area where they could be injured without the proper PPE as well, so it is — I would say it is a discussion, a contentious issue, and I don't fully agree with Mr Collier's views on that.</li> <li>Q. There is not a risk assessment, though, is there, it is just a blanket policy at the moment of always using PPE?</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	and amendments?  A. I think that is one official investigation. Others would have been addressed formally by a manager. It's not gone to a disciplinary issue, obviously this one has.  I am not sure exactly which one that one is.  Q. Something like late paperwork or amending paperwork wouldn't necessarily be official?  A. No, no. It is — that could be obviously a disciplinary matter against our code of ethics.  Q. Mr Collier recommends at recommendation 7 that line managers, assisted by the use of force instructor, should carry out random quality assurance checks on use of force statements submitted by their direct reports.  Is that done?  A. We quality check the use of force coordinator and the team quality check all the statements.  So, I mean, announcement of this contract is we have two dedicated use of force coordinators and part of that is to ensure we get all the documentation, the paperwork	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. Now that it is clear that PPE is not mandatory for planned use of force, is this something that will in practice change?</li> <li>A. Well, I would have to say it is common practice in I mean, mostly areas and establishments I have worked in is common practice, if you are requesting staff to do a planned use of force within into a bedroom, where you're uncertain if there is any weapons or visible threats to those staff, you will then I mean, as a responsible employee, employer, and under the Health and Safety At Work Act, I have the responsibility to protect my staff as well, so I would not knowingly send them into an area it's a risk assessment into an area where they could be injured without the proper PPE as well, so it is I would say it is a discussion, a contentious issue, and I don't fully agree with Mr Collier's views on that.</li> <li>Q. There is not a risk assessment, though, is there, it is just a blanket policy at the moment of always using PPE?</li> <li>A. It is a blanket policy and it has been I'd have to be</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	and amendments?  A. I think that is one official investigation. Others would have been addressed formally by a manager. It's not gone to a disciplinary issue, obviously this one has.  I am not sure exactly which one that one is.  Q. Something like late paperwork or amending paperwork wouldn't necessarily be official?  A. No, no. It is — that could be obviously a disciplinary matter against our code of ethics.  Q. Mr Collier recommends at recommendation 7 that line managers, assisted by the use of force instructor, should carry out random quality assurance checks on use of force statements submitted by their direct reports.  Is that done?  A. We quality check the use of force coordinator and the team quality check all the statements.  So, I mean, announcement of this contract is we have two dedicated use of force coordinators and part of that is to ensure we get all the documentation, the paperwork and we get it set to a good standard as well.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. Now that it is clear that PPE is not mandatory for planned use of force, is this something that will in practice change?</li> <li>A. Well, I would have to say it is common practice in — I mean, mostly areas and establishments I have worked in is common practice, if you are requesting staff to do a planned use of force within into a bedroom, where you're uncertain if there is any weapons or visible threats to those staff, you will then — I mean, as a responsible employee, employer, and under the Health and Safety At Work Act, I have the responsibility to protect my staff as well, so I would not knowingly send them into an area — it's a risk assessment — into an area where they could be injured without the proper PPE as well, so it is — I would say it is a discussion, a contentious issue, and I don't fully agree with Mr Collier's views on that.</li> <li>Q. There is not a risk assessment, though, is there, it is just a blanket policy at the moment of always using PPE?</li> <li>A. It is a blanket policy and it has been — I'd have to be — I'd like to see the reference where it says that it</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	and amendments?  A. I think that is one official investigation. Others would have been addressed formally by a manager. It's not gone to a disciplinary issue, obviously this one has.  I am not sure exactly which one that one is.  Q. Something like late paperwork or amending paperwork wouldn't necessarily be official?  A. No, no. It is — that could be obviously a disciplinary matter against our code of ethics.  Q. Mr Collier recommends at recommendation 7 that line managers, assisted by the use of force instructor, should carry out random quality assurance checks on use of force statements submitted by their direct reports.  Is that done?  A. We quality check the use of force coordinator and the team quality check all the statements.  So, I mean, announcement of this contract is we have two dedicated use of force coordinators and part of that is to ensure we get all the documentation, the paperwork and we get it set to a good standard as well.  Q. Is that part of the review that happens within 24 hours?	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. Now that it is clear that PPE is not mandatory for planned use of force, is this something that will in practice change?</li> <li>A. Well, I would have to say it is common practice in — I mean, mostly areas and establishments I have worked in is common practice, if you are requesting staff to do a planned use of force within into a bedroom, where you're uncertain if there is any weapons or visible threats to those staff, you will then — I mean, as a responsible employee, employer, and under the Health and Safety At Work Act, I have the responsibility to protect my staff as well, so I would not knowingly send them into an area — it's a risk assessment — into an area where they could be injured without the proper PPE as well, so it is — I would say it is a discussion, a contentious issue, and I don't fully agree with Mr Collier's views on that.</li> <li>Q. There is not a risk assessment, though, is there, it is just a blanket policy at the moment of always using PPE?</li> <li>A. It is a blanket policy and it has been — I'd have to be — I'd like to see the reference where it says that it may — because routinely, any planned use of force, if</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	and amendments?  A. I think that is one official investigation. Others would have been addressed formally by a manager. It's not gone to a disciplinary issue, obviously this one has.  I am not sure exactly which one that one is.  Q. Something like late paperwork or amending paperwork wouldn't necessarily be official?  A. No, no. It is — that could be obviously a disciplinary matter against our code of ethics.  Q. Mr Collier recommends at recommendation 7 that line managers, assisted by the use of force instructor, should carry out random quality assurance checks on use of force statements submitted by their direct reports.  Is that done?  A. We quality check the use of force coordinator and the team quality check all the statements.  So, I mean, announcement of this contract is we have two dedicated use of force coordinators and part of that is to ensure we get all the documentation, the paperwork and we get it set to a good standard as well.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. Now that it is clear that PPE is not mandatory for planned use of force, is this something that will in practice change?</li> <li>A. Well, I would have to say it is common practice in — I mean, mostly areas and establishments I have worked in is common practice, if you are requesting staff to do a planned use of force within into a bedroom, where you're uncertain if there is any weapons or visible threats to those staff, you will then — I mean, as a responsible employee, employer, and under the Health and Safety At Work Act, I have the responsibility to protect my staff as well, so I would not knowingly send them into an area — it's a risk assessment — into an area where they could be injured without the proper PPE as well, so it is — I would say it is a discussion, a contentious issue, and I don't fully agree with Mr Collier's views on that.</li> <li>Q. There is not a risk assessment, though, is there, it is just a blanket policy at the moment of always using PPE?</li> <li>A. It is a blanket policy and it has been — I'd have to be — I'd like to see the reference where it says that it</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	and amendments?  A. I think that is one official investigation. Others would have been addressed formally by a manager. It's not gone to a disciplinary issue, obviously this one has.  I am not sure exactly which one that one is.  Q. Something like late paperwork or amending paperwork wouldn't necessarily be official?  A. No, no. It is — that could be obviously a disciplinary matter against our code of ethics.  Q. Mr Collier recommends at recommendation 7 that line managers, assisted by the use of force instructor, should carry out random quality assurance checks on use of force statements submitted by their direct reports.  Is that done?  A. We quality check the use of force coordinator and the team quality check all the statements.  So, I mean, announcement of this contract is we have two dedicated use of force coordinators and part of that is to ensure we get all the documentation, the paperwork and we get it set to a good standard as well.  Q. Is that part of the review that happens within 24 hours?	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. Now that it is clear that PPE is not mandatory for planned use of force, is this something that will in practice change?</li> <li>A. Well, I would have to say it is common practice in — I mean, mostly areas and establishments I have worked in is common practice, if you are requesting staff to do a planned use of force within into a bedroom, where you're uncertain if there is any weapons or visible threats to those staff, you will then — I mean, as a responsible employee, employer, and under the Health and Safety At Work Act, I have the responsibility to protect my staff as well, so I would not knowingly send them into an area — it's a risk assessment — into an area where they could be injured without the proper PPE as well, so it is — I would say it is a discussion, a contentious issue, and I don't fully agree with Mr Collier's views on that.</li> <li>Q. There is not a risk assessment, though, is there, it is just a blanket policy at the moment of always using PPE?</li> <li>A. It is a blanket policy and it has been — I'd have to be — I'd like to see the reference where it says that it may — because routinely, any planned use of force, if</li> </ul>

## 1 1 you would ask them to put PPE in, to protect the staff. two abusive or racist -- events of language against 2 2 Q. In the manual, for example, it says that it should be an ex resident which was partially substantiated. Does 3 3 where a prisoner is aggressive or where they're likely either the volume or the nature of these complaints 4 4 concern you, particularly given the low levels of the to have a weapon or do have a weapon. 5 5 population at Brook House? A. Yes, ves. Q. Likely to have or do have a weapon is different from we 6 6 A. I wouldn't say it concerns me overly. 7 don't know what is in bedroom, isn't it? 7 I think what it does show is that staff are prepared 8 A. Yes, and what intelligence there is as well. So there 8 -- other staff are prepared -- we're building a culture q 9 may be intelligence that they have got a weapon or they a where staff are prepared to report things and other 10 have got a sharp blade or something as well, so it is 10 staff from swearing or, you know, unethical behaviour 11 11 an assessment and it is based on intelligence as well. and things we wouldn't expect as part of our code of 12 Q. But at the moment there is not any assessment. 12 conduct. I am more content that things are being 13 A. Not particularly. We will -- if there is a risk we will 13 reported, are being addressed and we are making the 14 14 right actions and right decisions. kit people up, yes. 15 15 Q. At the moment at Brook House, it is not that there is Q. I am asked on behalf of Duncan Lewis to ask about 16 an assessment at all, it is always the case that PPE is 16 a freedom of information response received by that firm 17 worn? 17 which shows the annual complaint report from January 18 A. For planned use of force, yes. 18 to December 2021, and according to Duncan Lewis this 19 19 shows 102 complaints received at Brook House and Tinsley Q. And it is not always going to be the case, is it, when 20 you go into someone's bedroom or otherwise plan a use of 20 together, of which only 10 were substantiated and two 21 force on them that there will be any underlying 21 were partially substantiated, 689 unsubstantiated, 22 concerns? 22 20 withdrawn and two withdrawn and unsubstantiated, only 23 A. No, it's not. 23 six that went to PSU from Brook House. So that's a lot 24 Q. You cannot assume that all detainees might have 24 of figures but in short 102 complaints and only 25 25 10 substantiated. Is that a low level in your view of a weapon? Page 145 Page 147 1 A. No, we can't. 1 substantiated complaints? 2 Q. There may be some people who there are those concerns? 2 A. Not particularly, no. I wouldn't say it were low level. 3 3 A. I also have a responsibility to protect the staff as I suppose what I would expect is that any complaint 4 4 is robustly investigated and a fair response given and 5 Q. That responsibility must be weighed, must it not, 5 a look at the circumstances. I am not sure whether all 6 against the benefits of not using PPE? those complaints were centred at looking at the 7 statistics, whether they were all passed on to Serco Q. The last topic I want to ask about then is complaints 8 8 issues or the number could relate to a number of 9 and oversight. complaints that have gone to healthcare or the 10 10 Home Office as well. You state from paragraph 92, page 21 over the last 11 18 months there have been nine disciplinary 11 So as we know, a DCF9 or a complaint form is sent 12 investigations against staff relating to the 12 directly to the Home Office and they allocate it out 13 mistreatment of detained people and you have summarised 13 to whoever they -- if it is complaint about Serco, it 14 them for us and they include an officer swearing at 14 will come to us and we will log that information and 15 15 residents, an alleged assault and they both resulted, take the appropriate action and response to it. 16 you said, in final written warnings, and there was 16 Q. You also state at paragraph 95 that in the last 17 another which involved the DCO acting in a provocative 17 18 months there has been no disciplinary investigation 18 18 manner to provoke detainees, after which point they carried out against staff relating to a failure to 19 19 resigned, others which included improper language report complaints or incidents of mistreatment? 20 towards the detainee and improper comments that were 20 2.1 made. You state at 94 that there had be four 2.1 Q. Ms Molyneux for the IMB raised her concerns in oral 22 evidence about the efficacy of the current complaints disciplinary investigations for racist, homophobic or 22 23 sexist behaviour, including an officer screaming in 23 process and said this: 24 a detainee's face, which was unsubstantiated, behaviour 24 "We do not think the complaints system as it is 25 towards a female member of staff which was pending and 25 working on the ground is fair or gives confidence it is Page 146 Page 148

1 2			
2	fair. We suggest that the Home Office really needs to	1	made?
	review it. The warning sign is it is about 13 per cent	2	A. Yes.
3	success rate for a number of years and also there are	3	Q. Is it shared with their manager, the DOM, so they can
4	some fundamental issues that the people who are	4	take action?
5	investigating the complaints are also Serco staff in	5	A. Yes, because we have to track that and that information
6	terms of a perception of fairness."	6	is tracked make sure we have met the recommendations
7	Do you agree that it would be more confidence and	7	from a PSU perspective.
8	trust if the complaints process was undertaken	8	Q. You state at paragraph 122 that Serco takes appropriate
9	independently?	9	action where issues are raised by residents, staff and
10	A. I suppose it would give more transparency but I think	10	Home Office or stakeholders, and I am asked to ask you
11	the system works and it is an (inaudible) system at this	11	on behalf of HMIP what would your attitude be if matters
12	point in time.	12	of concern were raised by HMIP after an unannounced
13	Q. Ms Molyneux also noted that too many responses the IMB	13	inspection?
14	see seemed technical and contorted and while she hadn't	14	A. We would, again, address the concerns, and I've worked
15	seen the contract, she says that there's a sense that	15	with HMIP in different contracts and everything we do,
16	these responses might be driven by penalties. Do you	16	they are there to advise, support and look at the
17	accept that as a legitimate concern?	17	decency agenda, et cetera, so we would take the
18	A. No, there is no I can assure you our responses are	18	appropriate action to address any concerns that HMIP had
19	not based on penalties or failures in any way, shape or	19	within Brook House.
20	form. Any response that Serco makes is quality assured	20	Q. Just turning back to a couple of matters I already asked
21	and there is a percentage from the on-site Home Office	21	you about, I asked you firstly about rule 14 and you
22	team conducting a percentage of our responses and also	22	said it wasn't now used pre-emptively, can I ask what is
23	the Home Office regional team also the what they call	23	your understanding of who out of Serco staff rather than
24	the detainee enforcement services complaints team, they	24	Home Office staff are able to authorise the use of
25	also sample our responses as well to make sure they are	25	a rule 40 under the urgent procedure?
	Page 149		Page 151
1	fair responses and we have done the relevant	1	A. From a Serco perspective it generally would be a DOM or
2	investigates.	2	the relevant assistant director or deputy director.
3	They do about 20 per cent as well, so	3	• •
			O. Is that any DOM of is it a DOM with a particular fole on
4	O. Mr Farrell, Shane Farrell, gave evidence to the inquiry	4	Q. Is that any DOM or is it a DOM with a particular role on the day?
4 5	Mr Farrell, Shane Farrell, gave evidence to the inquiry     and he was asked by the Chair about feedback from PSU or	4 5	the day?
	and he was asked by the Chair about feedback from PSU or	l	the day?  A. It all depends what the circumstances are. Generally if
5	and he was asked by the Chair about feedback from PSU or internal investigations about staff conduct. He said	5	the day?  A. It all depends what the circumstances are. Generally if it is an incident, it would the Oscar 1 of that day that
5 6	and he was asked by the Chair about feedback from PSU or internal investigations about staff conduct. He said that he personally doesn't receive feedback with	5 6	the day?  A. It all depends what the circumstances are. Generally if
5 6 7	and he was asked by the Chair about feedback from PSU or internal investigations about staff conduct. He said	5 6 7	the day?  A. It all depends what the circumstances are. Generally if it is an incident, it would the Oscar 1 of that day that would take that action, depending on the timing and the
5 6 7 8	and he was asked by the Chair about feedback from PSU or internal investigations about staff conduct. He said that he personally doesn't receive feedback with findings from investigations into staff he manages, so	5 6 7 8	the day?  A. It all depends what the circumstances are. Generally if it is an incident, it would the Oscar 1 of that day that would take that action, depending on the timing and the circumstances.
5 6 7 8 9	and he was asked by the Chair about feedback from PSU or internal investigations about staff conduct. He said that he personally doesn't receive feedback with findings from investigations into staff he manages, so he is a DOM, so he has staff he manages.	5 6 7 8 9	the day?  A. It all depends what the circumstances are. Generally if it is an incident, it would the Oscar 1 of that day that would take that action, depending on the timing and the circumstances.  Q. Does it have to be the Oscar 1 or can it be any DOM?
5 6 7 8 9	and he was asked by the Chair about feedback from PSU or internal investigations about staff conduct. He said that he personally doesn't receive feedback with findings from investigations into staff he manages, so he is a DOM, so he has staff he manages.  A. Yes.	5 6 7 8 9	the day?  A. It all depends what the circumstances are. Generally if it is an incident, it would the Oscar 1 of that day that would take that action, depending on the timing and the circumstances.  Q. Does it have to be the Oscar 1 or can it be any DOM?  A. It can be other DOMS as well, it doesn't have to be the
5 6 7 8 9 10	and he was asked by the Chair about feedback from PSU or internal investigations about staff conduct. He said that he personally doesn't receive feedback with findings from investigations into staff he manages, so he is a DOM, so he has staff he manages.  A. Yes.  Q. He says he doesn't receive feedback, including if they	5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the day?  A. It all depends what the circumstances are. Generally if it is an incident, it would the Oscar 1 of that day that would take that action, depending on the timing and the circumstances.  Q. Does it have to be the Oscar 1 or can it be any DOM?  A. It can be other DOMS as well, it doesn't have to be the Oscar 1.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11	and he was asked by the Chair about feedback from PSU or internal investigations about staff conduct. He said that he personally doesn't receive feedback with findings from investigations into staff he manages, so he is a DOM, so he has staff he manages.  A. Yes.  Q. He says he doesn't receive feedback, including if they are given advice, and he said he would like to think	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the day?  A. It all depends what the circumstances are. Generally if it is an incident, it would the Oscar 1 of that day that would take that action, depending on the timing and the circumstances.  Q. Does it have to be the Oscar 1 or can it be any DOM?  A. It can be other DOMS as well, it doesn't have to be the Oscar 1.  Q. Returning to another thing I asked about, when I was
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	and he was asked by the Chair about feedback from PSU or internal investigations about staff conduct. He said that he personally doesn't receive feedback with findings from investigations into staff he manages, so he is a DOM, so he has staff he manages.  A. Yes.  Q. He says he doesn't receive feedback, including if they are given advice, and he said he would like to think that he would be made aware of it but he doesn't believe	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the day?  A. It all depends what the circumstances are. Generally if it is an incident, it would the Oscar 1 of that day that would take that action, depending on the timing and the circumstances.  Q. Does it have to be the Oscar 1 or can it be any DOM?  A. It can be other DOMS as well, it doesn't have to be the Oscar 1.  Q. Returning to another thing I asked about, when I was asking about various matters that fed into the design of
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	and he was asked by the Chair about feedback from PSU or internal investigations about staff conduct. He said that he personally doesn't receive feedback with findings from investigations into staff he manages, so he is a DOM, so he has staff he manages.  A. Yes.  Q. He says he doesn't receive feedback, including if they are given advice, and he said he would like to think that he would be made aware of it but he doesn't believe at the moment that he is. Is there a process for	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the day?  A. It all depends what the circumstances are. Generally if it is an incident, it would the Oscar 1 of that day that would take that action, depending on the timing and the circumstances.  Q. Does it have to be the Oscar 1 or can it be any DOM?  A. It can be other DOMS as well, it doesn't have to be the Oscar 1.  Q. Returning to another thing I asked about, when I was asking about various matters that fed into the design of the contract, so earlier on, I asked you about
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	and he was asked by the Chair about feedback from PSU or internal investigations about staff conduct. He said that he personally doesn't receive feedback with findings from investigations into staff he manages, so he is a DOM, so he has staff he manages.  A. Yes.  Q. He says he doesn't receive feedback, including if they are given advice, and he said he would like to think that he would be made aware of it but he doesn't believe at the moment that he is. Is there a process for this	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the day?  A. It all depends what the circumstances are. Generally if it is an incident, it would the Oscar 1 of that day that would take that action, depending on the timing and the circumstances.  Q. Does it have to be the Oscar 1 or can it be any DOM?  A. It can be other DOMS as well, it doesn't have to be the Oscar 1.  Q. Returning to another thing I asked about, when I was asking about various matters that fed into the design of the contract, so earlier on, I asked you about electronic monitoring issues at Serco in 2010 to 2013 in
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	and he was asked by the Chair about feedback from PSU or internal investigations about staff conduct. He said that he personally doesn't receive feedback with findings from investigations into staff he manages, so he is a DOM, so he has staff he manages.  A. Yes.  Q. He says he doesn't receive feedback, including if they are given advice, and he said he would like to think that he would be made aware of it but he doesn't believe at the moment that he is. Is there a process for this  A. A PSU report?	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the day?  A. It all depends what the circumstances are. Generally if it is an incident, it would the Oscar 1 of that day that would take that action, depending on the timing and the circumstances.  Q. Does it have to be the Oscar 1 or can it be any DOM?  A. It can be other DOMS as well, it doesn't have to be the Oscar 1.  Q. Returning to another thing I asked about, when I was asking about various matters that fed into the design of the contract, so earlier on, I asked you about electronic monitoring issues at Serco in 2010 to 2013 in Serco's statement that the company reform had followed
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	and he was asked by the Chair about feedback from PSU or internal investigations about staff conduct. He said that he personally doesn't receive feedback with findings from investigations into staff he manages, so he is a DOM, so he has staff he manages.  A. Yes.  Q. He says he doesn't receive feedback, including if they are given advice, and he said he would like to think that he would be made aware of it but he doesn't believe at the moment that he is. Is there a process for this  A. A PSU report?  Q. Yes, PSU recommend something	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the day?  A. It all depends what the circumstances are. Generally if it is an incident, it would the Oscar 1 of that day that would take that action, depending on the timing and the circumstances.  Q. Does it have to be the Oscar 1 or can it be any DOM?  A. It can be other DOMS as well, it doesn't have to be the Oscar 1.  Q. Returning to another thing I asked about, when I was asking about various matters that fed into the design of the contract, so earlier on, I asked you about electronic monitoring issues at Serco in 2010 to 2013 in Serco's statement that the company reform had followed it and I asked you whether that reform fed into the
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	and he was asked by the Chair about feedback from PSU or internal investigations about staff conduct. He said that he personally doesn't receive feedback with findings from investigations into staff he manages, so he is a DOM, so he has staff he manages.  A. Yes.  Q. He says he doesn't receive feedback, including if they are given advice, and he said he would like to think that he would be made aware of it but he doesn't believe at the moment that he is. Is there a process for this  A. A PSU report?  Q. Yes, PSU recommend something  A. Yes, once they have concluded their report, we get	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the day?  A. It all depends what the circumstances are. Generally if it is an incident, it would the Oscar 1 of that day that would take that action, depending on the timing and the circumstances.  Q. Does it have to be the Oscar 1 or can it be any DOM?  A. It can be other DOMS as well, it doesn't have to be the Oscar 1.  Q. Returning to another thing I asked about, when I was asking about various matters that fed into the design of the contract, so earlier on, I asked you about electronic monitoring issues at Serco in 2010 to 2013 in Serco's statement that the company reform had followed it and I asked you whether that reform fed into the process and you said that it did and that it was
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	and he was asked by the Chair about feedback from PSU or internal investigations about staff conduct. He said that he personally doesn't receive feedback with findings from investigations into staff he manages, so he is a DOM, so he has staff he manages.  A. Yes.  Q. He says he doesn't receive feedback, including if they are given advice, and he said he would like to think that he would be made aware of it but he doesn't believe at the moment that he is. Is there a process for this  A. A PSU report?  Q. Yes, PSU recommend something  A. Yes, once they have concluded their report, we get a copy of their recommendations and we get a full report	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	the day?  A. It all depends what the circumstances are. Generally if it is an incident, it would the Oscar 1 of that day that would take that action, depending on the timing and the circumstances.  Q. Does it have to be the Oscar 1 or can it be any DOM?  A. It can be other DOMS as well, it doesn't have to be the Oscar 1.  Q. Returning to another thing I asked about, when I was asking about various matters that fed into the design of the contract, so earlier on, I asked you about electronic monitoring issues at Serco in 2010 to 2013 in Serco's statement that the company reform had followed it and I asked you whether that reform fed into the process and you said that it did and that it was followed by root and branch reform and ethically
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	and he was asked by the Chair about feedback from PSU or internal investigations about staff conduct. He said that he personally doesn't receive feedback with findings from investigations into staff he manages, so he is a DOM, so he has staff he manages.  A. Yes.  Q. He says he doesn't receive feedback, including if they are given advice, and he said he would like to think that he would be made aware of it but he doesn't believe at the moment that he is. Is there a process for this  A. A PSU report?  Q. Yes, PSU recommend something  A. Yes, once they have concluded their report, we get a copy of their recommendations and we get a full report and we log that information on our improvement plans and	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the day?  A. It all depends what the circumstances are. Generally if it is an incident, it would the Oscar 1 of that day that would take that action, depending on the timing and the circumstances.  Q. Does it have to be the Oscar 1 or can it be any DOM?  A. It can be other DOMS as well, it doesn't have to be the Oscar 1.  Q. Returning to another thing I asked about, when I was asking about various matters that fed into the design of the contract, so earlier on, I asked you about electronic monitoring issues at Serco in 2010 to 2013 in Serco's statement that the company reform had followed it and I asked you whether that reform fed into the process and you said that it did and that it was followed by root and branch reform and ethically positive behaviour was promoted and you said that that
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	and he was asked by the Chair about feedback from PSU or internal investigations about staff conduct. He said that he personally doesn't receive feedback with findings from investigations into staff he manages, so he is a DOM, so he has staff he manages.  A. Yes.  Q. He says he doesn't receive feedback, including if they are given advice, and he said he would like to think that he would be made aware of it but he doesn't believe at the moment that he is. Is there a process for this  A. A PSU report?  Q. Yes, PSU recommend something  A. Yes, once they have concluded their report, we get a copy of their recommendations and we get a full report and we log that information on our improvement plans and that is shared with appropriate SMT members to share	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the day?  A. It all depends what the circumstances are. Generally if it is an incident, it would the Oscar 1 of that day that would take that action, depending on the timing and the circumstances.  Q. Does it have to be the Oscar 1 or can it be any DOM?  A. It can be other DOMS as well, it doesn't have to be the Oscar 1.  Q. Returning to another thing I asked about, when I was asking about various matters that fed into the design of the contract, so earlier on, I asked you about electronic monitoring issues at Serco in 2010 to 2013 in Serco's statement that the company reform had followed it and I asked you whether that reform fed into the process and you said that it did and that it was followed by root and branch reform and ethically positive behaviour was promoted and you said that that included training that you received, so all managers
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	and he was asked by the Chair about feedback from PSU or internal investigations about staff conduct. He said that he personally doesn't receive feedback with findings from investigations into staff he manages, so he is a DOM, so he has staff he manages.  A. Yes.  Q. He says he doesn't receive feedback, including if they are given advice, and he said he would like to think that he would be made aware of it but he doesn't believe at the moment that he is. Is there a process for this  A. A PSU report?  Q. Yes, PSU recommend something  A. Yes, once they have concluded their report, we get a copy of their recommendations and we get a full report and we log that information on our improvement plans and that is shared with appropriate SMT members to share with a member of staff and if there are any actions or	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the day?  A. It all depends what the circumstances are. Generally if it is an incident, it would the Oscar 1 of that day that would take that action, depending on the timing and the circumstances.  Q. Does it have to be the Oscar 1 or can it be any DOM?  A. It can be other DOMS as well, it doesn't have to be the Oscar 1.  Q. Returning to another thing I asked about, when I was asking about various matters that fed into the design of the contract, so earlier on, I asked you about electronic monitoring issues at Serco in 2010 to 2013 in Serco's statement that the company reform had followed it and I asked you whether that reform fed into the process and you said that it did and that it was followed by root and branch reform and ethically positive behaviour was promoted and you said that that included training that you received, so all managers including you?
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	and he was asked by the Chair about feedback from PSU or internal investigations about staff conduct. He said that he personally doesn't receive feedback with findings from investigations into staff he manages, so he is a DOM, so he has staff he manages.  A. Yes.  Q. He says he doesn't receive feedback, including if they are given advice, and he said he would like to think that he would be made aware of it but he doesn't believe at the moment that he is. Is there a process for this  A. A PSU report?  Q. Yes, PSU recommend something  A. Yes, once they have concluded their report, we get a copy of their recommendations and we get a full report and we log that information on our improvement plans and that is shared with appropriate SMT members to share with a member of staff and if there are any actions or changes we need to take as a result of that	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the day?  A. It all depends what the circumstances are. Generally if it is an incident, it would the Oscar 1 of that day that would take that action, depending on the timing and the circumstances.  Q. Does it have to be the Oscar 1 or can it be any DOM?  A. It can be other DOMS as well, it doesn't have to be the Oscar 1.  Q. Returning to another thing I asked about, when I was asking about various matters that fed into the design of the contract, so earlier on, I asked you about electronic monitoring issues at Serco in 2010 to 2013 in Serco's statement that the company reform had followed it and I asked you whether that reform fed into the process and you said that it did and that it was followed by root and branch reform and ethically positive behaviour was promoted and you said that that included training that you received, so all managers including you?  A. That's correct, yes.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	and he was asked by the Chair about feedback from PSU or internal investigations about staff conduct. He said that he personally doesn't receive feedback with findings from investigations into staff he manages, so he is a DOM, so he has staff he manages.  A. Yes.  Q. He says he doesn't receive feedback, including if they are given advice, and he said he would like to think that he would be made aware of it but he doesn't believe at the moment that he is. Is there a process for this  A. A PSU report?  Q. Yes, PSU recommend something  A. Yes, once they have concluded their report, we get a copy of their recommendations and we get a full report and we log that information on our improvement plans and that is shared with appropriate SMT members to share with a member of staff and if there are any actions or changes we need to take as a result of that investigation.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the day?  A. It all depends what the circumstances are. Generally if it is an incident, it would the Oscar 1 of that day that would take that action, depending on the timing and the circumstances.  Q. Does it have to be the Oscar 1 or can it be any DOM?  A. It can be other DOMS as well, it doesn't have to be the Oscar 1.  Q. Returning to another thing I asked about, when I was asking about various matters that fed into the design of the contract, so earlier on, I asked you about electronic monitoring issues at Serco in 2010 to 2013 in Serco's statement that the company reform had followed it and I asked you whether that reform fed into the process and you said that it did and that it was followed by root and branch reform and ethically positive behaviour was promoted and you said that that included training that you received, so all managers including you?  A. That's correct, yes.  Q. I hope that it was clear but just for the avoidance of

1	involved in the 2010 and 2013 issues and neither was	1 time.	
2	Brook House.	2 Q. Mr Hewer, I don't have any further questions for you.	
3	A. No, that's correct.	The Chair may have questions however.	
4	Q. Finally, I just want to ask about looking into the	4 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Ms Moore.	
5	future, so the situation in 2020 and the IMB's findings	5 Thank you, Mr Hewer, I do have a couple of questions	
6	of inhumane treatment were made at a time when the	6 for you, if I may.	
7	population was very low, due to Covid obviously?	7 Questions from THE CHAIR	
8	A. Yes.	8 THE CHAIR: You told Ms Moore that your office is	
9	Q. And when due to the new Serco contract staffing levels	9 approximately 20 metres from the wings. Is that the	
10	were much higher than they had been during the relevant	same office that, as far as you are aware, Mrs Saunders	
11	period.	11 would have occupied during the relevant period?	
12	You noted in paragraph 50 with reference to the	12 A. I believe so, yes.	
13	reduced population that recent trends are not useful	13 THE CHAIR: There has been no fundamental structural change	,
14	predicters for future occupancy levels or demographics.	to that?	
15	Do you expect your capacity to continue to grow?	15 A. Not that I am aware of.	
16	A. I do, yes. I do. I expect over the coming months we	16 THE CHAIR: How often do you go to the wings.	
17	are changing policy and direction, I expect our	17 A. Every other day or weekly depending on what time I hav	/e
18	population to rise, yes.	18 available.	
19	Q. You told us before you don't have any control over the	19 THE CHAIR: Thank you.	
20	number of people who come in, other than the number of	20 Ms Moore also asked you some questions about some	
21	beds you have got?	21 specific members of staff who worked at G4S during the	
22	A. No.	relevant period, now work for Serco and who have given	
23	Q. You don't, I understand, have any control over the	evidence to the inquiry. I am not going to ask you	
24	number of people in the centre who have particular needs	24 anything about specific members of staff but I would	
25	or vulnerabilities either?	25 like to have an indication from you how many members of	
	Page 153	Page 155	
1 1	A No	statt do you have currently employed by Serco who were	
1 2	A. No.  O. Home Office detention, decision-making and any	staff do you have currently employed by Serco who were  TIPE'd over from G4S?	
2	Q. Home Office detention, decision-making and any	2 TUPE'd over from G4S?	as
2 3	Q. Home Office detention, decision-making and any enforcement priorities which might be seen in the future	TUPE'd over from G4S?  A. At the point in time when they were on 21 May was	as
2	Q. Home Office detention, decision-making and any enforcement priorities which might be seen in the future are also beyond your control. You may receive, as you	TUPE'd over from G4S?  A. At the point in time when they were on 21 May water the question how many staff were remaining that	as
2 3 4 5	Q. Home Office detention, decision-making and any enforcement priorities which might be seen in the future	TUPE'd over from G4S?  A. At the point in time when they were on 21 May was the question how many staff were remaining that were TUPE'd over or how many at the point time?	as
2 3 4 5 6	Q. Home Office detention, decision-making and any enforcement priorities which might be seen in the future are also beyond your control. You may receive, as you did before, some advanced notice but you cannot take any decision?	TUPE'd over from G4S?  A. At the point in time when they were on 21 May was the question how many staff were remaining that were TUPE'd over or how many at the point time?  THE CHAIR: If you could give me both that would be very	as
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. Home Office detention, decision-making and any enforcement priorities which might be seen in the future are also beyond your control. You may receive, as you did before, some advanced notice but you cannot take any decision?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>	TUPE'd over from G4S?  A. At the point in time when they were on 21 May was the question how many staff were remaining that were TUPE'd over or how many at the point time?  THE CHAIR: If you could give me both that would be very helpful.	as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. Home Office detention, decision-making and any enforcement priorities which might be seen in the future are also beyond your control. You may receive, as you did before, some advanced notice but you cannot take any decision?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You don't have any real choice, do you, if, for example,</li> </ul>	TUPE'd over from G4S?  A. At the point in time when they were on 21 May was the question how many staff were remaining that were TUPE'd over or how many at the point time?  THE CHAIR: If you could give me both that would be very helpful.  A. At the point in time I think there were about	as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. Home Office detention, decision-making and any enforcement priorities which might be seen in the future are also beyond your control. You may receive, as you did before, some advanced notice but you cannot take any decision?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You don't have any real choice, do you, if, for example, there was another decision to use Brook House as</li> </ul>	TUPE'd over from G4S?  A. At the point in time when they were on 21 May was the question how many staff were remaining that were TUPE'd over or how many at the point time?  THE CHAIR: If you could give me both that would be very helpful.  A. At the point in time I think there were about obviously I'm giving you an approximate number and	as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. Home Office detention, decision-making and any enforcement priorities which might be seen in the future are also beyond your control. You may receive, as you did before, some advanced notice but you cannot take any decision?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You don't have any real choice, do you, if, for example, there was another decision to use Brook House as a pre-departure facility for charter flights?</li> </ul>	TUPE'd over from G4S?  A. At the point in time when they were on 21 May was the question how many staff were remaining that were TUPE'd over or how many at the point time?  THE CHAIR: If you could give me both that would be very helpful.  A. At the point in time I think there were about obviously I'm giving you an approximate number and I think there were about 330 TUPE'd, which I had no	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q. Home Office detention, decision-making and any enforcement priorities which might be seen in the future are also beyond your control. You may receive, as you did before, some advanced notice but you cannot take any decision?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You don't have any real choice, do you, if, for example, there was another decision to use Brook House as a pre-departure facility for charter flights? If this occurred with a similar population,</li> </ul>	TUPE'd over from G4S?  A. At the point in time when they were on 21 May was the question how many staff were remaining that were TUPE'd over or how many at the point time?  THE CHAIR: If you could give me both that would be very helpful.  A. At the point in time I think there were about obviously I'm giving you an approximate number and I think there were about 330 TUPE'd, which I had no control over, which are people who will give evidence to	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. Home Office detention, decision-making and any enforcement priorities which might be seen in the future are also beyond your control. You may receive, as you did before, some advanced notice but you cannot take any decision?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You don't have any real choice, do you, if, for example, there was another decision to use Brook House as a pre-departure facility for charter flights?  If this occurred with a similar population, self-harm may go up again as it did before?</li> </ul>	TUPE'd over from G4S?  A. At the point in time when they were on 21 May was the question how many staff were remaining that were TUPE'd over or how many at the point time?  THE CHAIR: If you could give me both that would be very helpful.  A. At the point in time I think there were about obviously I'm giving you an approximate number and I think there were about 330 TUPE'd, which I had no control over, which are people who will give evidence to this inquiry, were all TUPE'd over to me at that point	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q. Home Office detention, decision-making and any enforcement priorities which might be seen in the future are also beyond your control. You may receive, as you did before, some advanced notice but you cannot take any decision?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You don't have any real choice, do you, if, for example, there was another decision to use Brook House as a pre-departure facility for charter flights?  If this occurred with a similar population, self-harm may go up again as it did before?</li> <li>A. It could do, yes.</li> </ul>	TUPE'd over from G4S?  A. At the point in time when they were on 21 May was the question how many staff were remaining that were TUPE'd over or how many at the point time?  THE CHAIR: If you could give me both that would be very helpful.  A. At the point in time I think there were about obviously I'm giving you an approximate number and I think there were about 330 TUPE'd, which I had no control over, which are people who will give evidence to this inquiry, were all TUPE'd over to me at that point	o
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. Home Office detention, decision-making and any enforcement priorities which might be seen in the future are also beyond your control. You may receive, as you did before, some advanced notice but you cannot take any decision?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You don't have any real choice, do you, if, for example, there was another decision to use Brook House as a pre-departure facility for charter flights?  If this occurred with a similar population, self-harm may go up again as it did before?</li> <li>A. It could do, yes.</li> <li>Q. The use of force may therefore increase as well.</li> </ul>	TUPE'd over from G4S?  A. At the point in time when they were on 21 May was the question how many staff were remaining that were TUPE'd over or how many at the point time?  THE CHAIR: If you could give me both that would be very helpful.  A. At the point in time I think there were about obviously I'm giving you an approximate number and I think there were about 330 TUPE'd, which I had no control over, which are people who will give evidence to this inquiry, were all TUPE'd over to me at that point in time, on 21 May.	o
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. Home Office detention, decision-making and any enforcement priorities which might be seen in the future are also beyond your control. You may receive, as you did before, some advanced notice but you cannot take any decision?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You don't have any real choice, do you, if, for example, there was another decision to use Brook House as a pre-departure facility for charter flights?  If this occurred with a similar population, self-harm may go up again as it did before?</li> <li>A. It could do, yes.</li> <li>Q. The use of force may therefore increase as well.  There would be a risk, wouldn't there, of a rerun of</li> </ul>	TUPE'd over from G4S?  A. At the point in time when they were on 21 May was the question how many staff were remaining that were TUPE'd over or how many at the point time?  THE CHAIR: If you could give me both that would be very helpful.  A. At the point in time I think there were about obviously I'm giving you an approximate number and I think there were about 330 TUPE'd, which I had no control over, which are people who will give evidence to this inquiry, were all TUPE'd over to me at that point in time, on 21 May.  THE CHAIR: Do you know how many of those remain at the moment?	o
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. Home Office detention, decision-making and any enforcement priorities which might be seen in the future are also beyond your control. You may receive, as you did before, some advanced notice but you cannot take any decision?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You don't have any real choice, do you, if, for example, there was another decision to use Brook House as a pre-departure facility for charter flights?  If this occurred with a similar population, self-harm may go up again as it did before?</li> <li>A. It could do, yes.</li> <li>Q. The use of force may therefore increase as well.  There would be a risk, wouldn't there, of a rerun of what had been described by Mr Castle as a very bad job</li> </ul>	TUPE'd over from G4S?  A. At the point in time when they were on 21 May was the question how many staff were remaining that were TUPE'd over or how many at the point time?  THE CHAIR: If you could give me both that would be very helpful.  A. At the point in time I think there were about obviously I'm giving you an approximate number and I think there were about 330 TUPE'd, which I had no control over, which are people who will give evidence to this inquiry, were all TUPE'd over to me at that point in time, on 21 May.  THE CHAIR: Do you know how many of those remain at the moment?  A. I would say a vast majority, at least 200 still remain	o
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. Home Office detention, decision-making and any enforcement priorities which might be seen in the future are also beyond your control. You may receive, as you did before, some advanced notice but you cannot take any decision?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You don't have any real choice, do you, if, for example, there was another decision to use Brook House as a pre-departure facility for charter flights?  If this occurred with a similar population, self-harm may go up again as it did before?</li> <li>A. It could do, yes.</li> <li>Q. The use of force may therefore increase as well.  There would be a risk, wouldn't there, of a rerun of what had been described by Mr Castle as a very bad job and by the IMB as humane.</li> </ul>	TUPE'd over from G4S?  A. At the point in time when they were on 21 May was the question how many staff were remaining that were TUPE'd over or how many at the point time?  THE CHAIR: If you could give me both that would be very helpful.  A. At the point in time I think there were about obviously I'm giving you an approximate number and I think there were about 330 TUPE'd, which I had no control over, which are people who will give evidence to this inquiry, were all TUPE'd over to me at that point in time, on 21 May.  THE CHAIR: Do you know how many of those remain at the moment?  A. I would say a vast majority, at least 200 still remain on the contract.	o
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. Home Office detention, decision-making and any enforcement priorities which might be seen in the future are also beyond your control. You may receive, as you did before, some advanced notice but you cannot take any decision?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You don't have any real choice, do you, if, for example, there was another decision to use Brook House as a pre-departure facility for charter flights?  If this occurred with a similar population, self-harm may go up again as it did before?</li> <li>A. It could do, yes.</li> <li>Q. The use of force may therefore increase as well.  There would be a risk, wouldn't there, of a rerun of what had been described by Mr Castle as a very bad job and by the IMB as humane.  What, if anything, can you do then to avoid another</li> </ul>	TUPE'd over from G4S?  A. At the point in time when they were on 21 May was the question how many staff were remaining that were TUPE'd over or how many at the point time?  THE CHAIR: If you could give me both that would be very helpful.  A. At the point in time I think there were about obviously I'm giving you an approximate number and I think there were about 330 TUPE'd, which I had no control over, which are people who will give evidence to this inquiry, were all TUPE'd over to me at that point in time, on 21 May.  THE CHAIR: Do you know how many of those remain at the moment?  A. I would say a vast majority, at least 200 still remain on the contract.  THE CHAIR: At least 200?	o
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. Home Office detention, decision-making and any enforcement priorities which might be seen in the future are also beyond your control. You may receive, as you did before, some advanced notice but you cannot take any decision?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You don't have any real choice, do you, if, for example, there was another decision to use Brook House as a pre-departure facility for charter flights?  If this occurred with a similar population, self-harm may go up again as it did before?</li> <li>A. It could do, yes.</li> <li>Q. The use of force may therefore increase as well.  There would be a risk, wouldn't there, of a rerun of what had been described by Mr Castle as a very bad job and by the IMB as humane.  What, if anything, can you do then to avoid another 2020 situation?</li> </ul>	TUPE'd over from G4S?  A. At the point in time when they were on 21 May was the question how many staff were remaining that were TUPE'd over or how many at the point time?  THE CHAIR: If you could give me both that would be very helpful.  A. At the point in time I think there were about obviously I'm giving you an approximate number and I think there were about 330 TUPE'd, which I had no control over, which are people who will give evidence to this inquiry, were all TUPE'd over to me at that point in time, on 21 May.  THE CHAIR: Do you know how many of those remain at the moment?  A. I would say a vast majority, at least 200 still remain on the contract.  THE CHAIR: At least 200?  A. At least 200, yes. I would have to check the figures,	o
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. Home Office detention, decision-making and any enforcement priorities which might be seen in the future are also beyond your control. You may receive, as you did before, some advanced notice but you cannot take any decision?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You don't have any real choice, do you, if, for example, there was another decision to use Brook House as a pre-departure facility for charter flights?  If this occurred with a similar population, self-harm may go up again as it did before?</li> <li>A. It could do, yes.</li> <li>Q. The use of force may therefore increase as well.  There would be a risk, wouldn't there, of a rerun of what had been described by Mr Castle as a very bad job and by the IMB as humane.  What, if anything, can you do then to avoid another 2020 situation?</li> <li>A. In respect I mean, there will unfortunately,</li> </ul>	TUPE'd over from G4S?  A. At the point in time when they were on 21 May was the question how many staff were remaining that were TUPE'd over or how many at the point time?  THE CHAIR: If you could give me both that would be very helpful.  A. At the point in time I think there were about obviously I'm giving you an approximate number and I think there were about 330 TUPE'd, which I had no control over, which are people who will give evidence to this inquiry, were all TUPE'd over to me at that point in time, on 21 May.  THE CHAIR: Do you know how many of those remain at the moment?  A. I would say a vast majority, at least 200 still remain on the contract.  THE CHAIR: At least 200?  A. At least 200, yes. I would have to check the figures, obviously, for that.	o
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. Home Office detention, decision-making and any enforcement priorities which might be seen in the future are also beyond your control. You may receive, as you did before, some advanced notice but you cannot take any decision?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You don't have any real choice, do you, if, for example, there was another decision to use Brook House as a pre-departure facility for charter flights?  If this occurred with a similar population, self-harm may go up again as it did before?</li> <li>A. It could do, yes.</li> <li>Q. The use of force may therefore increase as well.  There would be a risk, wouldn't there, of a rerun of what had been described by Mr Castle as a very bad job and by the IMB as humane.  What, if anything, can you do then to avoid another 2020 situation?</li> <li>A. In respect I mean, there will unfortunately, I have I have little control on what is allocated to</li> </ul>	TUPE'd over from G4S?  A. At the point in time when they were on 21 May was the question how many staff were remaining that were TUPE'd over or how many at the point time?  THE CHAIR: If you could give me both that would be very helpful.  A. At the point in time I think there were about obviously I'm giving you an approximate number and I think there were about 330 TUPE'd, which I had no control over, which are people who will give evidence to this inquiry, were all TUPE'd over to me at that point in time, on 21 May.  THE CHAIR: Do you know how many of those remain at the moment?  A. I would say a vast majority, at least 200 still remain on the contract.  THE CHAIR: At least 200?  A. At least 200, yes. I would have to check the figures, obviously, for that.	D e
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. Home Office detention, decision-making and any enforcement priorities which might be seen in the future are also beyond your control. You may receive, as you did before, some advanced notice but you cannot take any decision?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You don't have any real choice, do you, if, for example, there was another decision to use Brook House as a pre-departure facility for charter flights?  If this occurred with a similar population, self-harm may go up again as it did before?</li> <li>A. It could do, yes.</li> <li>Q. The use of force may therefore increase as well.  There would be a risk, wouldn't there, of a rerun of what had been described by Mr Castle as a very bad job and by the IMB as humane.  What, if anything, can you do then to avoid another 2020 situation?</li> <li>A. In respect — I mean, there will — unfortunately, I have — I have little control on what is allocated to us from that — I think that probably the question is</li> </ul>	TUPE'd over from G4S?  A. At the point in time when they were on 21 May was the question how many staff were remaining that were TUPE'd over or how many at the point time?  THE CHAIR: If you could give me both that would be very helpful.  A. At the point in time I think there were about obviously I'm giving you an approximate number and I think there were about 330 TUPE'd, which I had no control over, which are people who will give evidence to this inquiry, were all TUPE'd over to me at that point in time, on 21 May.  THE CHAIR: Do you know how many of those remain at the moment?  A. I would say a vast majority, at least 200 still remain on the contract.  THE CHAIR: At least 200?  A. At least 200, yes. I would have to check the figures, obviously, for that.  THE CHAIR: Thank you.	D e
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. Home Office detention, decision-making and any enforcement priorities which might be seen in the future are also beyond your control. You may receive, as you did before, some advanced notice but you cannot take any decision?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You don't have any real choice, do you, if, for example, there was another decision to use Brook House as a pre-departure facility for charter flights?  If this occurred with a similar population, self-harm may go up again as it did before?</li> <li>A. It could do, yes.</li> <li>Q. The use of force may therefore increase as well.  There would be a risk, wouldn't there, of a rerun of what had been described by Mr Castle as a very bad job and by the IMB as humane.  What, if anything, can you do then to avoid another 2020 situation?</li> <li>A. In respect I mean, there will unfortunately, I have I have little control on what is allocated to</li> </ul>	TUPE'd over from G4S?  A. At the point in time when they were on 21 May was the question how many staff were remaining that were TUPE'd over or how many at the point time?  THE CHAIR: If you could give me both that would be very helpful.  A. At the point in time I think there were about obviously I'm giving you an approximate number and I think there were about 330 TUPE'd, which I had no control over, which are people who will give evidence to this inquiry, were all TUPE'd over to me at that point in time, on 21 May.  THE CHAIR: Do you know how many of those remain at the moment?  A. I would say a vast majority, at least 200 still remain on the contract.  THE CHAIR: At least 200?  A. At least 200, yes. I would have to check the figures, obviously, for that.  THE CHAIR: Thank you.  Then my final question, Ms Moore also asked you some	D e
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. Home Office detention, decision-making and any enforcement priorities which might be seen in the future are also beyond your control. You may receive, as you did before, some advanced notice but you cannot take any decision?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You don't have any real choice, do you, if, for example, there was another decision to use Brook House as a pre-departure facility for charter flights?  If this occurred with a similar population, self-harm may go up again as it did before?</li> <li>A. It could do, yes.</li> <li>Q. The use of force may therefore increase as well.  There would be a risk, wouldn't there, of a rerun of what had been described by Mr Castle as a very bad job and by the IMB as humane.  What, if anything, can you do then to avoid another 2020 situation?</li> <li>A. In respect I mean, there will unfortunately, I have I have little control on what is allocated to us from that I think that probably the question is best placed answered by the Home Office in respect of</li> </ul>	TUPE'd over from G4S?  A. At the point in time when they were on 21 May was the question how many staff were remaining that were TUPE'd over or how many at the point time?  THE CHAIR: If you could give me both that would be very helpful.  A. At the point in time I think there were about obviously I'm giving you an approximate number and I think there were about 330 TUPE'd, which I had no control over, which are people who will give evidence to this inquiry, were all TUPE'd over to me at that point in time, on 21 May.  THE CHAIR: Do you know how many of those remain at the moment?  A. I would say a vast majority, at least 200 still remain on the contract.  THE CHAIR: At least 200?  A. At least 200, yes. I would have to check the figures, obviously, for that.  THE CHAIR: Thank you.  Then my final question, Ms Moore also asked you some questions about men currently detained at Brook House	D e
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. Home Office detention, decision-making and any enforcement priorities which might be seen in the future are also beyond your control. You may receive, as you did before, some advanced notice but you cannot take any decision?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You don't have any real choice, do you, if, for example, there was another decision to use Brook House as a pre-departure facility for charter flights?  If this occurred with a similar population, self-harm may go up again as it did before?</li> <li>A. It could do, yes.</li> <li>Q. The use of force may therefore increase as well.  There would be a risk, wouldn't there, of a rerun of what had been described by Mr Castle as a very bad job and by the IMB as humane.  What, if anything, can you do then to avoid another 2020 situation?</li> <li>A. In respect — I mean, there will — unfortunately, I have — I have little control on what is allocated to us from that — I think that probably the question is best placed answered by the Home Office in respect of their strategy, accommodation strategy in the future. It is not something I have knowledge of at this point in</li> </ul>	TUPE'd over from G4S?  A. At the point in time when they were on 21 May was the question how many staff were remaining that were TUPE'd over or how many at the point time?  THE CHAIR: If you could give me both that would be very helpful.  A. At the point in time I think there were about obviously I'm giving you an approximate number and I think there were about 330 TUPE'd, which I had no control over, which are people who will give evidence to this inquiry, were all TUPE'd over to me at that point in time, on 21 May.  THE CHAIR: Do you know how many of those remain at the moment?  A. I would say a vast majority, at least 200 still remain on the contract.  THE CHAIR: At least 200?  A. At least 200, yes. I would have to check the figures, obviously, for that.  THE CHAIR: Thank you.  Then my final question, Ms Moore also asked you some questions about men currently detained at Brook House who are on constant watch, on an ACDT constant watch.  In response to her question around where men on	D e
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. Home Office detention, decision-making and any enforcement priorities which might be seen in the future are also beyond your control. You may receive, as you did before, some advanced notice but you cannot take any decision?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You don't have any real choice, do you, if, for example, there was another decision to use Brook House as a pre-departure facility for charter flights?  If this occurred with a similar population, self-harm may go up again as it did before?</li> <li>A. It could do, yes.</li> <li>Q. The use of force may therefore increase as well.  There would be a risk, wouldn't there, of a rerun of what had been described by Mr Castle as a very bad job and by the IMB as humane.  What, if anything, can you do then to avoid another 2020 situation?</li> <li>A. In respect — I mean, there will — unfortunately, I have — I have little control on what is allocated to us from that — I think that probably the question is best placed answered by the Home Office in respect of their strategy, accommodation strategy in the future.</li> </ul>	TUPE'd over from G4S?  A. At the point in time when they were on 21 May was the question how many staff were remaining that were TUPE'd over or how many at the point time?  THE CHAIR: If you could give me both that would be very helpful.  A. At the point in time I think there were about obviously I'm giving you an approximate number and I think there were about 330 TUPE'd, which I had no control over, which are people who will give evidence to this inquiry, were all TUPE'd over to me at that point in time, on 21 May.  THE CHAIR: Do you know how many of those remain at the moment?  A. I would say a vast majority, at least 200 still remain on the contract.  THE CHAIR: At least 200?  A. At least 200, yes. I would have to check the figures, obviously, for that.  THE CHAIR: Thank you.  Then my final question, Ms Moore also asked you some questions about men currently detained at Brook House who are on constant watch, on an ACDT constant watch.	D e

i			
1	constant watches may be held in Brook House, you said	1	yesterday and that he said that PPG effectively didn't
2	that they are not always held in the CSU, that you may	2	have much experience of working in IRCs prior to the
3	have people who are also observed on the wing as well?	3	Gatwick IRCs; is that right?
4	A. Correct.	4	A. Yes, so we were in Campsfield House for a couple of
5	Q. You told her that you had two currently on constant	5	years before it closed. That was certainly my first
6	watch. Can you tell me where they are located?	6	experience of the IRC environment. We also provided
7	A. I only I got the statistics this morning from	7	healthcare in the Verne, but that quickly rerolled to
8	I have not been to work this morning, obviously,	8	a prison shortly after we took over.
9	I looked at the report. I would have to confirm,	9	Q. So most of the company's prior and current experience is
10	I believe one may be on the CSU, one may be on the wing.	10	mainly in the provision of healthcare in prisons; is
11	I would have to check the location. I'm not sure.	11	that right?
12	THE CHAIR: Thank you, I would appreciate it.	12	A. That's right, so we operate in 48 establishments at the
13	Thank you. I have no other questions for you.	13	moment, 47 of which are prisons.
14	Thank you very much for coming to give your evidence	14	Q. Thank you. You would accept though, as he did, that the
15	this morning, I appreciate it.	15	IRC operates as a different detention environment to
16	MS MOORE: Thank you, Chair. I suggest we return at 2.00	16	a prison, primarily because detainees are not in an IRC
17	for the evidence of Dr Sarah Bromley on behalf of PPG.	17	by order of a court, but rather because of
18	THE CHAIR: Thank you very much.	18	an administrative power being exercised by the
19	(1.16 pm)	19	Home Office, is that right?
20	(The short adjournment)	20	A. That's right, yes.
21	(2.00 pm)	21	Q. And there is also, in IRCs, no time limit to detention;
22	MS SIMCOCK: The next witness is Dr Sarah Bromley.	22	is that your understanding?
23	DR SARAH BROMLEY (sworn)	23	A. That is my understanding.
24	` ,	24	Q. The role of healthcare then in an IRC is not just to
25		25	provide primary healthcare, but to provide important
	Page 157		Page 159
1	Evamination by MS SIMCOCV	1	alinical safacyanda vyhiah idantify vyha is vyhamehla ta
1	Examination by MS SIMCOCK	1	clinical safeguards, which identify who is vulnerable to
	THE CHAID. Places take a cost	1 2	home in detention and notify the Home Office of these
2	THE CHAIR: Please take a seat.	2	harm in detention and notify the Home Office of those
3	A. Thank you.	3	people, so that their continued detention can be
3 4	A. Thank you.  MS SIMCOCK: Thank you, can you give your full name to the	3 4	people, so that their continued detention can be promptly reviewed and that they might be considered for
3 4 5	A. Thank you.  MS SIMCOCK: Thank you, can you give your full name to the inquiry, please?	3 4 5	people, so that their continued detention can be promptly reviewed and that they might be considered for removal from detention; is that right?
3 4 5 6	<ul><li>A. Thank you.</li><li>MS SIMCOCK: Thank you, can you give your full name to the inquiry, please?</li><li>A. I am Dr Sarah Bromley.</li></ul>	3 4 5 6	people, so that their continued detention can be promptly reviewed and that they might be considered for removal from detention; is that right?  A. That is certainly one of the roles of healthcare within
3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>MS SIMCOCK: Thank you, can you give your full name to the inquiry, please?</li> <li>A. I am Dr Sarah Bromley.</li> <li>Q. And you have made two statements to the inquiry, they</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7	people, so that their continued detention can be promptly reviewed and that they might be considered for removal from detention; is that right?  A. That is certainly one of the roles of healthcare within the environment.
3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>MS SIMCOCK: Thank you, can you give your full name to the inquiry, please?</li> <li>A. I am Dr Sarah Bromley.</li> <li>Q. And you have made two statements to the inquiry, they are at <ppg000172 <ppg000173="" and="">. I am going to ask</ppg000172></li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8	people, so that their continued detention can be promptly reviewed and that they might be considered for removal from detention; is that right?  A. That is certainly one of the roles of healthcare within the environment.  Q. And I just want to look, then, at the safeguards that we
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>MS SIMCOCK: Thank you, can you give your full name to the inquiry, please?</li> <li>A. I am Dr Sarah Bromley.</li> <li>Q. And you have made two statements to the inquiry, they are at <ppg000172 <ppg000173="" and="">. I am going to ask for those two statements to be adduced in full, please,</ppg000172></li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	people, so that their continued detention can be promptly reviewed and that they might be considered for removal from detention; is that right?  A. That is certainly one of the roles of healthcare within the environment.  Q. And I just want to look, then, at the safeguards that we have spent a considerable amount of time on in this
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>MS SIMCOCK: Thank you, can you give your full name to the inquiry, please?</li> <li>A. I am Dr Sarah Bromley.</li> <li>Q. And you have made two statements to the inquiry, they are at <ppg000172 <ppg000173="" and="">. I am going to ask for those two statements to be adduced in full, please, and what that means, Doctor, is I don't need to ask you</ppg000172></li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>people, so that their continued detention can be promptly reviewed and that they might be considered for removal from detention; is that right?</li> <li>A. That is certainly one of the roles of healthcare within the environment.</li> <li>Q. And I just want to look, then, at the safeguards that we have spent a considerable amount of time on in this inquiry, under rules 34 and 35.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>MS SIMCOCK: Thank you, can you give your full name to the inquiry, please?</li> <li>A. I am Dr Sarah Bromley.</li> <li>Q. And you have made two statements to the inquiry, they are at <ppg000172 <ppg000173="" and="">. I am going to ask for those two statements to be adduced in full, please, and what that means, Doctor, is I don't need to ask you about every single line of those statements because they</ppg000172></li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	people, so that their continued detention can be promptly reviewed and that they might be considered for removal from detention; is that right?  A. That is certainly one of the roles of healthcare within the environment.  Q. And I just want to look, then, at the safeguards that we have spent a considerable amount of time on in this inquiry, under rules 34 and 35.  At paragraph 4 of your first witness statement, you
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Thank you.  MS SIMCOCK: Thank you, can you give your full name to the inquiry, please?  A. I am Dr Sarah Bromley.  Q. And you have made two statements to the inquiry, they are at <ppg000172 <ppg000173="" and="">. I am going to ask for those two statements to be adduced in full, please, and what that means, Doctor, is I don't need to ask you about every single line of those statements because they are already in evidence, but I want to ask you some</ppg000172>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	people, so that their continued detention can be promptly reviewed and that they might be considered for removal from detention; is that right?  A. That is certainly one of the roles of healthcare within the environment.  Q. And I just want to look, then, at the safeguards that we have spent a considerable amount of time on in this inquiry, under rules 34 and 35.  At paragraph 4 of your first witness statement, you acknowledge that rule 34 is clear that all residents
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>MS SIMCOCK: Thank you, can you give your full name to the inquiry, please?</li> <li>A. I am Dr Sarah Bromley.</li> <li>Q. And you have made two statements to the inquiry, they are at <ppg000172 <ppg000173="" and="">. I am going to ask for those two statements to be adduced in full, please, and what that means, Doctor, is I don't need to ask you about every single line of those statements because they are already in evidence, but I want to ask you some questions on some particular topics.</ppg000172></li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	people, so that their continued detention can be promptly reviewed and that they might be considered for removal from detention; is that right?  A. That is certainly one of the roles of healthcare within the environment.  Q. And I just want to look, then, at the safeguards that we have spent a considerable amount of time on in this inquiry, under rules 34 and 35.  At paragraph 4 of your first witness statement, you acknowledge that rule 34 is clear that all residents should get an assessment within 24 hours and that there
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>MS SIMCOCK: Thank you, can you give your full name to the inquiry, please?</li> <li>A. I am Dr Sarah Bromley.</li> <li>Q. And you have made two statements to the inquiry, they are at <ppg000172 <ppg000173="" and="">. I am going to ask for those two statements to be adduced in full, please, and what that means, Doctor, is I don't need to ask you about every single line of those statements because they are already in evidence, but I want to ask you some questions on some particular topics.</ppg000172></li> <li>Can you please tell us what your qualifications are?</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	people, so that their continued detention can be promptly reviewed and that they might be considered for removal from detention; is that right?  A. That is certainly one of the roles of healthcare within the environment.  Q. And I just want to look, then, at the safeguards that we have spent a considerable amount of time on in this inquiry, under rules 34 and 35.  At paragraph 4 of your first witness statement, you acknowledge that rule 34 is clear that all residents should get an assessment within 24 hours and that there is an induction for all staff about the importance of
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>MS SIMCOCK: Thank you, can you give your full name to the inquiry, please?</li> <li>A. I am Dr Sarah Bromley.</li> <li>Q. And you have made two statements to the inquiry, they are at <ppg000172 <ppg000173="" and="">. I am going to ask for those two statements to be adduced in full, please, and what that means, Doctor, is I don't need to ask you about every single line of those statements because they are already in evidence, but I want to ask you some questions on some particular topics.</ppg000172></li> <li>Can you please tell us what your qualifications are?</li> <li>A. So I have a Bachelors of Medicine and Surgery from</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	people, so that their continued detention can be promptly reviewed and that they might be considered for removal from detention; is that right?  A. That is certainly one of the roles of healthcare within the environment.  Q. And I just want to look, then, at the safeguards that we have spent a considerable amount of time on in this inquiry, under rules 34 and 35.  At paragraph 4 of your first witness statement, you acknowledge that rule 34 is clear that all residents should get an assessment within 24 hours and that there is an induction for all staff about the importance of rule 34; is that right?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>MS SIMCOCK: Thank you, can you give your full name to the inquiry, please?</li> <li>A. I am Dr Sarah Bromley.</li> <li>Q. And you have made two statements to the inquiry, they are at <ppg000172 <ppg000173="" and="">. I am going to ask for those two statements to be adduced in full, please, and what that means, Doctor, is I don't need to ask you about every single line of those statements because they are already in evidence, but I want to ask you some questions on some particular topics.</ppg000172></li> <li>Can you please tell us what your qualifications are?</li> <li>A. So I have a Bachelors of Medicine and Surgery from Leeds University and I am a member of the Royal College</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	people, so that their continued detention can be promptly reviewed and that they might be considered for removal from detention; is that right?  A. That is certainly one of the roles of healthcare within the environment.  Q. And I just want to look, then, at the safeguards that we have spent a considerable amount of time on in this inquiry, under rules 34 and 35.  At paragraph 4 of your first witness statement, you acknowledge that rule 34 is clear that all residents should get an assessment within 24 hours and that there is an induction for all staff about the importance of rule 34; is that right?  A. Yes, that is currently the position.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>MS SIMCOCK: Thank you, can you give your full name to the inquiry, please?</li> <li>A. I am Dr Sarah Bromley.</li> <li>Q. And you have made two statements to the inquiry, they are at <ppg000172 <ppg000173="" and="">. I am going to ask for those two statements to be adduced in full, please, and what that means, Doctor, is I don't need to ask you about every single line of those statements because they are already in evidence, but I want to ask you some questions on some particular topics.</ppg000172></li> <li>Can you please tell us what your qualifications are?</li> <li>A. So I have a Bachelors of Medicine and Surgery from Leeds University and I am a member of the Royal College of GPs, became a fellow of the Royal College in 2013 and</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	people, so that their continued detention can be promptly reviewed and that they might be considered for removal from detention; is that right?  A. That is certainly one of the roles of healthcare within the environment.  Q. And I just want to look, then, at the safeguards that we have spent a considerable amount of time on in this inquiry, under rules 34 and 35.  At paragraph 4 of your first witness statement, you acknowledge that rule 34 is clear that all residents should get an assessment within 24 hours and that there is an induction for all staff about the importance of rule 34; is that right?  A. Yes, that is currently the position.  Q. At paragraph 5, you raise the issue of the high rate of
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>MS SIMCOCK: Thank you, can you give your full name to the inquiry, please?</li> <li>A. I am Dr Sarah Bromley.</li> <li>Q. And you have made two statements to the inquiry, they are at <ppg000172 <ppg000173="" and="">. I am going to ask for those two statements to be adduced in full, please, and what that means, Doctor, is I don't need to ask you about every single line of those statements because they are already in evidence, but I want to ask you some questions on some particular topics.</ppg000172></li> <li>Can you please tell us what your qualifications are?</li> <li>A. So I have a Bachelors of Medicine and Surgery from Leeds University and I am a member of the Royal College of GPs, became a fellow of the Royal College in 2013 and I am a Senior Fellow of the Faculty of Medical</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	people, so that their continued detention can be promptly reviewed and that they might be considered for removal from detention; is that right?  A. That is certainly one of the roles of healthcare within the environment.  Q. And I just want to look, then, at the safeguards that we have spent a considerable amount of time on in this inquiry, under rules 34 and 35.  At paragraph 4 of your first witness statement, you acknowledge that rule 34 is clear that all residents should get an assessment within 24 hours and that there is an induction for all staff about the importance of rule 34; is that right?  A. Yes, that is currently the position.  Q. At paragraph 5, you raise the issue of the high rate of "Did not attends" to rule 34 appointments and that you
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>MS SIMCOCK: Thank you, can you give your full name to the inquiry, please?</li> <li>A. I am Dr Sarah Bromley.</li> <li>Q. And you have made two statements to the inquiry, they are at <ppg000172 <ppg000173="" and="">. I am going to ask for those two statements to be adduced in full, please, and what that means, Doctor, is I don't need to ask you about every single line of those statements because they are already in evidence, but I want to ask you some questions on some particular topics.</ppg000172></li> <li>Can you please tell us what your qualifications are?</li> <li>A. So I have a Bachelors of Medicine and Surgery from Leeds University and I am a member of the Royal College of GPs, became a fellow of the Royal College in 2013 and I am a Senior Fellow of the Faculty of Medical Leadership and Management.</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	people, so that their continued detention can be promptly reviewed and that they might be considered for removal from detention; is that right?  A. That is certainly one of the roles of healthcare within the environment.  Q. And I just want to look, then, at the safeguards that we have spent a considerable amount of time on in this inquiry, under rules 34 and 35.  At paragraph 4 of your first witness statement, you acknowledge that rule 34 is clear that all residents should get an assessment within 24 hours and that there is an induction for all staff about the importance of rule 34; is that right?  A. Yes, that is currently the position.  Q. At paragraph 5, you raise the issue of the high rate of "Did not attends" to rule 34 appointments and that you plan to train staff to talk to detainees about the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>MS SIMCOCK: Thank you, can you give your full name to the inquiry, please?</li> <li>A. I am Dr Sarah Bromley.</li> <li>Q. And you have made two statements to the inquiry, they are at <ppg000172 <ppg000173="" and="">. I am going to ask for those two statements to be adduced in full, please, and what that means, Doctor, is I don't need to ask you about every single line of those statements because they are already in evidence, but I want to ask you some questions on some particular topics.</ppg000172></li> <li>Can you please tell us what your qualifications are?</li> <li>A. So I have a Bachelors of Medicine and Surgery from Leeds University and I am a member of the Royal College of GPs, became a fellow of the Royal College in 2013 and I am a Senior Fellow of the Faculty of Medical Leadership and Management.</li> <li>Q. What is your role at PPG?</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	people, so that their continued detention can be promptly reviewed and that they might be considered for removal from detention; is that right?  A. That is certainly one of the roles of healthcare within the environment.  Q. And I just want to look, then, at the safeguards that we have spent a considerable amount of time on in this inquiry, under rules 34 and 35.  At paragraph 4 of your first witness statement, you acknowledge that rule 34 is clear that all residents should get an assessment within 24 hours and that there is an induction for all staff about the importance of rule 34; is that right?  A. Yes, that is currently the position.  Q. At paragraph 5, you raise the issue of the high rate of "Did not attends" to rule 34 appointments and that you plan to train staff to talk to detainees about the importance and the purpose of rule 34 and to encourage
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>MS SIMCOCK: Thank you, can you give your full name to the inquiry, please?</li> <li>A. I am Dr Sarah Bromley.</li> <li>Q. And you have made two statements to the inquiry, they are at <ppg000172 <ppg000173="" and="">. I am going to ask for those two statements to be adduced in full, please, and what that means, Doctor, is I don't need to ask you about every single line of those statements because they are already in evidence, but I want to ask you some questions on some particular topics.</ppg000172></li> <li>Can you please tell us what your qualifications are?</li> <li>A. So I have a Bachelors of Medicine and Surgery from Leeds University and I am a member of the Royal College of GPs, became a fellow of the Royal College in 2013 and I am a Senior Fellow of the Faculty of Medical Leadership and Management.</li> <li>Q. What is your role at PPG?</li> <li>A. I am the National Medical Director for Health and</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	people, so that their continued detention can be promptly reviewed and that they might be considered for removal from detention; is that right?  A. That is certainly one of the roles of healthcare within the environment.  Q. And I just want to look, then, at the safeguards that we have spent a considerable amount of time on in this inquiry, under rules 34 and 35.  At paragraph 4 of your first witness statement, you acknowledge that rule 34 is clear that all residents should get an assessment within 24 hours and that there is an induction for all staff about the importance of rule 34; is that right?  A. Yes, that is currently the position.  Q. At paragraph 5, you raise the issue of the high rate of "Did not attends" to rule 34 appointments and that you plan to train staff to talk to detainees about the importance and the purpose of rule 34 and to encourage them to attend those appointments; is that right?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>MS SIMCOCK: Thank you, can you give your full name to the inquiry, please?</li> <li>A. I am Dr Sarah Bromley.</li> <li>Q. And you have made two statements to the inquiry, they are at <ppg000172 <ppg000173="" and="">. I am going to ask for those two statements to be adduced in full, please, and what that means, Doctor, is I don't need to ask you about every single line of those statements because they are already in evidence, but I want to ask you some questions on some particular topics. Can you please tell us what your qualifications are? A. So I have a Bachelors of Medicine and Surgery from Leeds University and I am a member of the Royal College of GPs, became a fellow of the Royal College in 2013 and I am a Senior Fellow of the Faculty of Medical Leadership and Management. Q. What is your role at PPG? A. I am the National Medical Director for Health and Justice, which means that I look after the sort of</ppg000172></li></ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	people, so that their continued detention can be promptly reviewed and that they might be considered for removal from detention; is that right?  A. That is certainly one of the roles of healthcare within the environment.  Q. And I just want to look, then, at the safeguards that we have spent a considerable amount of time on in this inquiry, under rules 34 and 35.  At paragraph 4 of your first witness statement, you acknowledge that rule 34 is clear that all residents should get an assessment within 24 hours and that there is an induction for all staff about the importance of rule 34; is that right?  A. Yes, that is currently the position.  Q. At paragraph 5, you raise the issue of the high rate of "Did not attends" to rule 34 appointments and that you plan to train staff to talk to detainees about the importance and the purpose of rule 34 and to encourage them to attend those appointments; is that right?  A. Yes.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>MS SIMCOCK: Thank you, can you give your full name to the inquiry, please?</li> <li>A. I am Dr Sarah Bromley.</li> <li>Q. And you have made two statements to the inquiry, they are at <ppg000172 <ppg000173="" and="">. I am going to ask for those two statements to be adduced in full, please, and what that means, Doctor, is I don't need to ask you about every single line of those statements because they are already in evidence, but I want to ask you some questions on some particular topics.</ppg000172></li> <li>Can you please tell us what your qualifications are?</li> <li>A. So I have a Bachelors of Medicine and Surgery from Leeds University and I am a member of the Royal College of GPs, became a fellow of the Royal College in 2013 and I am a Senior Fellow of the Faculty of Medical Leadership and Management.</li> <li>Q. What is your role at PPG?</li> <li>A. I am the National Medical Director for Health and Justice, which means that I look after the sort of clinical strategy and oversight of the secure</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	people, so that their continued detention can be promptly reviewed and that they might be considered for removal from detention; is that right?  A. That is certainly one of the roles of healthcare within the environment.  Q. And I just want to look, then, at the safeguards that we have spent a considerable amount of time on in this inquiry, under rules 34 and 35.  At paragraph 4 of your first witness statement, you acknowledge that rule 34 is clear that all residents should get an assessment within 24 hours and that there is an induction for all staff about the importance of rule 34; is that right?  A. Yes, that is currently the position.  Q. At paragraph 5, you raise the issue of the high rate of "Did not attends" to rule 34 appointments and that you plan to train staff to talk to detainees about the importance and the purpose of rule 34 and to encourage them to attend those appointments; is that right?  A. Yes.  Q. So that training hasn't yet been delivered, is that
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>MS SIMCOCK: Thank you, can you give your full name to the inquiry, please?</li> <li>A. I am Dr Sarah Bromley.</li> <li>Q. And you have made two statements to the inquiry, they are at <ppg000172 <ppg000173="" and="">. I am going to ask for those two statements to be adduced in full, please, and what that means, Doctor, is I don't need to ask you about every single line of those statements because they are already in evidence, but I want to ask you some questions on some particular topics.</ppg000172></li> <li>Can you please tell us what your qualifications are?</li> <li>A. So I have a Bachelors of Medicine and Surgery from Leeds University and I am a member of the Royal College of GPs, became a fellow of the Royal College in 2013 and I am a Senior Fellow of the Faculty of Medical Leadership and Management.</li> <li>Q. What is your role at PPG?</li> <li>A. I am the National Medical Director for Health and Justice, which means that I look after the sort of clinical strategy and oversight of the secure environments that we operate in.</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	people, so that their continued detention can be promptly reviewed and that they might be considered for removal from detention; is that right?  A. That is certainly one of the roles of healthcare within the environment.  Q. And I just want to look, then, at the safeguards that we have spent a considerable amount of time on in this inquiry, under rules 34 and 35.  At paragraph 4 of your first witness statement, you acknowledge that rule 34 is clear that all residents should get an assessment within 24 hours and that there is an induction for all staff about the importance of rule 34; is that right?  A. Yes, that is currently the position.  Q. At paragraph 5, you raise the issue of the high rate of "Did not attends" to rule 34 appointments and that you plan to train staff to talk to detainees about the importance and the purpose of rule 34 and to encourage them to attend those appointments; is that right?  A. Yes.  Q. So that training hasn't yet been delivered, is that correct?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>MS SIMCOCK: Thank you, can you give your full name to the inquiry, please?</li> <li>A. I am Dr Sarah Bromley.</li> <li>Q. And you have made two statements to the inquiry, they are at <ppg000172 <ppg000173="" and="">. I am going to ask for those two statements to be adduced in full, please, and what that means, Doctor, is I don't need to ask you about every single line of those statements because they are already in evidence, but I want to ask you some questions on some particular topics.</ppg000172></li> <li>Can you please tell us what your qualifications are?</li> <li>A. So I have a Bachelors of Medicine and Surgery from Leeds University and I am a member of the Royal College of GPs, became a fellow of the Royal College in 2013 and I am a Senior Fellow of the Faculty of Medical Leadership and Management.</li> <li>Q. What is your role at PPG?</li> <li>A. I am the National Medical Director for Health and Justice, which means that I look after the sort of clinical strategy and oversight of the secure</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	people, so that their continued detention can be promptly reviewed and that they might be considered for removal from detention; is that right?  A. That is certainly one of the roles of healthcare within the environment.  Q. And I just want to look, then, at the safeguards that we have spent a considerable amount of time on in this inquiry, under rules 34 and 35.  At paragraph 4 of your first witness statement, you acknowledge that rule 34 is clear that all residents should get an assessment within 24 hours and that there is an induction for all staff about the importance of rule 34; is that right?  A. Yes, that is currently the position.  Q. At paragraph 5, you raise the issue of the high rate of "Did not attends" to rule 34 appointments and that you plan to train staff to talk to detainees about the importance and the purpose of rule 34 and to encourage them to attend those appointments; is that right?  A. Yes.  Q. So that training hasn't yet been delivered, is that
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>MS SIMCOCK: Thank you, can you give your full name to the inquiry, please?</li> <li>A. I am Dr Sarah Bromley.</li> <li>Q. And you have made two statements to the inquiry, they are at <ppg000172 <ppg000173="" and="">. I am going to ask for those two statements to be adduced in full, please, and what that means, Doctor, is I don't need to ask you about every single line of those statements because they are already in evidence, but I want to ask you some questions on some particular topics.</ppg000172></li> <li>Can you please tell us what your qualifications are?</li> <li>A. So I have a Bachelors of Medicine and Surgery from Leeds University and I am a member of the Royal College of GPs, became a fellow of the Royal College in 2013 and I am a Senior Fellow of the Faculty of Medical Leadership and Management.</li> <li>Q. What is your role at PPG?</li> <li>A. I am the National Medical Director for Health and Justice, which means that I look after the sort of clinical strategy and oversight of the secure environments that we operate in.</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	people, so that their continued detention can be promptly reviewed and that they might be considered for removal from detention; is that right?  A. That is certainly one of the roles of healthcare within the environment.  Q. And I just want to look, then, at the safeguards that we have spent a considerable amount of time on in this inquiry, under rules 34 and 35.  At paragraph 4 of your first witness statement, you acknowledge that rule 34 is clear that all residents should get an assessment within 24 hours and that there is an induction for all staff about the importance of rule 34; is that right?  A. Yes, that is currently the position.  Q. At paragraph 5, you raise the issue of the high rate of "Did not attends" to rule 34 appointments and that you plan to train staff to talk to detainees about the importance and the purpose of rule 34 and to encourage them to attend those appointments; is that right?  A. Yes.  Q. So that training hasn't yet been delivered, is that correct?

1	Q. The intention is to complete that training by the end	1	deal more depth than I otherwise would have done, the
2	of May of this year; is that right?	2	requirements around this.
3	A. Yes, so the reception screening training is being	3	But I think my assessment from visiting the site and
4	adapted for the immigration removal environment and that	4	from listening to some of the evidence is the purpose of
5	will include information around rule 34, the importance	5	rule 34 and rule 35 have got lost in the process.
6	of it and the reasons for it, to try and help staff to	6	So people are focusing on getting the process,
7	encourage people to know what their rights are and to	7	ticking the boxes almost, without remembering why it is
8	attend for those appointments.	8	there and that it is actually a safeguarding process.
9	Q. Yes, because rule 34 is an important statutory mechanism	9	That is why I think, as my colleague said yesterday,
10	that is intended to and should lead to directly	10	we have decided to take a longer view on how we address
11	a rule 35 report at the earliest opportunity to identify	11	this issue, rather than a kind of quick-fix solution.
12	a person who possibly shouldn't be in detention because	12	Q. Yes, we will perhaps come to that in more detail in
13	they are an Adult at Risk; would you agree?	13	a moment
14	A. So I think there is a little bit too much of a direct	14	A. Sure.
15	relationship there, but, yes, in circumstances where	15	Q but what monitoring is there of the quality of that
16	somebody is unfit for detention, a rule 34 should lead	16	reception health screening process currently?
17	to a rule 35 assessment, but not necessarily for	17	A. I don't think I could point to anything that gives you
18	everybody.	18	much more than activity data. So the when somebody
19	Q. Staff don't it appears don't currently seem to be	19	undertakes a reception screening, it is recorded on the
20	explaining to detainees who decline or refuse the	20	clinical records system, system 1, and it is done via
21	rule 34 appointment, its importance, do they, and that	21	a template, so we know that it covers a range of topics
22	is clearly a training need you have identified?	22	that have been pre-agreed, and that needs to be explored
23	A. I would agree, yes.	23	at each of those reception screenings, but it doesn't
24	Q. They are not, or they certainly haven't been, up to	24	tell us much about the quality of the conversation that
25	date, informing detainees that they have a right to	25	happened at that point.
	Page 161		Page 163
	U		U
1	a full medical examination, both physical and mental,	1	Q. Does PPG intend to take any steps in the future to
2	including the possible consideration of a rule 35	2	monitor the quality of that process?
3	report, at that stage, have they?	3	A. It is quite a difficult thing to do, to find a quality
4	A. That is my understanding.	4	measure that works. So I think that will be something
5	Q. And so, in that way, the rules the staff haven't been	5	that will be subject to some audit and conversations at
6	explaining that the rules are a safeguard to identify	6	the quality assurance meeting.
7	vulnerable people to the Home Office so that their	7	There are things you can measure, you can pull out
8	detention can be reviewed, have they, to date?	8	of the records system, but it still only really tells
9	A. I am not even sure they have understood that themselves,	9	that an activity has happened, not what the quality of
10	let alone communicated that.	10	that conversation has been.
11	Q. It is clearly important that that information should be	11	Q. So that is something that PPG is considering how to do?
12	given to detainees, isn't it?	12	A. Absolutely. I just haven't got an answer for you yet.
13	A. Agreed.	13	Q. The inquiry has heard a considerable amount of evidence
14	Q. Because, otherwise, any refusal of that appointment or	14	about the operation of rules 34 and 35, and in
15	decision that they don't want to attend it is not	15	particular the inquiry has heard some evidence from
16	a properly informed one; would you agree?	16	Sandra Calver, who was, in 2017, and still is, the head
17	A. Agreed.	17	of healthcare in Brook House. Did you listen to her
18	Q. Have PPG taken any steps to date to reiterate that to	18	evidence?
19	staff conducting that reception health screening, in	19	A. I didn't see her evidence but I have read some of the
20	advance of the training being rolled out by the end	20	transcripts and I have read a summary of her evidence.
21	of May?	21	Q. She gave some evidence that GP appointments carried out
22	A. Other than informal conversations, no. I think it is	22	within the first 24 hours are now ten minutes long; in
23	fair to say that we have been on a learning curve as	23	2017, they were five minutes long. But that is not
24	well. I think the inquiry has actually been very	24	enough time to do a rule 34 compliant medical
25	helpful, from my perspective, to understand, in a great	25	examination, because it requires a full physical and
	Page 162		Page 164
	0. 3-	1	o

1	mental examination. Were you aware of that?	1	would almost be more sensible to consider
2	A. Not until I heard the evidence particularly, but it	2	vulnerabilities before the detention was even in place,
3	doesn't surprise me either, because GP appointments in	3	so that indicators of torture and pre-existing mental
4	the community are all ten minutes long, so it would	4	illness were identified before the person was even
5	stand to reason that that is excuse me translated	5	detained in the first place; would you agree with that?
6	into the environment as a standard.	6	A. That would make complete sense.
7	Q. Dr Oozeerally gave some evidence that it wasn't possible	7	Q. So improved medical screening by the Home Office prior
8	to do the sort of physical and mental state examination	8	to detention to identify vulnerabilities and decision
9	required at that initial GP appointment. He described	9	making on those unsuitable for detention under the
10	it as almost like triage. Were you aware of that?	10	Adults at Risk policy would most effectively reduce the
11	A. That is all you can do, really, in ten minutes, unless	11	pressures on the rule 34 and 35 process, wouldn't it?
12	you are dealing with a specific issue that somebody	12	A. Agreed. It makes no sense to send people to a place
13	presents with.	13	that is unsuitable for them.
14	Q. Did you watch Dr Oozeerally's evidence?	14	Q. If there was better screening, filtering out vulnerable
15	A. I watched most of it.	15	people before detention, the rules would be less likely
16	Q. He gave evidence that if there was a disclosure for	16	to be breached, wouldn't they, in detention, because
17	example, of torture in that initial appointment or	17	there would simply be less people requiring a rule 35
18	something else which raised a concern which meant there	18	report?
19	should be consideration of a rule 35 report, instead of	19	A. Agreed.
20	completing a report immediately at that time, when the	20	Q. Do you think it is likely that, without such screening,
21	disclosure or concern was raised, a further, longer	21	prior to detention, the rules will continue to be
22	appointment was made at a later time for a further	22	breached?
23	rule 35 assessment and that that built in delays. Were	23	A. Again, I don't know the answer to that yet, because I am
24	you aware of that?	24	keen to explore what we can do effectively with the
25	A. No so specifically, but I guess I would have assumed	25	resources that we have got, but I think it is likely
	Page 165		Page 167
1	that was the case, yes.	1	that it will continue to be breached, particularly as
1 2	that was the case, yes.  O. Certainly you are aware of that now, as a result of his	1 2	that it will continue to be breached, particularly as the numbers ramp up in Brook House. At the moment, my
2 3	that was the case, yes.  Q. Certainly you are aware of that now, as a result of his evidence?		the numbers ramp up in Brook House. At the moment, my
2	Q. Certainly you are aware of that now, as a result of his	2	the numbers ramp up in Brook House. At the moment, my understanding is numbers are quite low compared to where
2 3	Q. Certainly you are aware of that now, as a result of his evidence?	2 3	the numbers ramp up in Brook House. At the moment, my
2 3 4	<ul><li>Q. Certainly you are aware of that now, as a result of his evidence?</li><li>A. Yes.</li></ul>	2 3 4	the numbers ramp up in Brook House. At the moment, my understanding is numbers are quite low compared to where they may be in the future, and obviously that is
2 3 4 5	<ul><li>Q. Certainly you are aware of that now, as a result of his evidence?</li><li>A. Yes.</li><li>Q. So, whilst you are arranging GP appointments within</li></ul>	2 3 4 5	the numbers ramp up in Brook House. At the moment, my understanding is numbers are quite low compared to where they may be in the future, and obviously that is a highly variable number, but the more people that are
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Q. Certainly you are aware of that now, as a result of his evidence?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So, whilst you are arranging GP appointments within 24 hours, that appointment isn't achieving the purpose</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	the numbers ramp up in Brook House. At the moment, my understanding is numbers are quite low compared to where they may be in the future, and obviously that is a highly variable number, but the more people that are in there, the more likely it is that those timescales
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. Certainly you are aware of that now, as a result of his evidence?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So, whilst you are arranging GP appointments within 24 hours, that appointment isn't achieving the purpose of rule 34, is it; would you accept that?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	the numbers ramp up in Brook House. At the moment, my understanding is numbers are quite low compared to where they may be in the future, and obviously that is a highly variable number, but the more people that are in there, the more likely it is that those timescales would be breached.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. Certainly you are aware of that now, as a result of his evidence?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So, whilst you are arranging GP appointments within 24 hours, that appointment isn't achieving the purpose of rule 34, is it; would you accept that?</li> <li>A. No. I don't think it is quite as clear-cut when I read</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the numbers ramp up in Brook House. At the moment, my understanding is numbers are quite low compared to where they may be in the future, and obviously that is a highly variable number, but the more people that are in there, the more likely it is that those timescales would be breached.  Q. Yes, I think there are 169 detainees in Brook House at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. Certainly you are aware of that now, as a result of his evidence?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So, whilst you are arranging GP appointments within 24 hours, that appointment isn't achieving the purpose of rule 34, is it; would you accept that?</li> <li>A. No. I don't think it is quite as clear-cut when I read the rule 35 guidance, but I appreciate that it does ask</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the numbers ramp up in Brook House. At the moment, my understanding is numbers are quite low compared to where they may be in the future, and obviously that is a highly variable number, but the more people that are in there, the more likely it is that those timescales would be breached.  Q. Yes, I think there are 169 detainees in Brook House at present are you aware of that?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. Certainly you are aware of that now, as a result of his evidence?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So, whilst you are arranging GP appointments within 24 hours, that appointment isn't achieving the purpose of rule 34, is it; would you accept that?</li> <li>A. No. I don't think it is quite as clear-cut when I read the rule 35 guidance, but I appreciate that it does ask for a full physical and mental assessment, so it</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the numbers ramp up in Brook House. At the moment, my understanding is numbers are quite low compared to where they may be in the future, and obviously that is a highly variable number, but the more people that are in there, the more likely it is that those timescales would be breached.  Q. Yes, I think there are 169 detainees in Brook House at present are you aware of that?  A. Just from this morning's evidence, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q. Certainly you are aware of that now, as a result of his evidence?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So, whilst you are arranging GP appointments within 24 hours, that appointment isn't achieving the purpose of rule 34, is it; would you accept that?</li> <li>A. No. I don't think it is quite as clear-cut when I read the rule 35 guidance, but I appreciate that it does ask for a full physical and mental assessment, so it won't it won't achieve that, and I don't think it can</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the numbers ramp up in Brook House. At the moment, my understanding is numbers are quite low compared to where they may be in the future, and obviously that is a highly variable number, but the more people that are in there, the more likely it is that those timescales would be breached.  Q. Yes, I think there are 169 detainees in Brook House at present are you aware of that?  A. Just from this morning's evidence, yes.  Q. Exactly. At paragraph 7 of your witness statement, you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. Certainly you are aware of that now, as a result of his evidence?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So, whilst you are arranging GP appointments within 24 hours, that appointment isn't achieving the purpose of rule 34, is it; would you accept that?</li> <li>A. No. I don't think it is quite as clear-cut when I read the rule 35 guidance, but I appreciate that it does ask for a full physical and mental assessment, so it won't — it won't achieve that, and I don't think it can achieve a decision at the end of that period about</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the numbers ramp up in Brook House. At the moment, my understanding is numbers are quite low compared to where they may be in the future, and obviously that is a highly variable number, but the more people that are in there, the more likely it is that those timescales would be breached.  Q. Yes, I think there are 169 detainees in Brook House at present are you aware of that?  A. Just from this morning's evidence, yes.  Q. Exactly. At paragraph 7 of your witness statement, you say that staff have been made aware through induction of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. Certainly you are aware of that now, as a result of his evidence?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So, whilst you are arranging GP appointments within 24 hours, that appointment isn't achieving the purpose of rule 34, is it; would you accept that?</li> <li>A. No. I don't think it is quite as clear-cut when I read the rule 35 guidance, but I appreciate that it does ask for a full physical and mental assessment, so it won't — it won't achieve that, and I don't think it can achieve a decision at the end of that period about whether somebody is fit for detention.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the numbers ramp up in Brook House. At the moment, my understanding is numbers are quite low compared to where they may be in the future, and obviously that is a highly variable number, but the more people that are in there, the more likely it is that those timescales would be breached.  Q. Yes, I think there are 169 detainees in Brook House at present are you aware of that?  A. Just from this morning's evidence, yes.  Q. Exactly. At paragraph 7 of your witness statement, you say that staff have been made aware through induction of the process for obtaining a rule 35 report. But we know
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. Certainly you are aware of that now, as a result of his evidence?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So, whilst you are arranging GP appointments within 24 hours, that appointment isn't achieving the purpose of rule 34, is it; would you accept that?</li> <li>A. No. I don't think it is quite as clear-cut when I read the rule 35 guidance, but I appreciate that it does ask for a full physical and mental assessment, so it won't it won't achieve that, and I don't think it can achieve a decision at the end of that period about whether somebody is fit for detention.</li> <li>Q. Or indeed the completion of the report?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the numbers ramp up in Brook House. At the moment, my understanding is numbers are quite low compared to where they may be in the future, and obviously that is a highly variable number, but the more people that are in there, the more likely it is that those timescales would be breached.  Q. Yes, I think there are 169 detainees in Brook House at present are you aware of that?  A. Just from this morning's evidence, yes.  Q. Exactly. At paragraph 7 of your witness statement, you say that staff have been made aware through induction of the process for obtaining a rule 35 report. But we know from the evidence of both Dr Oozeerally and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. Certainly you are aware of that now, as a result of his evidence?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So, whilst you are arranging GP appointments within 24 hours, that appointment isn't achieving the purpose of rule 34, is it; would you accept that?</li> <li>A. No. I don't think it is quite as clear-cut when I read the rule 35 guidance, but I appreciate that it does ask for a full physical and mental assessment, so it won't it won't achieve that, and I don't think it can achieve a decision at the end of that period about whether somebody is fit for detention.</li> <li>Q. Or indeed the completion of the report?</li> <li>A. Or the completion of the report, no.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the numbers ramp up in Brook House. At the moment, my understanding is numbers are quite low compared to where they may be in the future, and obviously that is a highly variable number, but the more people that are in there, the more likely it is that those timescales would be breached.  Q. Yes, I think there are 169 detainees in Brook House at present are you aware of that?  A. Just from this morning's evidence, yes.  Q. Exactly. At paragraph 7 of your witness statement, you say that staff have been made aware through induction of the process for obtaining a rule 35 report. But we know from the evidence of both Dr Oozeerally and Sandra Calver that they are not, in fact, being
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. Certainly you are aware of that now, as a result of his evidence?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So, whilst you are arranging GP appointments within 24 hours, that appointment isn't achieving the purpose of rule 34, is it; would you accept that?</li> <li>A. No. I don't think it is quite as clear-cut when I read the rule 35 guidance, but I appreciate that it does ask for a full physical and mental assessment, so it won't it won't achieve that, and I don't think it can achieve a decision at the end of that period about whether somebody is fit for detention.</li> <li>Q. Or indeed the completion of the report?</li> <li>A. Or the completion of the report, no.</li> <li>Q. And so it is not feasible within the way things are</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the numbers ramp up in Brook House. At the moment, my understanding is numbers are quite low compared to where they may be in the future, and obviously that is a highly variable number, but the more people that are in there, the more likely it is that those timescales would be breached.  Q. Yes, I think there are 169 detainees in Brook House at present are you aware of that?  A. Just from this morning's evidence, yes.  Q. Exactly. At paragraph 7 of your witness statement, you say that staff have been made aware through induction of the process for obtaining a rule 35 report. But we know from the evidence of both Dr Oozeerally and Sandra Calver that they are not, in fact, being completed as a result of those initial appointments
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. Certainly you are aware of that now, as a result of his evidence?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So, whilst you are arranging GP appointments within 24 hours, that appointment isn't achieving the purpose of rule 34, is it; would you accept that?</li> <li>A. No. I don't think it is quite as clear-cut when I read the rule 35 guidance, but I appreciate that it does ask for a full physical and mental assessment, so it won't it won't achieve that, and I don't think it can achieve a decision at the end of that period about whether somebody is fit for detention.</li> <li>Q. Or indeed the completion of the report?</li> <li>A. Or the completion of the report, no.</li> <li>Q. And so it is not feasible within the way things are currently arranged in terms of ten minutes ten-minute</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the numbers ramp up in Brook House. At the moment, my understanding is numbers are quite low compared to where they may be in the future, and obviously that is a highly variable number, but the more people that are in there, the more likely it is that those timescales would be breached.  Q. Yes, I think there are 169 detainees in Brook House at present are you aware of that?  A. Just from this morning's evidence, yes.  Q. Exactly. At paragraph 7 of your witness statement, you say that staff have been made aware through induction of the process for obtaining a rule 35 report. But we know from the evidence of both Dr Oozeerally and Sandra Calver that they are not, in fact, being completed as a result of those initial appointments within 24 hours because that appointment isn't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. Certainly you are aware of that now, as a result of his evidence?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So, whilst you are arranging GP appointments within 24 hours, that appointment isn't achieving the purpose of rule 34, is it; would you accept that?</li> <li>A. No. I don't think it is quite as clear-cut when I read the rule 35 guidance, but I appreciate that it does ask for a full physical and mental assessment, so it won't it won't achieve that, and I don't think it can achieve a decision at the end of that period about whether somebody is fit for detention.</li> <li>Q. Or indeed the completion of the report?</li> <li>A. Or the completion of the report, no.</li> <li>Q. And so it is not feasible within the way things are currently arranged in terms of ten minutes ten-minute appointments. Would you agree that more resources are</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the numbers ramp up in Brook House. At the moment, my understanding is numbers are quite low compared to where they may be in the future, and obviously that is a highly variable number, but the more people that are in there, the more likely it is that those timescales would be breached.  Q. Yes, I think there are 169 detainees in Brook House at present are you aware of that?  A. Just from this morning's evidence, yes.  Q. Exactly. At paragraph 7 of your witness statement, you say that staff have been made aware through induction of the process for obtaining a rule 35 report. But we know from the evidence of both Dr Oozeerally and Sandra Calver that they are not, in fact, being completed as a result of those initial appointments within 24 hours because that appointment isn't an effective rule 34 appointment.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. Certainly you are aware of that now, as a result of his evidence?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So, whilst you are arranging GP appointments within 24 hours, that appointment isn't achieving the purpose of rule 34, is it; would you accept that?</li> <li>A. No. I don't think it is quite as clear-cut when I read the rule 35 guidance, but I appreciate that it does ask for a full physical and mental assessment, so it won't it won't achieve that, and I don't think it can achieve a decision at the end of that period about whether somebody is fit for detention.</li> <li>Q. Or indeed the completion of the report?</li> <li>A. Or the completion of the report, no.</li> <li>Q. And so it is not feasible within the way things are currently arranged in terms of ten minutes ten-minute appointments. Would you agree that more resources are needed to comply with the requirements of rule 34 than</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the numbers ramp up in Brook House. At the moment, my understanding is numbers are quite low compared to where they may be in the future, and obviously that is a highly variable number, but the more people that are in there, the more likely it is that those timescales would be breached.  Q. Yes, I think there are 169 detainees in Brook House at present are you aware of that?  A. Just from this morning's evidence, yes.  Q. Exactly. At paragraph 7 of your witness statement, you say that staff have been made aware through induction of the process for obtaining a rule 35 report. But we know from the evidence of both Dr Oozeerally and Sandra Calver that they are not, in fact, being completed as a result of those initial appointments within 24 hours because that appointment isn't an effective rule 34 appointment.  Is that your understanding of the current situation?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. Certainly you are aware of that now, as a result of his evidence?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So, whilst you are arranging GP appointments within 24 hours, that appointment isn't achieving the purpose of rule 34, is it; would you accept that?</li> <li>A. No. I don't think it is quite as clear-cut when I read the rule 35 guidance, but I appreciate that it does ask for a full physical and mental assessment, so it won't it won't achieve that, and I don't think it can achieve a decision at the end of that period about whether somebody is fit for detention.</li> <li>Q. Or indeed the completion of the report?</li> <li>A. Or the completion of the report, no.</li> <li>Q. And so it is not feasible within the way things are currently arranged in terms of ten minutes ten-minute appointments. Would you agree that more resources are needed to comply with the requirements of rule 34 than are currently allocated?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the numbers ramp up in Brook House. At the moment, my understanding is numbers are quite low compared to where they may be in the future, and obviously that is a highly variable number, but the more people that are in there, the more likely it is that those timescales would be breached.  Q. Yes, I think there are 169 detainees in Brook House at present are you aware of that?  A. Just from this morning's evidence, yes.  Q. Exactly. At paragraph 7 of your witness statement, you say that staff have been made aware through induction of the process for obtaining a rule 35 report. But we know from the evidence of both Dr Oozeerally and Sandra Calver that they are not, in fact, being completed as a result of those initial appointments within 24 hours because that appointment isn't an effective rule 34 appointment.  Is that your understanding of the current situation?  A. My understanding, at the moment, is that the rule 35
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. Certainly you are aware of that now, as a result of his evidence?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So, whilst you are arranging GP appointments within 24 hours, that appointment isn't achieving the purpose of rule 34, is it; would you accept that?</li> <li>A. No. I don't think it is quite as clear-cut when I read the rule 35 guidance, but I appreciate that it does ask for a full physical and mental assessment, so it won't it won't achieve that, and I don't think it can achieve a decision at the end of that period about whether somebody is fit for detention.</li> <li>Q. Or indeed the completion of the report?</li> <li>A. Or the completion of the report, no.</li> <li>Q. And so it is not feasible within the way things are currently arranged in terms of ten minutes ten-minute appointments. Would you agree that more resources are needed to comply with the requirements of rule 34 than are currently allocated?</li> <li>A. I don't know yet. That is something that I am keen to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the numbers ramp up in Brook House. At the moment, my understanding is numbers are quite low compared to where they may be in the future, and obviously that is a highly variable number, but the more people that are in there, the more likely it is that those timescales would be breached.  Q. Yes, I think there are 169 detainees in Brook House at present are you aware of that?  A. Just from this morning's evidence, yes.  Q. Exactly. At paragraph 7 of your witness statement, you say that staff have been made aware through induction of the process for obtaining a rule 35 report. But we know from the evidence of both Dr Oozeerally and Sandra Calver that they are not, in fact, being completed as a result of those initial appointments within 24 hours because that appointment isn't an effective rule 34 appointment.  Is that your understanding of the current situation?  A. My understanding, at the moment, is that the rule 35 process is failing at various points through the system,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. Certainly you are aware of that now, as a result of his evidence?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So, whilst you are arranging GP appointments within 24 hours, that appointment isn't achieving the purpose of rule 34, is it; would you accept that?</li> <li>A. No. I don't think it is quite as clear-cut when I read the rule 35 guidance, but I appreciate that it does ask for a full physical and mental assessment, so it won't it won't achieve that, and I don't think it can achieve a decision at the end of that period about whether somebody is fit for detention.</li> <li>Q. Or indeed the completion of the report?</li> <li>A. Or the completion of the report, no.</li> <li>Q. And so it is not feasible within the way things are currently arranged in terms of ten minutes ten-minute appointments. Would you agree that more resources are needed to comply with the requirements of rule 34 than are currently allocated?</li> <li>A. I don't know yet. That is something that I am keen to explore with the teams to see if we can do things</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the numbers ramp up in Brook House. At the moment, my understanding is numbers are quite low compared to where they may be in the future, and obviously that is a highly variable number, but the more people that are in there, the more likely it is that those timescales would be breached.  Q. Yes, I think there are 169 detainees in Brook House at present are you aware of that?  A. Just from this morning's evidence, yes.  Q. Exactly. At paragraph 7 of your witness statement, you say that staff have been made aware through induction of the process for obtaining a rule 35 report. But we know from the evidence of both Dr Oozeerally and Sandra Calver that they are not, in fact, being completed as a result of those initial appointments within 24 hours because that appointment isn't an effective rule 34 appointment.  Is that your understanding of the current situation?  A. My understanding, at the moment, is that the rule 35 process is failing at various points through the system, one of which is from reception through to that first
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. Certainly you are aware of that now, as a result of his evidence?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So, whilst you are arranging GP appointments within 24 hours, that appointment isn't achieving the purpose of rule 34, is it; would you accept that?</li> <li>A. No. I don't think it is quite as clear-cut when I read the rule 35 guidance, but I appreciate that it does ask for a full physical and mental assessment, so it won't it won't achieve that, and I don't think it can achieve a decision at the end of that period about whether somebody is fit for detention.</li> <li>Q. Or indeed the completion of the report?</li> <li>A. Or the completion of the report, no.</li> <li>Q. And so it is not feasible within the way things are currently arranged in terms of ten minutes ten-minute appointments. Would you agree that more resources are needed to comply with the requirements of rule 34 than are currently allocated?</li> <li>A. I don't know yet. That is something that I am keen to explore with the teams to see if we can do things differently, to understand how to make that system work</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the numbers ramp up in Brook House. At the moment, my understanding is numbers are quite low compared to where they may be in the future, and obviously that is a highly variable number, but the more people that are in there, the more likely it is that those timescales would be breached.  Q. Yes, I think there are 169 detainees in Brook House at present are you aware of that?  A. Just from this morning's evidence, yes.  Q. Exactly. At paragraph 7 of your witness statement, you say that staff have been made aware through induction of the process for obtaining a rule 35 report. But we know from the evidence of both Dr Oozeerally and Sandra Calver that they are not, in fact, being completed as a result of those initial appointments within 24 hours because that appointment isn't an effective rule 34 appointment.  Is that your understanding of the current situation?  A. My understanding, at the moment, is that the rule 35 process is failing at various points through the system, one of which is from reception through to that first opportunity to assess somebody.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. Certainly you are aware of that now, as a result of his evidence?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So, whilst you are arranging GP appointments within 24 hours, that appointment isn't achieving the purpose of rule 34, is it; would you accept that?</li> <li>A. No. I don't think it is quite as clear-cut when I read the rule 35 guidance, but I appreciate that it does ask for a full physical and mental assessment, so it won't it won't achieve that, and I don't think it can achieve a decision at the end of that period about whether somebody is fit for detention.</li> <li>Q. Or indeed the completion of the report?</li> <li>A. Or the completion of the report, no.</li> <li>Q. And so it is not feasible within the way things are currently arranged in terms of ten minutes ten-minute appointments. Would you agree that more resources are needed to comply with the requirements of rule 34 than are currently allocated?</li> <li>A. I don't know yet. That is something that I am keen to explore with the teams to see if we can do things differently, to understand how to make that system work effectively.</li> <li>Q. Dr Oozeerally also said that he would argue that it</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the numbers ramp up in Brook House. At the moment, my understanding is numbers are quite low compared to where they may be in the future, and obviously that is a highly variable number, but the more people that are in there, the more likely it is that those timescales would be breached.  Q. Yes, I think there are 169 detainees in Brook House at present are you aware of that?  A. Just from this morning's evidence, yes.  Q. Exactly. At paragraph 7 of your witness statement, you say that staff have been made aware through induction of the process for obtaining a rule 35 report. But we know from the evidence of both Dr Oozeerally and Sandra Calver that they are not, in fact, being completed as a result of those initial appointments within 24 hours because that appointment isn't an effective rule 34 appointment.  Is that your understanding of the current situation?  A. My understanding, at the moment, is that the rule 35 process is failing at various points through the system, one of which is from reception through to that first opportunity to assess somebody.  Q. Yes, so it is failing at that initial stage when someone comes into detention; would you agree?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. Certainly you are aware of that now, as a result of his evidence?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So, whilst you are arranging GP appointments within 24 hours, that appointment isn't achieving the purpose of rule 34, is it; would you accept that?</li> <li>A. No. I don't think it is quite as clear-cut when I read the rule 35 guidance, but I appreciate that it does ask for a full physical and mental assessment, so it won't — it won't achieve that, and I don't think it can achieve a decision at the end of that period about whether somebody is fit for detention.</li> <li>Q. Or indeed the completion of the report?</li> <li>A. Or the completion of the report, no.</li> <li>Q. And so it is not feasible within the way things are currently arranged in terms of ten minutes — ten-minute appointments. Would you agree that more resources are needed to comply with the requirements of rule 34 than are currently allocated?</li> <li>A. I don't know yet. That is something that I am keen to explore with the teams to see if we can do things differently, to understand how to make that system work effectively.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the numbers ramp up in Brook House. At the moment, my understanding is numbers are quite low compared to where they may be in the future, and obviously that is a highly variable number, but the more people that are in there, the more likely it is that those timescales would be breached.  Q. Yes, I think there are 169 detainees in Brook House at present are you aware of that?  A. Just from this morning's evidence, yes.  Q. Exactly. At paragraph 7 of your witness statement, you say that staff have been made aware through induction of the process for obtaining a rule 35 report. But we know from the evidence of both Dr Oozeerally and Sandra Calver that they are not, in fact, being completed as a result of those initial appointments within 24 hours because that appointment isn't an effective rule 34 appointment.  Is that your understanding of the current situation?  A. My understanding, at the moment, is that the rule 35 process is failing at various points through the system, one of which is from reception through to that first opportunity to assess somebody.  Q. Yes, so it is failing at that initial stage when someone

1 1 A. At times. Obviously, sometimes, it works, but other deliver care that meets their needs. 2 So by adopting a person-centred approach on arrival, 2 times, it doesn't. 3 3 Q. And as we have established, the rule 34 is particularly we can do a better job, but I think that that works best 4 important to identify vulnerability at the outset of 4 when you have a multidisciplinary team as part of that 5 detention and inform the Home Office through rule 35 5 assessment because then we have a wider understanding 6 because of the absence of prior screening; would you 6 that can inform that assessment by the doctor under 7 agree with that? 7 rule 35, acknowledging that it is the GP that needs to 8 8 complete the assessment. A. Let me just untangle that for a second. So, if people 9 But that broader multidisciplinary assessment -don't come to us, that makes more sense --10 10 Q. But if they are, because they are not being screened -sorry, I keep hitting the microphone -- from the mental 11 11 A. -- if they are screened out, but if they do come to us, health team, from the nursing staff that are involved, 12 it is important to pick up their vulnerabilities at that 12 can actually give a much more holistic picture of 13 point, in order to inform a rule 35 assessment, in order 13 somebody's needs and vulnerabilities than one single to inform the Home Office decision about the suitability 14 14 appointment will do with a GP. 15 15 Q. Yes, agreed, in relation to providing any care or 16 16 meeting their needs in detention, but of course the Q. Yes, at the earliest, very earliest, opportunity of them 17 coming into detention? 17 importance of the safeguards is to notify the 18 A. Yes. 18 Home Office, so that they are required to undertake 19 Q. Your staff don't appear to be doing that on the ground, 19 a review of their detention, potentially to route those 20 currently. Do you think that is because of a lack of 20 vulnerable people out of detention; that is right, 21 understanding of the purpose of rule 34 and 35 working 21 22 together? 22 A. I agree, but what I would say is this: when people come 23 23 into an environment, a secure environment, whether that A. I think there might be a number of reasons for that. 24 One may be a lack of understanding. I think showing 24 be prison or immigration removal, it is an overwhelming 25 25 somebody a piece of paper about what to do doesn't and frightening experience; people don't know what the Page 169 Page 171 1 necessarily help them to understand it properly; hence 1 rules of engagement are, they don't know if they are 2 2 the plan for training. going to be safe, there are a number of things that will 3 But I think, again, my reading of what is happening, 3 be affecting them at that point. So whether you get 4 and from the visits I have done, there is a great deal 4 a full picture of their vulnerabilities at that point is 5 5 of custom and practice which is in Gatwick, but is also highly debatable, and a lot of it is about needing to 6 prevalent across other parts of the immigration removal 6 build a rapport and trust with people, in order to 7 estate, as I understand it. So some of what we need to enable them to be able to open up and trust you to be 8 able to disclose their vulnerabilities. So I am not do is to challenge custom and practice and the Q interpretation of the rules that have happened to date. 9 convinced that one single appointment will achieve that. 10 Q. And even if your staff understand what needs to be done 10 Q. No, and, of course, rule 35 is not about one single 11 under rule 34, working together with rule 35, at present 11 appointment, is it? It is an ongoing safeguard for 12 they don't have sufficient resources to do it because 12 whatever time the detainee is in detention? 13 the appointments are only ten minutes long; do you agree 13 A. Agreed, and this is why I said earlier I think it is 14 14 with that? failing at multiple points, because I think it is being 15 15 A. So I agree that the ten-minute appointments are not long seen as a process to fulfil a task, rather than 16 enough to undertake a full physical and mental health 16 a safeguarding process to look after people who are very 17 17 vulnerable in the environment and that is a culture 18 Whether the resources are there or not, I don't know 18 shift that we have work to do on. 19 19 still, yet. We are looking at alternative models about Q. Is the Home Office aware of the allocation of resources 20 how we better assess people on arrival in immigration 20 of ten-minute appointments for rule 34 appointments? As 21 removal centres, and my personal view is that time spent 2.1 far as you know? 22 up front is time well spent. Even if people remain in 22 A. I don't know. I would assume so, but I don't know. detention, having a greater understanding of their 23 23 Q. Is the allocation of resources something that PPG is 24 physical and mental health needs has to be of benefit in 24 going to be raising with the Home Office in this regard? 25 terms of planning for their care and making sure that we 25 A. Once we have undertaken our exercise to look at the Page 170 Page 172

1	process and how it is working and begun to understand,	1	A. It is a concern.
2	if there is any immediate changes that we can make, that	2	Q. In relation to rule 35, your colleague, Mr Wells, said,
3	are straightforward without requiring further resources,	3	at paragraph 15 of his statement, that provision is also
4	then we will definitely be including the Home Office and	4	made for two rule 35 appointments per day over and above
5	wider partnerships in our discussions about how we move	5	provision for primary care services and also separate to
6	forward.	6	those rule 34 ten-minute appointments.
7	Q. At paragraph 8 of your first witness statement, you deal	7	Do you consider that to be sufficient provision?
8	with training staff in the identification of conditions	8	A. I suspect not. That is something that we have inherited
9	that may be detrimentally affected by detention. Does	9	as practice and I think, again, as the numbers ramp up
10	that training cover nurses only or is that all staff?	10	within Brook House, that is going to have to be reviewed
11	A. No, I think it needs to be all staff. And the reception	11	in order to make sure that we have got adequate
12	screening would largely be directed at nursing staff	12	provision.
13	because it is them who see people when they first	13	Q. Yes. You are aware that a high proportion of detainees
14	arrive. But the rule 35 training we are developing will	14	in immigration detention have clinically significant
15	also be training doctors and more senior nurses to	15	levels of depression, PTSD and anxiety; is that right?
16	understand those conditions as well.	16	A. Of course.
17	Q. What is your understanding of the conditions that may be	17	Q. Are you also aware that PTSD is frequently linked with
18	detrimentally affected by detention?	18	a history of torture or other forms of serious
19	A. That is actually quite a difficult question to answer.	19	ill-treatment?
20	I know it is in the Adults at Risk policy that is	20	A. Yes.
21	defined in terms of the vulnerabilities, so it may be	21	Q. Would you agree that detention is likely to precipitate
22	a number of physical health conditions, and it depends	22	significant deterioration of mental health in the
23	on the severity of those conditions, frequent	23	majority of cases?
24	hospitalisation, for example, people who are elderly,	24	A. Yes. I don't know about how you define "majority" but,
25	people with mental ill-health, people who are suicidal,	25	yes, it is likely to precipitate a deterioration.
	Page 173		Page 175
		1	O It was for any only in many side of all house and
1	and people who have been victims of trauma, torture and	1	Q. It can, for example, increase a risk of self-harm and
2	slavery and so on.	2	suicidal ideation?
3	Q. Is it intended that the training covers the Adults at	3	A. It can.
4	Risk statutory guidance and the list of vulnerabilities?	4	Q. And given the high prevalence of PTSD in people who are
5	A. It certainly will do, but we also reached out to the	5	likely to have a history of torture or ill-treatment in
6	Faculty of Forensic and Legal Medicine for some help	6	their past, who are likely to be harmed by being in
7	with that training as well, particularly in terms of the	7	detention, their prompt identification to the
8	identification of symptoms and signs of trauma and	8	Home Office is essential so that their detention can be
9	torture, because they have a great deal of experience	9	reviewed; would you agree?
10	working in police custody, and so on, in terms of	10	A. I would agree but what I would say is that unless
11	identifying identification and giving an opinion,	11	somebody has been previously diagnosed with PTSD,
12	which I understand has been one of the criticisms of the	12	that is not quite as straightforward as it sounds.
13	rule 35 reports to date.	13	Q. Dr Oozeerally gave some evidence that there are
14	Q. Is the training intended also to make clear that the	14	currently delays in getting through the number of
15	Adults at Risk policy in those indicators of risk is	15	rule 35s that need to be done, and there is a waiting
16	connected to the use of the statutory safeguards under	16	list because only one rule 35 is done a day.
17	rule 35?	17	Would you accept that it is likely that, whether it
18	A. Yes. I mean, it is quite interesting, I having read	18	is one or two, there is going to need to be more
19	through the documentation, you have to look quite hard	19	resources allocated to the rule 35 process, as you say,
20	to see the connection between the Adults at Risk policy	20	once numbers start to increase?
21	and the rule 35 assessments but it is there. But	21	A. I think that is likely. It is something that we will
22	I think people do see them there does seem to be	22	have to keep under close monitoring to understand what
23	a tendency to see them as completely separate, which is	23	the waiting times are and be able to respond quickly
24	unfortunate.	24	when they if they increase.
25	Q. That is a concern?	25	Q. Your role, as you have described, at paragraph 1 of your
		1	
	Page 174		Page 176

1	ita	1	-4 4bb -1 d d d b
2	witness statement is governance and the quality of	1	at the whole process and understand how we get better
2	healthcare; is that right?	2	training and understanding in the GPs working there.
3	A. Yes.	3	Q. Some evidence was given from Medical Justice of the
4	Q. You say, at paragraph 36 of your first witness	4	types of deficiencies that they have seen in their case
5	statement, that rule 35 training was previously provided	5	work in relation to rule 35 reports and their quality
6	by the Home Office and NHS England but this has not been	6	and Dr Hard, in his live evidence, agreed that there
7	offered over recent years.	7	were various different deficiencies as they described in
8	You say, at paragraph 37, that currently	8	the majority of the reports he had seen.
9	DoctorPA Limited, your GP partner, provide new GPs with	9	Sometimes, because of the misapplication of
10	a slide set about the rule 35 process and an example of	10	threshold for a report, sometimes the failure to
11	a good rule 35 submission. This is discussed with a GP	11	identify the mental health consequences of torture, as
12	to ensure understanding of the process.	12	I have mentioned, a failure to consider the impact of
13	On what basis did you assess the example provided	13	detention, despite the fact that the form directs the
14	was a good rule 35 submission?	14	doctor to do so; and a lack of recognition that having
15	A. So I didn't and it was a question that I asked myself	15	a history of torture makes someone vulnerable to harm in
16	when I went into Brook House, as to who has defined what	16	detention.
17	a good one looks like, and I haven't actually had	17	Dr Hard was of the view in his evidence that, in the
18	a satisfactory answer to that.	18	circumstances where Dr Oozeerally's training was likely
19	I am not sure I think there has been some	19	to have been inadequate, and these various deficiencies
20	evidence given as well about oversight of the quality of	20	were in so many of the reports, it wasn't acceptable for
21	rule 35 reports, there doesn't seem to be any standard.	21	him to be training other GPs. Do you have any comment
22	With the training, I wasn't around when the training	22	upon that, given that it seems he still is training
23	was provided by NHS England and the Home Office, it is	23	other GPs?
24	something I have had reported to me, but it certainly	24	A. I think there is no training out there for rule 35
25	hasn't been repeated, so understanding expectations is	25	assessments. Certainly none that we have been able to
	Page 177		Page 179
	1 age 1//		1 age 179
1	something that I think has been difficult for GPs	1	C 1 C 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
	***************************************	1	find. So people have had to make do and produce
2	working in this environment. It is one of the reasons	2	something themselves. I think it is a deficiency
2	· ·		
	working in this environment. It is one of the reasons	2	something themselves. I think it is a deficiency
3	working in this environment. It is one of the reasons why we have decided to take the approach that we have to	2 3	something themselves. I think it is a deficiency generally across the immigration removal estate and
3 4	working in this environment. It is one of the reasons why we have decided to take the approach that we have to look at what good looks like and to try and understand	2 3 4	something themselves. I think it is a deficiency generally across the immigration removal estate and something that we are keen to address by developing some
3 4 5	working in this environment. It is one of the reasons why we have decided to take the approach that we have to look at what good looks like and to try and understand how we then train people to do that, not just as	2 3 4 5	something themselves. I think it is a deficiency generally across the immigration removal estate and something that we are keen to address by developing some training. So yes, whilst it is a concern, it is
3 4 5 6	working in this environment. It is one of the reasons why we have decided to take the approach that we have to look at what good looks like and to try and understand how we then train people to do that, not just as a one-off but as a regular refresher, in terms of doing	2 3 4 5 6	something themselves. I think it is a deficiency generally across the immigration removal estate and something that we are keen to address by developing some training. So yes, whilst it is a concern, it is something that we are addressing at the moment but
3 4 5 6 7	working in this environment. It is one of the reasons why we have decided to take the approach that we have to look at what good looks like and to try and understand how we then train people to do that, not just as a one-off but as a regular refresher, in terms of doing high quality rule 35 reports.	2 3 4 5 6 7	something themselves. I think it is a deficiency generally across the immigration removal estate and something that we are keen to address by developing some training. So yes, whilst it is a concern, it is something that we are addressing at the moment but I don't think it is peculiar to Gatwick.
3 4 5 6 7 8	working in this environment. It is one of the reasons why we have decided to take the approach that we have to look at what good looks like and to try and understand how we then train people to do that, not just as a one-off but as a regular refresher, in terms of doing high quality rule 35 reports.  Q. Are you aware that Dr Hard looked at over 80 rule 35	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	something themselves. I think it is a deficiency generally across the immigration removal estate and something that we are keen to address by developing some training. So yes, whilst it is a concern, it is something that we are addressing at the moment but I don't think it is peculiar to Gatwick.  Q. Has the deficiencies in those reports, in particular
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	working in this environment. It is one of the reasons why we have decided to take the approach that we have to look at what good looks like and to try and understand how we then train people to do that, not just as a one-off but as a regular refresher, in terms of doing high quality rule 35 reports.  Q. Are you aware that Dr Hard looked at over 80 rule 35 reports from the relevant period in 2017 and found that,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	something themselves. I think it is a deficiency generally across the immigration removal estate and something that we are keen to address by developing some training. So yes, whilst it is a concern, it is something that we are addressing at the moment but I don't think it is peculiar to Gatwick.  Q. Has the deficiencies in those reports, in particular that they, for the most part, failed to consider the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	working in this environment. It is one of the reasons why we have decided to take the approach that we have to look at what good looks like and to try and understand how we then train people to do that, not just as a one-off but as a regular refresher, in terms of doing high quality rule 35 reports.  Q. Are you aware that Dr Hard looked at over 80 rule 35 reports from the relevant period in 2017 and found that, in 75 per cent, roughly, of the cases, that they were	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	something themselves. I think it is a deficiency generally across the immigration removal estate and something that we are keen to address by developing some training. So yes, whilst it is a concern, it is something that we are addressing at the moment but I don't think it is peculiar to Gatwick.  Q. Has the deficiencies in those reports, in particular that they, for the most part, failed to consider the impact of detention, been taken up with Dr Oozeerally to
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	working in this environment. It is one of the reasons why we have decided to take the approach that we have to look at what good looks like and to try and understand how we then train people to do that, not just as a one-off but as a regular refresher, in terms of doing high quality rule 35 reports.  Q. Are you aware that Dr Hard looked at over 80 rule 35 reports from the relevant period in 2017 and found that, in 75 per cent, roughly, of the cases, that they were inadequate, in particular because there had been no	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	something themselves. I think it is a deficiency generally across the immigration removal estate and something that we are keen to address by developing some training. So yes, whilst it is a concern, it is something that we are addressing at the moment but I don't think it is peculiar to Gatwick.  Q. Has the deficiencies in those reports, in particular that they, for the most part, failed to consider the impact of detention, been taken up with Dr Oozeerally to date?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	working in this environment. It is one of the reasons why we have decided to take the approach that we have to look at what good looks like and to try and understand how we then train people to do that, not just as a one-off but as a regular refresher, in terms of doing high quality rule 35 reports.  Q. Are you aware that Dr Hard looked at over 80 rule 35 reports from the relevant period in 2017 and found that, in 75 per cent, roughly, of the cases, that they were inadequate, in particular because there had been no assessment or recording of the continued impact of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	something themselves. I think it is a deficiency generally across the immigration removal estate and something that we are keen to address by developing some training. So yes, whilst it is a concern, it is something that we are addressing at the moment but I don't think it is peculiar to Gatwick.  Q. Has the deficiencies in those reports, in particular that they, for the most part, failed to consider the impact of detention, been taken up with Dr Oozeerally to date?  A. I haven't had a conversation with him about it.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	working in this environment. It is one of the reasons why we have decided to take the approach that we have to look at what good looks like and to try and understand how we then train people to do that, not just as a one-off but as a regular refresher, in terms of doing high quality rule 35 reports.  Q. Are you aware that Dr Hard looked at over 80 rule 35 reports from the relevant period in 2017 and found that, in 75 per cent, roughly, of the cases, that they were inadequate, in particular because there had been no assessment or recording of the continued impact of detention?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	something themselves. I think it is a deficiency generally across the immigration removal estate and something that we are keen to address by developing some training. So yes, whilst it is a concern, it is something that we are addressing at the moment but I don't think it is peculiar to Gatwick.  Q. Has the deficiencies in those reports, in particular that they, for the most part, failed to consider the impact of detention, been taken up with Dr Oozeerally to date?  A. I haven't had a conversation with him about it.  Q. Why not? Because I appreciate the the lack of
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	working in this environment. It is one of the reasons why we have decided to take the approach that we have to look at what good looks like and to try and understand how we then train people to do that, not just as a one-off but as a regular refresher, in terms of doing high quality rule 35 reports.  Q. Are you aware that Dr Hard looked at over 80 rule 35 reports from the relevant period in 2017 and found that, in 75 per cent, roughly, of the cases, that they were inadequate, in particular because there had been no assessment or recording of the continued impact of detention?  A. Yes, I read his report and listened to some of his	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	something themselves. I think it is a deficiency generally across the immigration removal estate and something that we are keen to address by developing some training. So yes, whilst it is a concern, it is something that we are addressing at the moment but I don't think it is peculiar to Gatwick.  Q. Has the deficiencies in those reports, in particular that they, for the most part, failed to consider the impact of detention, been taken up with Dr Oozeerally to date?  A. I haven't had a conversation with him about it.  Q. Why not? Because I appreciate the the lack of training out there, but isn't it a relatively
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	working in this environment. It is one of the reasons why we have decided to take the approach that we have to look at what good looks like and to try and understand how we then train people to do that, not just as a one-off but as a regular refresher, in terms of doing high quality rule 35 reports.  Q. Are you aware that Dr Hard looked at over 80 rule 35 reports from the relevant period in 2017 and found that, in 75 per cent, roughly, of the cases, that they were inadequate, in particular because there had been no assessment or recording of the continued impact of detention?  A. Yes, I read his report and listened to some of his evidence on that and that is one of the reasons why we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	something themselves. I think it is a deficiency generally across the immigration removal estate and something that we are keen to address by developing some training. So yes, whilst it is a concern, it is something that we are addressing at the moment but I don't think it is peculiar to Gatwick.  Q. Has the deficiencies in those reports, in particular that they, for the most part, failed to consider the impact of detention, been taken up with Dr Oozeerally to date?  A. I haven't had a conversation with him about it.  Q. Why not? Because I appreciate the the lack of training out there, but isn't it a relatively straightforward thing to bring up with him that,
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	working in this environment. It is one of the reasons why we have decided to take the approach that we have to look at what good looks like and to try and understand how we then train people to do that, not just as a one-off but as a regular refresher, in terms of doing high quality rule 35 reports.  Q. Are you aware that Dr Hard looked at over 80 rule 35 reports from the relevant period in 2017 and found that, in 75 per cent, roughly, of the cases, that they were inadequate, in particular because there had been no assessment or recording of the continued impact of detention?  A. Yes, I read his report and listened to some of his evidence on that and that is one of the reasons why we have reached out to the Faculty of Forensic and Legal	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	something themselves. I think it is a deficiency generally across the immigration removal estate and something that we are keen to address by developing some training. So yes, whilst it is a concern, it is something that we are addressing at the moment but I don't think it is peculiar to Gatwick.  Q. Has the deficiencies in those reports, in particular that they, for the most part, failed to consider the impact of detention, been taken up with Dr Oozeerally to date?  A. I haven't had a conversation with him about it.  Q. Why not? Because I appreciate the the lack of training out there, but isn't it a relatively straightforward thing to bring up with him that, "Doctor, you must, as the form directs, consider and
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	working in this environment. It is one of the reasons why we have decided to take the approach that we have to look at what good looks like and to try and understand how we then train people to do that, not just as a one-off but as a regular refresher, in terms of doing high quality rule 35 reports.  Q. Are you aware that Dr Hard looked at over 80 rule 35 reports from the relevant period in 2017 and found that, in 75 per cent, roughly, of the cases, that they were inadequate, in particular because there had been no assessment or recording of the continued impact of detention?  A. Yes, I read his report and listened to some of his evidence on that and that is one of the reasons why we have reached out to the Faculty of Forensic and Legal Medicine to help us with increasing confidence in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	something themselves. I think it is a deficiency generally across the immigration removal estate and something that we are keen to address by developing some training. So yes, whilst it is a concern, it is something that we are addressing at the moment but I don't think it is peculiar to Gatwick.  Q. Has the deficiencies in those reports, in particular that they, for the most part, failed to consider the impact of detention, been taken up with Dr Oozeerally to date?  A. I haven't had a conversation with him about it.  Q. Why not? Because I appreciate the the lack of training out there, but isn't it a relatively straightforward thing to bring up with him that, "Doctor, you must, as the form directs, consider and comment upon the impact of detention on the detainee
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	working in this environment. It is one of the reasons why we have decided to take the approach that we have to look at what good looks like and to try and understand how we then train people to do that, not just as a one-off but as a regular refresher, in terms of doing high quality rule 35 reports.  Q. Are you aware that Dr Hard looked at over 80 rule 35 reports from the relevant period in 2017 and found that, in 75 per cent, roughly, of the cases, that they were inadequate, in particular because there had been no assessment or recording of the continued impact of detention?  A. Yes, I read his report and listened to some of his evidence on that and that is one of the reasons why we have reached out to the Faculty of Forensic and Legal Medicine to help us with increasing confidence in the GPs in giving an opinion on precisely that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	something themselves. I think it is a deficiency generally across the immigration removal estate and something that we are keen to address by developing some training. So yes, whilst it is a concern, it is something that we are addressing at the moment but I don't think it is peculiar to Gatwick.  Q. Has the deficiencies in those reports, in particular that they, for the most part, failed to consider the impact of detention, been taken up with Dr Oozeerally to date?  A. I haven't had a conversation with him about it.  Q. Why not? Because I appreciate the the lack of training out there, but isn't it a relatively straightforward thing to bring up with him that, "Doctor, you must, as the form directs, consider and comment upon the impact of detention on the detainee when you complete these reports"?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	working in this environment. It is one of the reasons why we have decided to take the approach that we have to look at what good looks like and to try and understand how we then train people to do that, not just as a one-off but as a regular refresher, in terms of doing high quality rule 35 reports.  Q. Are you aware that Dr Hard looked at over 80 rule 35 reports from the relevant period in 2017 and found that, in 75 per cent, roughly, of the cases, that they were inadequate, in particular because there had been no assessment or recording of the continued impact of detention?  A. Yes, I read his report and listened to some of his evidence on that and that is one of the reasons why we have reached out to the Faculty of Forensic and Legal Medicine to help us with increasing confidence in the GPs in giving an opinion on precisely that.  Q. Yes, because those reports that Dr Hard looked at were	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	something themselves. I think it is a deficiency generally across the immigration removal estate and something that we are keen to address by developing some training. So yes, whilst it is a concern, it is something that we are addressing at the moment but I don't think it is peculiar to Gatwick.  Q. Has the deficiencies in those reports, in particular that they, for the most part, failed to consider the impact of detention, been taken up with Dr Oozeerally to date?  A. I haven't had a conversation with him about it.  Q. Why not? Because I appreciate the the lack of training out there, but isn't it a relatively straightforward thing to bring up with him that, "Doctor, you must, as the form directs, consider and comment upon the impact of detention on the detainee when you complete these reports"?  A. Yes, I think that is a fair comment. I think what
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	working in this environment. It is one of the reasons why we have decided to take the approach that we have to look at what good looks like and to try and understand how we then train people to do that, not just as a one-off but as a regular refresher, in terms of doing high quality rule 35 reports.  Q. Are you aware that Dr Hard looked at over 80 rule 35 reports from the relevant period in 2017 and found that, in 75 per cent, roughly, of the cases, that they were inadequate, in particular because there had been no assessment or recording of the continued impact of detention?  A. Yes, I read his report and listened to some of his evidence on that and that is one of the reasons why we have reached out to the Faculty of Forensic and Legal Medicine to help us with increasing confidence in the GPs in giving an opinion on precisely that.  Q. Yes, because those reports that Dr Hard looked at were primarily from Dr Oozeerally and Dr Chaudhary, who of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	something themselves. I think it is a deficiency generally across the immigration removal estate and something that we are keen to address by developing some training. So yes, whilst it is a concern, it is something that we are addressing at the moment but I don't think it is peculiar to Gatwick.  Q. Has the deficiencies in those reports, in particular that they, for the most part, failed to consider the impact of detention, been taken up with Dr Oozeerally to date?  A. I haven't had a conversation with him about it.  Q. Why not? Because I appreciate the the lack of training out there, but isn't it a relatively straightforward thing to bring up with him that, "Doctor, you must, as the form directs, consider and comment upon the impact of detention on the detainee when you complete these reports"?  A. Yes, I think that is a fair comment. I think what I would say is that I do not have that much direct
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	working in this environment. It is one of the reasons why we have decided to take the approach that we have to look at what good looks like and to try and understand how we then train people to do that, not just as a one-off but as a regular refresher, in terms of doing high quality rule 35 reports.  Q. Are you aware that Dr Hard looked at over 80 rule 35 reports from the relevant period in 2017 and found that, in 75 per cent, roughly, of the cases, that they were inadequate, in particular because there had been no assessment or recording of the continued impact of detention?  A. Yes, I read his report and listened to some of his evidence on that and that is one of the reasons why we have reached out to the Faculty of Forensic and Legal Medicine to help us with increasing confidence in the GPs in giving an opinion on precisely that.  Q. Yes, because those reports that Dr Hard looked at were primarily from Dr Oozeerally and Dr Chaudhary, who of course are still working in Brook House and who are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	something themselves. I think it is a deficiency generally across the immigration removal estate and something that we are keen to address by developing some training. So yes, whilst it is a concern, it is something that we are addressing at the moment but I don't think it is peculiar to Gatwick.  Q. Has the deficiencies in those reports, in particular that they, for the most part, failed to consider the impact of detention, been taken up with Dr Oozeerally to date?  A. I haven't had a conversation with him about it.  Q. Why not? Because I appreciate the the lack of training out there, but isn't it a relatively straightforward thing to bring up with him that, "Doctor, you must, as the form directs, consider and comment upon the impact of detention on the detainee when you complete these reports"?  A. Yes, I think that is a fair comment. I think what I would say is that I do not have that much direct contact with the site, and so the rule 35 pathway
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	working in this environment. It is one of the reasons why we have decided to take the approach that we have to look at what good looks like and to try and understand how we then train people to do that, not just as a one-off but as a regular refresher, in terms of doing high quality rule 35 reports.  Q. Are you aware that Dr Hard looked at over 80 rule 35 reports from the relevant period in 2017 and found that, in 75 per cent, roughly, of the cases, that they were inadequate, in particular because there had been no assessment or recording of the continued impact of detention?  A. Yes, I read his report and listened to some of his evidence on that and that is one of the reasons why we have reached out to the Faculty of Forensic and Legal Medicine to help us with increasing confidence in the GPs in giving an opinion on precisely that.  Q. Yes, because those reports that Dr Hard looked at were primarily from Dr Oozeerally and Dr Chaudhary, who of course are still working in Brook House and who are training other GPs in rule 35. That is of concern,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	something themselves. I think it is a deficiency generally across the immigration removal estate and something that we are keen to address by developing some training. So yes, whilst it is a concern, it is something that we are addressing at the moment but I don't think it is peculiar to Gatwick.  Q. Has the deficiencies in those reports, in particular that they, for the most part, failed to consider the impact of detention, been taken up with Dr Oozeerally to date?  A. I haven't had a conversation with him about it.  Q. Why not? Because I appreciate the the lack of training out there, but isn't it a relatively straightforward thing to bring up with him that, "Doctor, you must, as the form directs, consider and comment upon the impact of detention on the detainee when you complete these reports"?  A. Yes, I think that is a fair comment. I think what I would say is that I do not have that much direct contact with the site, and so the rule 35 pathway workshop that was discussed yesterday, I have been
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	working in this environment. It is one of the reasons why we have decided to take the approach that we have to look at what good looks like and to try and understand how we then train people to do that, not just as a one-off but as a regular refresher, in terms of doing high quality rule 35 reports.  Q. Are you aware that Dr Hard looked at over 80 rule 35 reports from the relevant period in 2017 and found that, in 75 per cent, roughly, of the cases, that they were inadequate, in particular because there had been no assessment or recording of the continued impact of detention?  A. Yes, I read his report and listened to some of his evidence on that and that is one of the reasons why we have reached out to the Faculty of Forensic and Legal Medicine to help us with increasing confidence in the GPs in giving an opinion on precisely that.  Q. Yes, because those reports that Dr Hard looked at were primarily from Dr Oozeerally and Dr Chaudhary, who of course are still working in Brook House and who are training other GPs in rule 35. That is of concern, isn't it, given Dr Hard's view about the quality of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	something themselves. I think it is a deficiency generally across the immigration removal estate and something that we are keen to address by developing some training. So yes, whilst it is a concern, it is something that we are addressing at the moment but I don't think it is peculiar to Gatwick.  Q. Has the deficiencies in those reports, in particular that they, for the most part, failed to consider the impact of detention, been taken up with Dr Oozeerally to date?  A. I haven't had a conversation with him about it.  Q. Why not? Because I appreciate the the lack of training out there, but isn't it a relatively straightforward thing to bring up with him that, "Doctor, you must, as the form directs, consider and comment upon the impact of detention on the detainee when you complete these reports"?  A. Yes, I think that is a fair comment. I think what I would say is that I do not have that much direct contact with the site, and so the rule 35 pathway workshop that was discussed yesterday, I have been seeing as my opportunity to sit down with them. We have
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	working in this environment. It is one of the reasons why we have decided to take the approach that we have to look at what good looks like and to try and understand how we then train people to do that, not just as a one-off but as a regular refresher, in terms of doing high quality rule 35 reports.  Q. Are you aware that Dr Hard looked at over 80 rule 35 reports from the relevant period in 2017 and found that, in 75 per cent, roughly, of the cases, that they were inadequate, in particular because there had been no assessment or recording of the continued impact of detention?  A. Yes, I read his report and listened to some of his evidence on that and that is one of the reasons why we have reached out to the Faculty of Forensic and Legal Medicine to help us with increasing confidence in the GPs in giving an opinion on precisely that.  Q. Yes, because those reports that Dr Hard looked at were primarily from Dr Oozeerally and Dr Chaudhary, who of course are still working in Brook House and who are training other GPs in rule 35. That is of concern, isn't it, given Dr Hard's view about the quality of those reports?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	something themselves. I think it is a deficiency generally across the immigration removal estate and something that we are keen to address by developing some training. So yes, whilst it is a concern, it is something that we are addressing at the moment but I don't think it is peculiar to Gatwick.  Q. Has the deficiencies in those reports, in particular that they, for the most part, failed to consider the impact of detention, been taken up with Dr Oozeerally to date?  A. I haven't had a conversation with him about it.  Q. Why not? Because I appreciate the the lack of training out there, but isn't it a relatively straightforward thing to bring up with him that, "Doctor, you must, as the form directs, consider and comment upon the impact of detention on the detainee when you complete these reports"?  A. Yes, I think that is a fair comment. I think what I would say is that I do not have that much direct contact with the site, and so the rule 35 pathway workshop that was discussed yesterday, I have been seeing as my opportunity to sit down with them. We have just taken over Heathrow Immigration Removal Centre as

1	to do some looking at what works well and what doesn't	1 to date, and the fact that the Home Office has relied in
2	work well and sharing some good practice.	2 cases upon a lack of comment on the impact of detention
3	My understanding so far, and it is limited to	3 in order to maintain detention? Isn't that something
4	Heathrow, because, as I say, we have literally just	4 you need, as senior management, to be ensuring is
5	taken that, but there are more rule 35(2) reports done	5 happening as a matter of urgency?
6	at Heathrow than there are at Gatwick, for example. So	6 A. So, absolutely. It is something that we need to ensure
7	there is clearly a different understanding of the	7 is happening and I would just take issue with the idea
8	process and, by bringing the two teams together, we can	8 that my simply talking to them would make a huge
9	understand why there is difference and why there is	9 difference to that.
10	difference in practice there.	10 I think there are a number of things we need to do
11	Q. In the circumstances though, I appreciate what you have	11 to change the way rule 35s are viewed and the custom and
12	said about the workshop and the opportunity to sit down	12 practice that has been in place in Gatwick.
13	and talk about these issues, but isn't there an urgent	13 Q. But talking to them and instructing them to do what the
14	need to look at the quality of the reports that	14 form says is, at least, one thing you can do immediately
15	Dr Oozeerally and Dr Chaudhary are actually completing	15 without putting in place all the other things that will
16	now?	16 come further down the line, isn't it?
17	A. So I understand where you are coming from with that, and	17 A. Well, it is, but I think the evidence that has been
18	I think you have asked the question of my colleague	given and the conversations and reports that have been
19	yesterday: are there likely to be people in detention	19 written have pretty much explained to Dr Oozeerally and
20	who shouldn't be there, if they had had a better quality	20 Dr Chaudhary that the expectation is around that, so
21	of rule 35 report done?	21 I don't know I am going to add an awful lot to that.
22	I completely acknowledge the role we have, as	22 Q. Can we look specifically at rules 35(1) and 35 (2)?
23	a healthcare provider, in making that system work to the	23 A. Of course.
24	best of our ability, but just to point out we are not in	24 Q. Professor Bosworth did a subreview of literature for the
25	control of the final decision about that; it is	25 Shaw review, in 2016, and found that detention is
	Page 181	Page 183
1	a recommendation and a report that is done on	1 harmful to those with vulnerabilities and mental
2	healthcare. So we want to do that as well as we	2 illness. Were you aware of that at the time?
2 3	healthcare. So we want to do that as well as we possibly can.	2 illness. Were you aware of that at the time? 3 A. Professor Bosworth's report?
3	possibly can.	3 A. Professor Bosworth's report?
3 4	possibly can.  We had some debate about how quickly we needed to	3 A. Professor Bosworth's report? 4 Q. Yes?
3 4 5	possibly can.  We had some debate about how quickly we needed to move on this, but felt that, actually, this is largely	3 A. Professor Bosworth's report? 4 Q. Yes? 5 A. No.
3 4 5 6	possibly can.  We had some debate about how quickly we needed to move on this, but felt that, actually, this is largely a culture issue and it has been around custom and practice, it is the way things have always been done	<ul> <li>3 A. Professor Bosworth's report?</li> <li>4 Q. Yes?</li> <li>5 A. No.</li> <li>6 Q. Shaw, in his review, was highly critical of the idea of</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7	possibly can.  We had some debate about how quickly we needed to move on this, but felt that, actually, this is largely a culture issue and it has been around custom and practice, it is the way things have always been done and, whilst you can tell people what to do, there is	<ul> <li>3 A. Professor Bosworth's report?</li> <li>4 Q. Yes?</li> <li>5 A. No.</li> <li>6 Q. Shaw, in his review, was highly critical of the idea of</li> <li>7 managing serious mental illness in detention. He said</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8	possibly can.  We had some debate about how quickly we needed to move on this, but felt that, actually, this is largely a culture issue and it has been around custom and practice, it is the way things have always been done and, whilst you can tell people what to do, there is quite a lot of other things that need to happen in order	3 A. Professor Bosworth's report? 4 Q. Yes? 5 A. No. 6 Q. Shaw, in his review, was highly critical of the idea of 7 managing serious mental illness in detention. He said 8 it wasn't possible to meet good practice and described
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	possibly can.  We had some debate about how quickly we needed to move on this, but felt that, actually, this is largely a culture issue and it has been around custom and practice, it is the way things have always been done and, whilst you can tell people what to do, there is quite a lot of other things that need to happen in order to change that culture and produce sustained change that	3 A. Professor Bosworth's report? 4 Q. Yes? 5 A. No. 6 Q. Shaw, in his review, was highly critical of the idea of 7 managing serious mental illness in detention. He said 8 it wasn't possible to meet good practice and described 9 it as an affront to civilised values. Were you aware of 10 that?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	possibly can.  We had some debate about how quickly we needed to move on this, but felt that, actually, this is largely a culture issue and it has been around custom and practice, it is the way things have always been done and, whilst you can tell people what to do, there is quite a lot of other things that need to happen in order to change that culture and produce sustained change that you can be confident of in the longer term, and that is	3 A. Professor Bosworth's report? 4 Q. Yes? 5 A. No. 6 Q. Shaw, in his review, was highly critical of the idea of 7 managing serious mental illness in detention. He said 8 it wasn't possible to meet good practice and described 9 it as an affront to civilised values. Were you aware of 10 that? 11 A. Not specifically, no, I don't think so.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	possibly can.  We had some debate about how quickly we needed to move on this, but felt that, actually, this is largely a culture issue and it has been around custom and practice, it is the way things have always been done and, whilst you can tell people what to do, there is quite a lot of other things that need to happen in order to change that culture and produce sustained change that you can be confident of in the longer term, and that is things like the training, like sharing good practice, it	3 A. Professor Bosworth's report? 4 Q. Yes? 5 A. No. 6 Q. Shaw, in his review, was highly critical of the idea of 7 managing serious mental illness in detention. He said 8 it wasn't possible to meet good practice and described 9 it as an affront to civilised values. Were you aware of 10 that? 11 A. Not specifically, no, I don't think so. 12 Q. The Shaw review was also concerned about segregation
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	possibly can.  We had some debate about how quickly we needed to move on this, but felt that, actually, this is largely a culture issue and it has been around custom and practice, it is the way things have always been done and, whilst you can tell people what to do, there is quite a lot of other things that need to happen in order to change that culture and produce sustained change that you can be confident of in the longer term, and that is things like the training, like sharing good practice, it is supervision, clinical supervision of people.	3 A. Professor Bosworth's report? 4 Q. Yes? 5 A. No. 6 Q. Shaw, in his review, was highly critical of the idea of 7 managing serious mental illness in detention. He said 8 it wasn't possible to meet good practice and described 9 it as an affront to civilised values. Were you aware of 10 that? 11 A. Not specifically, no, I don't think so. 12 Q. The Shaw review was also concerned about segregation 13 appearing to be used as a default for those with serious
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	possibly can.  We had some debate about how quickly we needed to move on this, but felt that, actually, this is largely a culture issue and it has been around custom and practice, it is the way things have always been done and, whilst you can tell people what to do, there is quite a lot of other things that need to happen in order to change that culture and produce sustained change that you can be confident of in the longer term, and that is things like the training, like sharing good practice, it is supervision, clinical supervision of people.  So there are a number of factors that we have put in	3 A. Professor Bosworth's report? 4 Q. Yes? 5 A. No. 6 Q. Shaw, in his review, was highly critical of the idea of 7 managing serious mental illness in detention. He said 8 it wasn't possible to meet good practice and described 9 it as an affront to civilised values. Were you aware of 10 that? 11 A. Not specifically, no, I don't think so. 12 Q. The Shaw review was also concerned about segregation 13 appearing to be used as a default for those with serious 14 mental health problems and, in particular, without
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	possibly can.  We had some debate about how quickly we needed to move on this, but felt that, actually, this is largely a culture issue and it has been around custom and practice, it is the way things have always been done and, whilst you can tell people what to do, there is quite a lot of other things that need to happen in order to change that culture and produce sustained change that you can be confident of in the longer term, and that is things like the training, like sharing good practice, it is supervision, clinical supervision of people.  So there are a number of factors that we have put in place.	3 A. Professor Bosworth's report? 4 Q. Yes? 5 A. No. 6 Q. Shaw, in his review, was highly critical of the idea of 7 managing serious mental illness in detention. He said 8 it wasn't possible to meet good practice and described 9 it as an affront to civilised values. Were you aware of 10 that? 11 A. Not specifically, no, I don't think so. 12 Q. The Shaw review was also concerned about segregation 13 appearing to be used as a default for those with serious 14 mental health problems and, in particular, without 15 mental health care being provided to them, which he said
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	possibly can.  We had some debate about how quickly we needed to move on this, but felt that, actually, this is largely a culture issue and it has been around custom and practice, it is the way things have always been done and, whilst you can tell people what to do, there is quite a lot of other things that need to happen in order to change that culture and produce sustained change that you can be confident of in the longer term, and that is things like the training, like sharing good practice, it is supervision, clinical supervision of people.  So there are a number of factors that we have put in place.  Dr Oozeerally and Dr Chaudhary, in particular, do	3 A. Professor Bosworth's report? 4 Q. Yes? 5 A. No. 6 Q. Shaw, in his review, was highly critical of the idea of 7 managing serious mental illness in detention. He said 8 it wasn't possible to meet good practice and described 9 it as an affront to civilised values. Were you aware of 10 that? 11 A. Not specifically, no, I don't think so. 12 Q. The Shaw review was also concerned about segregation 13 appearing to be used as a default for those with serious 14 mental health problems and, in particular, without 15 mental health care being provided to them, which he said 16 was not consonant with detainees' welfare and could
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	possibly can.  We had some debate about how quickly we needed to move on this, but felt that, actually, this is largely a culture issue and it has been around custom and practice, it is the way things have always been done and, whilst you can tell people what to do, there is quite a lot of other things that need to happen in order to change that culture and produce sustained change that you can be confident of in the longer term, and that is things like the training, like sharing good practice, it is supervision, clinical supervision of people.  So there are a number of factors that we have put in place.  Dr Oozeerally and Dr Chaudhary, in particular, do have regular sessions with our regional medical lead for	3 A. Professor Bosworth's report? 4 Q. Yes? 5 A. No. 6 Q. Shaw, in his review, was highly critical of the idea of 7 managing serious mental illness in detention. He said 8 it wasn't possible to meet good practice and described 9 it as an affront to civilised values. Were you aware of 10 that? 11 A. Not specifically, no, I don't think so. 12 Q. The Shaw review was also concerned about segregation 13 appearing to be used as a default for those with serious 14 mental health problems and, in particular, without 15 mental health care being provided to them, which he said 16 was not consonant with detainees' welfare and could 17 represent cruel and unusual punishment. Were you aware
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	possibly can.  We had some debate about how quickly we needed to move on this, but felt that, actually, this is largely a culture issue and it has been around custom and practice, it is the way things have always been done and, whilst you can tell people what to do, there is quite a lot of other things that need to happen in order to change that culture and produce sustained change that you can be confident of in the longer term, and that is things like the training, like sharing good practice, it is supervision, clinical supervision of people.  So there are a number of factors that we have put in place.  Dr Oozeerally and Dr Chaudhary, in particular, do have regular sessions with our regional medical lead for the Thames Valley region. I don't know what	3 A. Professor Bosworth's report? 4 Q. Yes? 5 A. No. 6 Q. Shaw, in his review, was highly critical of the idea of 7 managing serious mental illness in detention. He said 8 it wasn't possible to meet good practice and described 9 it as an affront to civilised values. Were you aware of 10 that? 11 A. Not specifically, no, I don't think so. 12 Q. The Shaw review was also concerned about segregation 13 appearing to be used as a default for those with serious 14 mental health problems and, in particular, without 15 mental health care being provided to them, which he said 16 was not consonant with detainees' welfare and could 17 represent cruel and unusual punishment. Were you aware 18 of that finding in the Shaw report?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	possibly can.  We had some debate about how quickly we needed to move on this, but felt that, actually, this is largely a culture issue and it has been around custom and practice, it is the way things have always been done and, whilst you can tell people what to do, there is quite a lot of other things that need to happen in order to change that culture and produce sustained change that you can be confident of in the longer term, and that is things like the training, like sharing good practice, it is supervision, clinical supervision of people.  So there are a number of factors that we have put in place.  Dr Oozeerally and Dr Chaudhary, in particular, do have regular sessions with our regional medical lead for the Thames Valley region. I don't know what conversations have happened between them. So they may	3 A. Professor Bosworth's report? 4 Q. Yes? 5 A. No. 6 Q. Shaw, in his review, was highly critical of the idea of 7 managing serious mental illness in detention. He said 8 it wasn't possible to meet good practice and described 9 it as an affront to civilised values. Were you aware of 10 that? 11 A. Not specifically, no, I don't think so. 12 Q. The Shaw review was also concerned about segregation 13 appearing to be used as a default for those with serious 14 mental health problems and, in particular, without 15 mental health care being provided to them, which he said 16 was not consonant with detainees' welfare and could 17 represent cruel and unusual punishment. Were you aware 18 of that finding in the Shaw report? 19 A. So it's some time since I have read the Shaw report, and
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	possibly can.  We had some debate about how quickly we needed to move on this, but felt that, actually, this is largely a culture issue and it has been around custom and practice, it is the way things have always been done and, whilst you can tell people what to do, there is quite a lot of other things that need to happen in order to change that culture and produce sustained change that you can be confident of in the longer term, and that is things like the training, like sharing good practice, it is supervision, clinical supervision of people.  So there are a number of factors that we have put in place.  Dr Oozeerally and Dr Chaudhary, in particular, do have regular sessions with our regional medical lead for the Thames Valley region. I don't know what conversations have happened between them. So they may have had a conversation about the report, but I don't	3 A. Professor Bosworth's report? 4 Q. Yes? 5 A. No. 6 Q. Shaw, in his review, was highly critical of the idea of 7 managing serious mental illness in detention. He said 8 it wasn't possible to meet good practice and described 9 it as an affront to civilised values. Were you aware of 10 that? 11 A. Not specifically, no, I don't think so. 12 Q. The Shaw review was also concerned about segregation 13 appearing to be used as a default for those with serious 14 mental health problems and, in particular, without 15 mental health care being provided to them, which he said 16 was not consonant with detainees' welfare and could 17 represent cruel and unusual punishment. Were you aware 18 of that finding in the Shaw report? 19 A. So it's some time since I have read the Shaw report, and 20 so I can't recall everything that was in it, but none of
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	possibly can.  We had some debate about how quickly we needed to move on this, but felt that, actually, this is largely a culture issue and it has been around custom and practice, it is the way things have always been done and, whilst you can tell people what to do, there is quite a lot of other things that need to happen in order to change that culture and produce sustained change that you can be confident of in the longer term, and that is things like the training, like sharing good practice, it is supervision, clinical supervision of people.  So there are a number of factors that we have put in place.  Dr Oozeerally and Dr Chaudhary, in particular, do have regular sessions with our regional medical lead for the Thames Valley region. I don't know what conversations have happened between them. So they may have had a conversation about the report, but I don't know for sure and it is something I can go back and	A. Professor Bosworth's report?  Q. Yes?  A. No.  Q. Shaw, in his review, was highly critical of the idea of managing serious mental illness in detention. He said it wasn't possible to meet good practice and described it as an affront to civilised values. Were you aware of that?  A. Not specifically, no, I don't think so.  Q. The Shaw review was also concerned about segregation appearing to be used as a default for those with serious mental health problems and, in particular, without mental health care being provided to them, which he said was not consonant with detainees' welfare and could represent cruel and unusual punishment. Were you aware of that finding in the Shaw report?  A. So it's some time since I have read the Shaw report, and so I can't recall everything that was in it, but none of those things come as a surprise to me.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	possibly can.  We had some debate about how quickly we needed to move on this, but felt that, actually, this is largely a culture issue and it has been around custom and practice, it is the way things have always been done and, whilst you can tell people what to do, there is quite a lot of other things that need to happen in order to change that culture and produce sustained change that you can be confident of in the longer term, and that is things like the training, like sharing good practice, it is supervision, clinical supervision of people.  So there are a number of factors that we have put in place.  Dr Oozeerally and Dr Chaudhary, in particular, do have regular sessions with our regional medical lead for the Thames Valley region. I don't know what conversations have happened between them. So they may have had a conversation about the report, but I don't know for sure and it is something I can go back and check.	3 A. Professor Bosworth's report? 4 Q. Yes? 5 A. No. 6 Q. Shaw, in his review, was highly critical of the idea of 7 managing serious mental illness in detention. He said 8 it wasn't possible to meet good practice and described 9 it as an affront to civilised values. Were you aware of 10 that? 11 A. Not specifically, no, I don't think so. 12 Q. The Shaw review was also concerned about segregation 13 appearing to be used as a default for those with serious 14 mental health problems and, in particular, without 15 mental health care being provided to them, which he said 16 was not consonant with detainees' welfare and could 17 represent cruel and unusual punishment. Were you aware 18 of that finding in the Shaw report? 19 A. So it's some time since I have read the Shaw report, and 20 so I can't recall everything that was in it, but none of 21 those things come as a surprise to me. 22 Q. Would you accept, then, that it is important for the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	possibly can.  We had some debate about how quickly we needed to move on this, but felt that, actually, this is largely a culture issue and it has been around custom and practice, it is the way things have always been done and, whilst you can tell people what to do, there is quite a lot of other things that need to happen in order to change that culture and produce sustained change that you can be confident of in the longer term, and that is things like the training, like sharing good practice, it is supervision, clinical supervision of people.  So there are a number of factors that we have put in place.  Dr Oozeerally and Dr Chaudhary, in particular, do have regular sessions with our regional medical lead for the Thames Valley region. I don't know what conversations have happened between them. So they may have had a conversation about the report, but I don't know for sure and it is something I can go back and check.  Q. Isn't it up to the senior management at PPG, including	3 A. Professor Bosworth's report? 4 Q. Yes? 5 A. No. 6 Q. Shaw, in his review, was highly critical of the idea of 7 managing serious mental illness in detention. He said 8 it wasn't possible to meet good practice and described 9 it as an affront to civilised values. Were you aware of 10 that? 11 A. Not specifically, no, I don't think so. 12 Q. The Shaw review was also concerned about segregation 13 appearing to be used as a default for those with serious 14 mental health problems and, in particular, without 15 mental health care being provided to them, which he said 16 was not consonant with detainees' welfare and could 17 represent cruel and unusual punishment. Were you aware 18 of that finding in the Shaw report? 19 A. So it's some time since I have read the Shaw report, and 20 so I can't recall everything that was in it, but none of 21 those things come as a surprise to me. 22 Q. Would you accept, then, that it is important for the 23 rule 35 safeguards to operate to ensure that those with
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	possibly can.  We had some debate about how quickly we needed to move on this, but felt that, actually, this is largely a culture issue and it has been around custom and practice, it is the way things have always been done and, whilst you can tell people what to do, there is quite a lot of other things that need to happen in order to change that culture and produce sustained change that you can be confident of in the longer term, and that is things like the training, like sharing good practice, it is supervision, clinical supervision of people.  So there are a number of factors that we have put in place.  Dr Oozeerally and Dr Chaudhary, in particular, do have regular sessions with our regional medical lead for the Thames Valley region. I don't know what conversations have happened between them. So they may have had a conversation about the report, but I don't know for sure and it is something I can go back and check.  Q. Isn't it up to the senior management at PPG, including you, to ensure that those instructions are being given	A. Professor Bosworth's report?  Q. Yes?  A. No.  Q. Shaw, in his review, was highly critical of the idea of managing serious mental illness in detention. He said it wasn't possible to meet good practice and described it as an affront to civilised values. Were you aware of that?  A. Not specifically, no, I don't think so.  Q. The Shaw review was also concerned about segregation appearing to be used as a default for those with serious mental health problems and, in particular, without mental health care being provided to them, which he said was not consonant with detainees' welfare and could represent cruel and unusual punishment. Were you aware of that finding in the Shaw report?  A. So it's some time since I have read the Shaw report, and so I can't recall everything that was in it, but none of those things come as a surprise to me.  Q. Would you accept, then, that it is important for the rule 35 safeguards to operate to ensure that those with mental illness are identified, not so that it can be
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	possibly can.  We had some debate about how quickly we needed to move on this, but felt that, actually, this is largely a culture issue and it has been around custom and practice, it is the way things have always been done and, whilst you can tell people what to do, there is quite a lot of other things that need to happen in order to change that culture and produce sustained change that you can be confident of in the longer term, and that is things like the training, like sharing good practice, it is supervision, clinical supervision of people.  So there are a number of factors that we have put in place.  Dr Oozeerally and Dr Chaudhary, in particular, do have regular sessions with our regional medical lead for the Thames Valley region. I don't know what conversations have happened between them. So they may have had a conversation about the report, but I don't know for sure and it is something I can go back and check.  Q. Isn't it up to the senior management at PPG, including	3 A. Professor Bosworth's report? 4 Q. Yes? 5 A. No. 6 Q. Shaw, in his review, was highly critical of the idea of 7 managing serious mental illness in detention. He said 8 it wasn't possible to meet good practice and described 9 it as an affront to civilised values. Were you aware of 10 that? 11 A. Not specifically, no, I don't think so. 12 Q. The Shaw review was also concerned about segregation 13 appearing to be used as a default for those with serious 14 mental health problems and, in particular, without 15 mental health care being provided to them, which he said 16 was not consonant with detainees' welfare and could 17 represent cruel and unusual punishment. Were you aware 18 of that finding in the Shaw report? 19 A. So it's some time since I have read the Shaw report, and 20 so I can't recall everything that was in it, but none of 21 those things come as a surprise to me. 22 Q. Would you accept, then, that it is important for the 23 rule 35 safeguards to operate to ensure that those with
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	possibly can.  We had some debate about how quickly we needed to move on this, but felt that, actually, this is largely a culture issue and it has been around custom and practice, it is the way things have always been done and, whilst you can tell people what to do, there is quite a lot of other things that need to happen in order to change that culture and produce sustained change that you can be confident of in the longer term, and that is things like the training, like sharing good practice, it is supervision, clinical supervision of people.  So there are a number of factors that we have put in place.  Dr Oozeerally and Dr Chaudhary, in particular, do have regular sessions with our regional medical lead for the Thames Valley region. I don't know what conversations have happened between them. So they may have had a conversation about the report, but I don't know for sure and it is something I can go back and check.  Q. Isn't it up to the senior management at PPG, including you, to ensure that those instructions are being given	A. Professor Bosworth's report?  Q. Yes?  A. No.  Q. Shaw, in his review, was highly critical of the idea of managing serious mental illness in detention. He said it wasn't possible to meet good practice and described it as an affront to civilised values. Were you aware of that?  A. Not specifically, no, I don't think so.  Q. The Shaw review was also concerned about segregation appearing to be used as a default for those with serious mental health problems and, in particular, without mental health care being provided to them, which he said was not consonant with detainees' welfare and could represent cruel and unusual punishment. Were you aware of that finding in the Shaw report?  A. So it's some time since I have read the Shaw report, and so I can't recall everything that was in it, but none of those things come as a surprise to me.  Q. Would you accept, then, that it is important for the rule 35 safeguards to operate to ensure that those with mental illness are identified, not so that it can be

_			
1	but so the Home Office can promptly consider their	1	A. Yes.
2	continued detention because, otherwise, they may remain	2	Q. Does senior management also bear some responsibility in
3	in detention and open to having force used upon them,	3	the failure in the safeguards currently?
4	open to being segregated, which is likely to be damaging	4	A. So yes, we are responsible for what goes on in the
5	and to potential deterioration of their mental health?	5	Gatwick Immigration Removal Centre.
6	A. So do I think that mental illness should be identified	6	Q. The very low numbers, even currently, suggest that the
7	and reported, yes, of course. I don't think it is quite	7	safeguard continues to fail. Would you agree with that?
8	as straightforward as that.	8	A. Well, I don't know, because I don't know what conditions
9	Would it be so simple as that people arrived with	9	people have come into Gatwick with, and that is
10	a label stuck on them to tell you what is exactly what	10	something that we want to explore as we go forward.
11	wrong with them. Unfortunately, healthcare doesn't	11	Q. But, of course, rule 35(1) doesn't require a condition,
12	really work like that and it can take some time to	12	does it, it requires a likelihood of harm in detention?
13	understand what is going on with people, it can take	13	A. No, and one might argue that anybody coming into
14	some time for them to open up and express their	14	detention has a likelihood of harm from being in
15	concerns, their vulnerabilities and their health needs	15	detention.
16	and, in the meantime, we need to look after people.	16	Q. I would like to just look at a couple of examples,
17	So our job is not only it is definitely to do	17	please, that come from the recent past. In some
18	with these safeguards and we take our responsibility for	18	evidence from Theresa Schleicher from Medical Justice,
19	that seriously, but our role is much wider than that	19	about some case studies that she had looked at, is at
20	within healthcare, and it is to look after people, so we	20	her in her second witness statement, at annex 2,
21	need to make sure we get the balance of that right and,	21	page 118, she set out a case of a detained person known
22	if we focus too much on one or the other, then we are	22	as RNA(?), and he had a mental health appointment on
23	not meeting the needs of people effectively.	23	11 September 2021 so this would have been after PPG
24	Q. Rule 35(1) is a key statutory reporting mechanism for	24	had taken over healthcare in Brook House. He disclosed
25	triggering a detention review in respect of someone	25	feeling hopeless, anxious and having difficulties
	Page 185		Page 187
1	likely to be injuriously affected by continued	1	sleeping. But there was no rule 35(1) report completed
2	detention; it doesn't require actual harm, does it?	2	at that stage.
3	A. Yes, from my understanding, yes.	3	Do you accept it should have been?
4	Q. There have only been there has only been one	4	A. I don't know. With that level of information,
5	rule 35(1) report from September 2021 to January 2022,	5	I couldn't say. Like I say, I think pretty much anybody
6	according to your witness statement.	6	coming into detention would have trouble sleeping. And
7	Sandra Calver, certainly in her evidence, has	7	feel anxious, and one could argue that that is
8	accepted that she had misunderstood the threshold for	8	detrimental to anybody entering detention.
9	a rule 35(1) report and she and her staff were applying	9	Q. On 14 September, he was still showing those symptoms and
10	too high a threshold. Her evidence was that this	10	he had also self-harmed a week beforehand by banging his
11	misunderstanding had led to very few rule 35(1)s at the	11	head against the wall.
12	time in 2017, and it appears there remain very few	12	No rule 35(1) report was completed at that stage.
13	rule 35(1)s being completed in Brook House; would you	13	Do you accept that, at that stage, it should have done?
14	agree?	14	A. Again, I don't know. With that level of detail, it is
15	A. Yes.	15	very difficult to make an assessment on that.
16	Q. That was a failure at the time, in 2017, she took some	16	Self-harm is interesting, people self-harm for
17	responsibility for, along with the Home Office; would	17	a whole variety of reasons and not necessarily related
18	you agree with that?	18	to mental illness, but it does rather depend on how you
19	A. I don't know whether she took responsibility.	19	define mental ill-health. It is not good for your
20	Q. In her evidence, she accepted that the failure in the	20	mental health to have control taken away from you and to
21	safeguards, in that there were so few rule 35(1) reports	21	feel powerless and, therefore, most people's mental
22	when there should have been more, was partly her	22	health, in that definition of it, would deteriorate when
23	responsibility, along with the Home Office.	23	coming into detention.
24	A. Okay.	24	Q. By 21 September, he was reporting auditory
25	Q. Would you agree?	25	hallucinations. No mental health assessment was done on
	D 407		D 400
	Page 186		Page 188
			47 (Pages 185 to 188)

1	him. Do you accept that, given the reporting of those	1	being completed; would you accept that?
2	symptoms, he should have had a mental health assessment?	2	A. Yes.
3	A. Yes, I would expect a mental health assessment at that	3	Q. It seems, then, that deteriorating mental health in
4	point.	4	detention is being managed in detention, even though
5	Q. The GP who saw him didn't complete a mental state	5	that was said to be poor psychiatric practice by as long
6	examination; he should have done, shouldn't he?	6	ago as 2016 by the Shaw review; would you agree with
7	A. Certainly he should have undertaken some form of mental	7	that?
8	health examination, but a GP mental health examination	8	A. Can you just say that again, sorry?
9	is very different to what a psychiatrist would undertake	9	Q. Deteriorating mental health is appears to be managed
10	and it is obviously briefer.	10	in detention, despite Shaw's criticism of that as being
11	Q. Of course.	11	poor psychiatric practice as long ago as 2016. Would
12	He went on, in November 2021, to undertake a period	12	you agree?
13	of food refusal. Again, no further examination was done	13	A. Yes.
14	in relation to his mental health. Should a period of	14	Q. So it is not simply about enabling staff to manage and
15	food refusal have at least prompted consideration of	15	treat conditions in detention, it is about the
16	a mental health assessment?	16	importance of those safeguards notifying the Home Office
17	A. It would certainly it should somebody who has	17	in order to review detention, isn't it?
18	undertaken food refusal should be seen by a doctor and	18	A. As I say, there is a balance to be had, isn't there,
19	try to understand the reasons behind the food refusal.	19	between those two elements of the care that we provide?
20	Q. That doesn't seem to be happening in Brook House	20	We are largely commissioned to provide community
21	currently either, does it?	21	equivalent healthcare in detained settings and there is
22	A. To be honest, I don't know the answer to that.	22	no community equivalent of rule 35, of course. So that
23	Q. Medical Justice became involved and informed healthcare	23	is an additional duty that exists in immigration removal
24	of their concerns on 23 November, but, again, no mental	24	centres that is not normal for general practice outside
25	health assessment was carried out. At that stage, when	25	and, of course, we don't have the luxury, as you have
20	neum accession was entired out 110 and onge, when		, , ,
	Page 189		Page 191
1	an external body involving clinical expertise in this	1	rightly pointed out of 45-minute and hour-long
1	an external body involving clinical expertise in this	1 2	rightly pointed out, of 45-minute and hour-long
2	area is informing healthcare of concerns, that should	2	appointments to undertake those assessments.
2	area is informing healthcare of concerns, that should have prompted some further exploration of his mental	2 3	appointments to undertake those assessments.  Q. Sandra Calver, in her evidence, accepted that it is
2 3 4	area is informing healthcare of concerns, that should have prompted some further exploration of his mental state, shouldn't it?	2 3 4	appointments to undertake those assessments.  Q. Sandra Calver, in her evidence, accepted that it is inappropriate, or it would be inappropriate, to use
2 3 4 5	area is informing healthcare of concerns, that should have prompted some further exploration of his mental state, shouldn't it?  A. I would expect it to, yes.	2 3 4 5	appointments to undertake those assessments.  Q. Sandra Calver, in her evidence, accepted that it is inappropriate, or it would be inappropriate, to use part C instead of rule 35(2) or rule 35(1); would you
2 3 4 5 6	area is informing healthcare of concerns, that should have prompted some further exploration of his mental state, shouldn't it?  A. I would expect it to, yes.  Q. They wrote to Medical Justice wrote to healthcare, on	2 3 4 5 6	appointments to undertake those assessments.  Q. Sandra Calver, in her evidence, accepted that it is inappropriate, or it would be inappropriate, to use part C instead of rule 35(2) or rule 35(1); would you agree with that?
2 3 4 5 6 7	area is informing healthcare of concerns, that should have prompted some further exploration of his mental state, shouldn't it?  A. I would expect it to, yes.  Q. They wrote to Medical Justice wrote to healthcare, on 2 December, to raise concerns about his mental	2 3 4 5 6 7	appointments to undertake those assessments.  Q. Sandra Calver, in her evidence, accepted that it is inappropriate, or it would be inappropriate, to use part C instead of rule 35(2) or rule 35(1); would you agree with that?  A. So I don't understand the part C process well enough to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	area is informing healthcare of concerns, that should have prompted some further exploration of his mental state, shouldn't it?  A. I would expect it to, yes.  Q. They wrote to Medical Justice wrote to healthcare, on 2 December, to raise concerns about his mental ill-health and a diagnosis of PTSD. Would you agree	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>appointments to undertake those assessments.</li> <li>Q. Sandra Calver, in her evidence, accepted that it is inappropriate, or it would be inappropriate, to use part C instead of rule 35(2) or rule 35(1); would you agree with that?</li> <li>A. So I don't understand the part C process well enough to be able to pass much comment on it. What I will say is</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	area is informing healthcare of concerns, that should have prompted some further exploration of his mental state, shouldn't it?  A. I would expect it to, yes.  Q. They wrote to Medical Justice wrote to healthcare, on 2 December, to raise concerns about his mental ill-health and a diagnosis of PTSD. Would you agree that there seems to be here, from this case study,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	appointments to undertake those assessments.  Q. Sandra Calver, in her evidence, accepted that it is inappropriate, or it would be inappropriate, to use part C instead of rule 35(2) or rule 35(1); would you agree with that?  A. So I don't understand the part C process well enough to be able to pass much comment on it. What I will say is that, in my experience of working across secure
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	area is informing healthcare of concerns, that should have prompted some further exploration of his mental state, shouldn't it?  A. I would expect it to, yes.  Q. They wrote to Medical Justice wrote to healthcare, on 2 December, to raise concerns about his mental ill-health and a diagnosis of PTSD. Would you agree that there seems to be here, from this case study, various different failures in the safeguards happening,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	appointments to undertake those assessments.  Q. Sandra Calver, in her evidence, accepted that it is inappropriate, or it would be inappropriate, to use part C instead of rule 35(2) or rule 35(1); would you agree with that?  A. So I don't understand the part C process well enough to be able to pass much comment on it. What I will say is that, in my experience of working across secure environments, there is a lot of processes that kind of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	area is informing healthcare of concerns, that should have prompted some further exploration of his mental state, shouldn't it?  A. I would expect it to, yes.  Q. They wrote to Medical Justice wrote to healthcare, on 2 December, to raise concerns about his mental ill-health and a diagnosis of PTSD. Would you agree that there seems to be here, from this case study, various different failures in the safeguards happening, in terms of a lack of mental health assessment, a lack	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	appointments to undertake those assessments.  Q. Sandra Calver, in her evidence, accepted that it is inappropriate, or it would be inappropriate, to use part C instead of rule 35(2) or rule 35(1); would you agree with that?  A. So I don't understand the part C process well enough to be able to pass much comment on it. What I will say is that, in my experience of working across secure environments, there is a lot of processes that kind of don't quite work and one of the things I discover a lot
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	area is informing healthcare of concerns, that should have prompted some further exploration of his mental state, shouldn't it?  A. I would expect it to, yes.  Q. They wrote to Medical Justice wrote to healthcare, on 2 December, to raise concerns about his mental ill-health and a diagnosis of PTSD. Would you agree that there seems to be here, from this case study, various different failures in the safeguards happening, in terms of a lack of mental health assessment, a lack of consideration of rule 35(1), and at least a not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	appointments to undertake those assessments.  Q. Sandra Calver, in her evidence, accepted that it is inappropriate, or it would be inappropriate, to use part C instead of rule 35(2) or rule 35(1); would you agree with that?  A. So I don't understand the part C process well enough to be able to pass much comment on it. What I will say is that, in my experience of working across secure environments, there is a lot of processes that kind of don't quite work and one of the things I discover a lot when I am travelling around sites is that people put in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	area is informing healthcare of concerns, that should have prompted some further exploration of his mental state, shouldn't it?  A. I would expect it to, yes.  Q. They wrote to Medical Justice wrote to healthcare, on 2 December, to raise concerns about his mental ill-health and a diagnosis of PTSD. Would you agree that there seems to be here, from this case study, various different failures in the safeguards happening, in terms of a lack of mental health assessment, a lack of consideration of rule 35(1), and at least a not taking account of concerns raised by other medical	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	appointments to undertake those assessments.  Q. Sandra Calver, in her evidence, accepted that it is inappropriate, or it would be inappropriate, to use part C instead of rule 35(2) or rule 35(1); would you agree with that?  A. So I don't understand the part C process well enough to be able to pass much comment on it. What I will say is that, in my experience of working across secure environments, there is a lot of processes that kind of don't quite work and one of the things I discover a lot when I am travelling around sites is that people put in work-arounds to make up for the fact that the systems
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	area is informing healthcare of concerns, that should have prompted some further exploration of his mental state, shouldn't it?  A. I would expect it to, yes.  Q. They wrote to Medical Justice wrote to healthcare, on 2 December, to raise concerns about his mental ill-health and a diagnosis of PTSD. Would you agree that there seems to be here, from this case study, various different failures in the safeguards happening, in terms of a lack of mental health assessment, a lack of consideration of rule 35(1), and at least a not taking account of concerns raised by other medical professionals?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	appointments to undertake those assessments.  Q. Sandra Calver, in her evidence, accepted that it is inappropriate, or it would be inappropriate, to use part C instead of rule 35(2) or rule 35(1); would you agree with that?  A. So I don't understand the part C process well enough to be able to pass much comment on it. What I will say is that, in my experience of working across secure environments, there is a lot of processes that kind of don't quite work and one of the things I discover a lot when I am travelling around sites is that people put in work-arounds to make up for the fact that the systems don't work that well. Part of my role is to challenge
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	area is informing healthcare of concerns, that should have prompted some further exploration of his mental state, shouldn't it?  A. I would expect it to, yes.  Q. They wrote to Medical Justice wrote to healthcare, on 2 December, to raise concerns about his mental ill-health and a diagnosis of PTSD. Would you agree that there seems to be here, from this case study, various different failures in the safeguards happening, in terms of a lack of mental health assessment, a lack of consideration of rule 35(1), and at least a not taking account of concerns raised by other medical professionals?  A. So on face value of everything you have said, of course	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	appointments to undertake those assessments.  Q. Sandra Calver, in her evidence, accepted that it is inappropriate, or it would be inappropriate, to use part C instead of rule 35(2) or rule 35(1); would you agree with that?  A. So I don't understand the part C process well enough to be able to pass much comment on it. What I will say is that, in my experience of working across secure environments, there is a lot of processes that kind of don't quite work and one of the things I discover a lot when I am travelling around sites is that people put in work-arounds to make up for the fact that the systems don't work that well. Part of my role is to challenge those work-arounds and say, "You might be thinking you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	area is informing healthcare of concerns, that should have prompted some further exploration of his mental state, shouldn't it?  A. I would expect it to, yes.  Q. They wrote to Medical Justice wrote to healthcare, on 2 December, to raise concerns about his mental ill-health and a diagnosis of PTSD. Would you agree that there seems to be here, from this case study, various different failures in the safeguards happening, in terms of a lack of mental health assessment, a lack of consideration of rule 35(1), and at least a not taking account of concerns raised by other medical professionals?  A. So on face value of everything you have said, of course there are points at which assessment could have been	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	appointments to undertake those assessments.  Q. Sandra Calver, in her evidence, accepted that it is inappropriate, or it would be inappropriate, to use part C instead of rule 35(2) or rule 35(1); would you agree with that?  A. So I don't understand the part C process well enough to be able to pass much comment on it. What I will say is that, in my experience of working across secure environments, there is a lot of processes that kind of don't quite work and one of the things I discover a lot when I am travelling around sites is that people put in work-arounds to make up for the fact that the systems don't work that well. Part of my role is to challenge those work-arounds and say, "You might be thinking you are acting in the best interests of an individual but
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	area is informing healthcare of concerns, that should have prompted some further exploration of his mental state, shouldn't it?  A. I would expect it to, yes.  Q. They wrote to Medical Justice wrote to healthcare, on 2 December, to raise concerns about his mental ill-health and a diagnosis of PTSD. Would you agree that there seems to be here, from this case study, various different failures in the safeguards happening, in terms of a lack of mental health assessment, a lack of consideration of rule 35(1), and at least a not taking account of concerns raised by other medical professionals?  A. So on face value of everything you have said, of course there are points at which assessment could have been undertaken to have made a difference. I don't know any	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	appointments to undertake those assessments.  Q. Sandra Calver, in her evidence, accepted that it is inappropriate, or it would be inappropriate, to use part C instead of rule 35(2) or rule 35(1); would you agree with that?  A. So I don't understand the part C process well enough to be able to pass much comment on it. What I will say is that, in my experience of working across secure environments, there is a lot of processes that kind of don't quite work and one of the things I discover a lot when I am travelling around sites is that people put in work-arounds to make up for the fact that the systems don't work that well. Part of my role is to challenge those work-arounds and say, "You might be thinking you are acting in the best interests of an individual but actually what we have got to do is make the system work
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	area is informing healthcare of concerns, that should have prompted some further exploration of his mental state, shouldn't it?  A. I would expect it to, yes.  Q. They wrote to Medical Justice wrote to healthcare, on 2 December, to raise concerns about his mental ill-health and a diagnosis of PTSD. Would you agree that there seems to be here, from this case study, various different failures in the safeguards happening, in terms of a lack of mental health assessment, a lack of consideration of rule 35(1), and at least a not taking account of concerns raised by other medical professionals?  A. So on face value of everything you have said, of course there are points at which assessment could have been undertaken to have made a difference. I don't know any of the circumstances surrounding this or any other	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	appointments to undertake those assessments.  Q. Sandra Calver, in her evidence, accepted that it is inappropriate, or it would be inappropriate, to use part C instead of rule 35(2) or rule 35(1); would you agree with that?  A. So I don't understand the part C process well enough to be able to pass much comment on it. What I will say is that, in my experience of working across secure environments, there is a lot of processes that kind of don't quite work and one of the things I discover a lot when I am travelling around sites is that people put in work-arounds to make up for the fact that the systems don't work that well. Part of my role is to challenge those work-arounds and say, "You might be thinking you are acting in the best interests of an individual but actually what we have got to do is make the system work effectively as best we can", and that is part of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	area is informing healthcare of concerns, that should have prompted some further exploration of his mental state, shouldn't it?  A. I would expect it to, yes.  Q. They wrote to Medical Justice wrote to healthcare, on 2 December, to raise concerns about his mental ill-health and a diagnosis of PTSD. Would you agree that there seems to be here, from this case study, various different failures in the safeguards happening, in terms of a lack of mental health assessment, a lack of consideration of rule 35(1), and at least a not taking account of concerns raised by other medical professionals?  A. So on face value of everything you have said, of course there are points at which assessment could have been undertaken to have made a difference. I don't know any of the circumstances surrounding this or any other factors relating to it, so being painted a line in that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	appointments to undertake those assessments.  Q. Sandra Calver, in her evidence, accepted that it is inappropriate, or it would be inappropriate, to use part C instead of rule 35(2) or rule 35(1); would you agree with that?  A. So I don't understand the part C process well enough to be able to pass much comment on it. What I will say is that, in my experience of working across secure environments, there is a lot of processes that kind of don't quite work and one of the things I discover a lot when I am travelling around sites is that people put in work-arounds to make up for the fact that the systems don't work that well. Part of my role is to challenge those work-arounds and say, "You might be thinking you are acting in the best interests of an individual but actually what we have got to do is make the system work effectively as best we can", and that is part of the challenge that is going in now.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	area is informing healthcare of concerns, that should have prompted some further exploration of his mental state, shouldn't it?  A. I would expect it to, yes.  Q. They wrote to Medical Justice wrote to healthcare, on 2 December, to raise concerns about his mental ill-health and a diagnosis of PTSD. Would you agree that there seems to be here, from this case study, various different failures in the safeguards happening, in terms of a lack of mental health assessment, a lack of consideration of rule 35(1), and at least a not taking account of concerns raised by other medical professionals?  A. So on face value of everything you have said, of course there are points at which assessment could have been undertaken to have made a difference. I don't know any of the circumstances surrounding this or any other factors relating to it, so being painted a line in that direction, of course the conclusion is there are points	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	appointments to undertake those assessments.  Q. Sandra Calver, in her evidence, accepted that it is inappropriate, or it would be inappropriate, to use part C instead of rule 35(2) or rule 35(1); would you agree with that?  A. So I don't understand the part C process well enough to be able to pass much comment on it. What I will say is that, in my experience of working across secure environments, there is a lot of processes that kind of don't quite work and one of the things I discover a lot when I am travelling around sites is that people put in work-arounds to make up for the fact that the systems don't work that well. Part of my role is to challenge those work-arounds and say, "You might be thinking you are acting in the best interests of an individual but actually what we have got to do is make the system work effectively as best we can", and that is part of the challenge that is going in now.  Q. The problem with part C is, of course, that it doesn't,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	area is informing healthcare of concerns, that should have prompted some further exploration of his mental state, shouldn't it?  A. I would expect it to, yes.  Q. They wrote to Medical Justice wrote to healthcare, on 2 December, to raise concerns about his mental ill-health and a diagnosis of PTSD. Would you agree that there seems to be here, from this case study, various different failures in the safeguards happening, in terms of a lack of mental health assessment, a lack of consideration of rule 35(1), and at least a not taking account of concerns raised by other medical professionals?  A. So on face value of everything you have said, of course there are points at which assessment could have been undertaken to have made a difference. I don't know any of the circumstances surrounding this or any other factors relating to it, so being painted a line in that direction, of course the conclusion is there are points at which they could have intervened but I don't know	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	appointments to undertake those assessments.  Q. Sandra Calver, in her evidence, accepted that it is inappropriate, or it would be inappropriate, to use part C instead of rule 35(2) or rule 35(1); would you agree with that?  A. So I don't understand the part C process well enough to be able to pass much comment on it. What I will say is that, in my experience of working across secure environments, there is a lot of processes that kind of don't quite work and one of the things I discover a lot when I am travelling around sites is that people put in work-arounds to make up for the fact that the systems don't work that well. Part of my role is to challenge those work-arounds and say, "You might be thinking you are acting in the best interests of an individual but actually what we have got to do is make the system work effectively as best we can", and that is part of the challenge that is going in now.  Q. The problem with part C is, of course, that it doesn't, contrary to rule 35, require the Home Office to review
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	area is informing healthcare of concerns, that should have prompted some further exploration of his mental state, shouldn't it?  A. I would expect it to, yes.  Q. They wrote to Medical Justice wrote to healthcare, on 2 December, to raise concerns about his mental ill-health and a diagnosis of PTSD. Would you agree that there seems to be here, from this case study, various different failures in the safeguards happening, in terms of a lack of mental health assessment, a lack of consideration of rule 35(1), and at least a not taking account of concerns raised by other medical professionals?  A. So on face value of everything you have said, of course there are points at which assessment could have been undertaken to have made a difference. I don't know any of the circumstances surrounding this or any other factors relating to it, so being painted a line in that direction, of course the conclusion is there are points at which they could have intervened but I don't know what else was going on.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	appointments to undertake those assessments.  Q. Sandra Calver, in her evidence, accepted that it is inappropriate, or it would be inappropriate, to use part C instead of rule 35(2) or rule 35(1); would you agree with that?  A. So I don't understand the part C process well enough to be able to pass much comment on it. What I will say is that, in my experience of working across secure environments, there is a lot of processes that kind of don't quite work and one of the things I discover a lot when I am travelling around sites is that people put in work-arounds to make up for the fact that the systems don't work that well. Part of my role is to challenge those work-arounds and say, "You might be thinking you are acting in the best interests of an individual but actually what we have got to do is make the system work effectively as best we can", and that is part of the challenge that is going in now.  Q. The problem with part C is, of course, that it doesn't, contrary to rule 35, require the Home Office to review detention. So the statutory requirement is contained in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	area is informing healthcare of concerns, that should have prompted some further exploration of his mental state, shouldn't it?  A. I would expect it to, yes.  Q. They wrote to Medical Justice wrote to healthcare, on 2 December, to raise concerns about his mental ill-health and a diagnosis of PTSD. Would you agree that there seems to be here, from this case study, various different failures in the safeguards happening, in terms of a lack of mental health assessment, a lack of consideration of rule 35(1), and at least a not taking account of concerns raised by other medical professionals?  A. So on face value of everything you have said, of course there are points at which assessment could have been undertaken to have made a difference. I don't know any of the circumstances surrounding this or any other factors relating to it, so being painted a line in that direction, of course the conclusion is there are points at which they could have intervened but I don't know what else was going on.  Q. He was only released from detention after litigation.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	appointments to undertake those assessments.  Q. Sandra Calver, in her evidence, accepted that it is inappropriate, or it would be inappropriate, to use part C instead of rule 35(2) or rule 35(1); would you agree with that?  A. So I don't understand the part C process well enough to be able to pass much comment on it. What I will say is that, in my experience of working across secure environments, there is a lot of processes that kind of don't quite work and one of the things I discover a lot when I am travelling around sites is that people put in work-arounds to make up for the fact that the systems don't work that well. Part of my role is to challenge those work-arounds and say, "You might be thinking you are acting in the best interests of an individual but actually what we have got to do is make the system work effectively as best we can", and that is part of the challenge that is going in now.  Q. The problem with part C is, of course, that it doesn't, contrary to rule 35, require the Home Office to review detention. So the statutory requirement is contained in rule 35 and not in part C.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	area is informing healthcare of concerns, that should have prompted some further exploration of his mental state, shouldn't it?  A. I would expect it to, yes.  Q. They wrote to Medical Justice wrote to healthcare, on 2 December, to raise concerns about his mental ill-health and a diagnosis of PTSD. Would you agree that there seems to be here, from this case study, various different failures in the safeguards happening, in terms of a lack of mental health assessment, a lack of consideration of rule 35(1), and at least a not taking account of concerns raised by other medical professionals?  A. So on face value of everything you have said, of course there are points at which assessment could have been undertaken to have made a difference. I don't know any of the circumstances surrounding this or any other factors relating to it, so being painted a line in that direction, of course the conclusion is there are points at which they could have intervened but I don't know what else was going on.  Q. He was only released from detention after litigation. Again, the Home Office haven't had a chance to review	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	appointments to undertake those assessments.  Q. Sandra Calver, in her evidence, accepted that it is inappropriate, or it would be inappropriate, to use part C instead of rule 35(2) or rule 35(1); would you agree with that?  A. So I don't understand the part C process well enough to be able to pass much comment on it. What I will say is that, in my experience of working across secure environments, there is a lot of processes that kind of don't quite work and one of the things I discover a lot when I am travelling around sites is that people put in work-arounds to make up for the fact that the systems don't work that well. Part of my role is to challenge those work-arounds and say, "You might be thinking you are acting in the best interests of an individual but actually what we have got to do is make the system work effectively as best we can", and that is part of the challenge that is going in now.  Q. The problem with part C is, of course, that it doesn't, contrary to rule 35, require the Home Office to review detention. So the statutory requirement is contained in rule 35 and not in part C.  Do you think your staff understand that?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	area is informing healthcare of concerns, that should have prompted some further exploration of his mental state, shouldn't it?  A. I would expect it to, yes.  Q. They wrote to Medical Justice wrote to healthcare, on 2 December, to raise concerns about his mental ill-health and a diagnosis of PTSD. Would you agree that there seems to be here, from this case study, various different failures in the safeguards happening, in terms of a lack of mental health assessment, a lack of consideration of rule 35(1), and at least a not taking account of concerns raised by other medical professionals?  A. So on face value of everything you have said, of course there are points at which assessment could have been undertaken to have made a difference. I don't know any of the circumstances surrounding this or any other factors relating to it, so being painted a line in that direction, of course the conclusion is there are points at which they could have intervened but I don't know what else was going on.  Q. He was only released from detention after litigation.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	appointments to undertake those assessments.  Q. Sandra Calver, in her evidence, accepted that it is inappropriate, or it would be inappropriate, to use part C instead of rule 35(2) or rule 35(1); would you agree with that?  A. So I don't understand the part C process well enough to be able to pass much comment on it. What I will say is that, in my experience of working across secure environments, there is a lot of processes that kind of don't quite work and one of the things I discover a lot when I am travelling around sites is that people put in work-arounds to make up for the fact that the systems don't work that well. Part of my role is to challenge those work-arounds and say, "You might be thinking you are acting in the best interests of an individual but actually what we have got to do is make the system work effectively as best we can", and that is part of the challenge that is going in now.  Q. The problem with part C is, of course, that it doesn't, contrary to rule 35, require the Home Office to review detention. So the statutory requirement is contained in rule 35 and not in part C.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	area is informing healthcare of concerns, that should have prompted some further exploration of his mental state, shouldn't it?  A. I would expect it to, yes.  Q. They wrote to Medical Justice wrote to healthcare, on 2 December, to raise concerns about his mental ill-health and a diagnosis of PTSD. Would you agree that there seems to be here, from this case study, various different failures in the safeguards happening, in terms of a lack of mental health assessment, a lack of consideration of rule 35(1), and at least a not taking account of concerns raised by other medical professionals?  A. So on face value of everything you have said, of course there are points at which assessment could have been undertaken to have made a difference. I don't know any of the circumstances surrounding this or any other factors relating to it, so being painted a line in that direction, of course the conclusion is there are points at which they could have intervened but I don't know what else was going on.  Q. He was only released from detention after litigation. Again, the Home Office haven't had a chance to review	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	appointments to undertake those assessments.  Q. Sandra Calver, in her evidence, accepted that it is inappropriate, or it would be inappropriate, to use part C instead of rule 35(2) or rule 35(1); would you agree with that?  A. So I don't understand the part C process well enough to be able to pass much comment on it. What I will say is that, in my experience of working across secure environments, there is a lot of processes that kind of don't quite work and one of the things I discover a lot when I am travelling around sites is that people put in work-arounds to make up for the fact that the systems don't work that well. Part of my role is to challenge those work-arounds and say, "You might be thinking you are acting in the best interests of an individual but actually what we have got to do is make the system work effectively as best we can", and that is part of the challenge that is going in now.  Q. The problem with part C is, of course, that it doesn't, contrary to rule 35, require the Home Office to review detention. So the statutory requirement is contained in rule 35 and not in part C.  Do you think your staff understand that?

1	days of the inquiry, so I can't speak for other people	1	a serious failing in the safeguard. Again, that is
2	but certainly I haven't had that level of understanding.	2	something of serious concern, isn't it?
3	Q. From Dr Oozeerally's evidence, it appears that he is	3	A. Yes, as I say, I think the rule 35 process has become
4	still using part C and not rules 35(1) and (2); do you	4	synonymous with looking for torture, so people have
5	agree, in the circumstances, that that practice is	5	forgotten both parts (1) and part (2).
6	inappropriate?	6	Q. Were PPG aware of that when they took over the contract?
7	A. So I think people use processes to bypass the system,	7	A. No.
8	when they find them effective.	8	Q. Because the IMB report of 2021, which covered the period
9	That seems to indicate to me that there is something	9	of January 2020 to December 2020 described the lack of
10	broken in the system of rule 35, that people have been	10	any rule 35(2) reports to be puzzling in the light of
11	trying to find ways around.	11	the scale of self-harm and suicide threats made during
12	Q. But he should, at the very least, be doing both,	12	the latter part of 2020, and they said:
13	shouldn't he? If there's a concern about	13	"We cannot reconcile the evidence of frequent
14	a vulnerability or self-harm or a suicide attempt,	14	suicide ideation with there being absolutely no
15	suicidal ideation, or a deterioration in someone's	15	rule 35(2) reports."
16	mental health, he could put in a part C but he should	16	You were not aware of that at the time?
17	also, in those circumstances, be using rule 35, given	17	A. Not until more recently.
18	their requirement of a review by the Home Office of	18	Q. Your statistics that you set out at paragraph 131 of
19	detention; is that right?	19	your first witness statement on ACDTs indicate that
20	A. That is my understanding of the rules there. I think,	20	there were 73 opened with 45 of those a constant watch
21	again, from conversations over the years, when I haven't	21	for the period September 2021 to December 2021. Someone
22	been particularly involved in immigration removal	22	being on a constant watch indicates a high risk of
23	centres, I think rule 35 has become kind of shorthand	23	suicide; would you agree?
24	for discussion around torture.	24	A. Certainly a high risk of harm.
25	Q. Yes.	25	Q. And as we have just established, there were no
			,
	Page 193		Page 195
1	A. The elements that you have been alluding to, parts (1)	1	rule 35(2) reports at all in that corresponding period.
1 2	A. The elements that you have been alluding to, parts (1) and (2). I think have been a little lost along the way.	1 2	rule 35(2) reports at all in that corresponding period.  Again, that suggests a fundamental, ongoing failure in
2	and (2), I think have been a little lost along the way.	2	Again, that suggests a fundamental, ongoing failure in
2 3	and (2), I think have been a little lost along the way.  Q. Yes, the vast majority of reports are rule 35(3) reports	2 3	Again, that suggests a fundamental, ongoing failure in the safeguard, doesn't it?
2 3 4	and (2), I think have been a little lost along the way.  Q. Yes, the vast majority of reports are rule 35(3) reports and it appears that rule 35(2) is not used at all?	2 3 4	Again, that suggests a fundamental, ongoing failure in the safeguard, doesn't it?  A. It does.
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>and (2), I think have been a little lost along the way.</li> <li>Q. Yes, the vast majority of reports are rule 35(3) reports and it appears that rule 35(2) is not used at all?</li> <li>A. Certainly not in Gatwick, no.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	Again, that suggests a fundamental, ongoing failure in the safeguard, doesn't it?  A. It does.  Q. Doesn't that need urgently addressing?
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>and (2), I think have been a little lost along the way.</li> <li>Q. Yes, the vast majority of reports are rule 35(3) reports and it appears that rule 35(2) is not used at all?</li> <li>A. Certainly not in Gatwick, no.</li> <li>Q. We know, in relation to rule 35(2), from the Home Office</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	Again, that suggests a fundamental, ongoing failure in the safeguard, doesn't it?  A. It does. Q. Doesn't that need urgently addressing?  A. I think we are addressing it. But as I say, whilst it
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>and (2), I think have been a little lost along the way.</li> <li>Q. Yes, the vast majority of reports are rule 35(3) reports and it appears that rule 35(2) is not used at all?</li> <li>A. Certainly not in Gatwick, no.</li> <li>Q. We know, in relation to rule 35(2), from the Home Office figures that there were no rule 35(2) reports completed</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	Again, that suggests a fundamental, ongoing failure in the safeguard, doesn't it?  A. It does.  Q. Doesn't that need urgently addressing?  A. I think we are addressing it. But as I say, whilst it is tempting to think that you can just dive in there and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>and (2), I think have been a little lost along the way.</li> <li>Q. Yes, the vast majority of reports are rule 35(3) reports and it appears that rule 35(2) is not used at all?</li> <li>A. Certainly not in Gatwick, no.</li> <li>Q. We know, in relation to rule 35(2), from the Home Office figures that there were no rule 35(2) reports completed in Brook House in 2017. Indeed there weren't any in</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Again, that suggests a fundamental, ongoing failure in the safeguard, doesn't it?  A. It does.  Q. Doesn't that need urgently addressing?  A. I think we are addressing it. But as I say, whilst it is tempting to think that you can just dive in there and fix this problem that has been clearly endemic for the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>and (2), I think have been a little lost along the way.</li> <li>Q. Yes, the vast majority of reports are rule 35(3) reports and it appears that rule 35(2) is not used at all?</li> <li>A. Certainly not in Gatwick, no.</li> <li>Q. We know, in relation to rule 35(2), from the Home Office figures that there were no rule 35(2) reports completed in Brook House in 2017. Indeed there weren't any in 2016, 2018, 2019 or 2020 either.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Again, that suggests a fundamental, ongoing failure in the safeguard, doesn't it?  A. It does.  Q. Doesn't that need urgently addressing?  A. I think we are addressing it. But as I say, whilst it is tempting to think that you can just dive in there and fix this problem that has been clearly endemic for the last five years at least, given the numbers you have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>and (2), I think have been a little lost along the way.</li> <li>Q. Yes, the vast majority of reports are rule 35(3) reports and it appears that rule 35(2) is not used at all?</li> <li>A. Certainly not in Gatwick, no.</li> <li>Q. We know, in relation to rule 35(2), from the Home Office figures that there were no rule 35(2) reports completed in Brook House in 2017. Indeed there weren't any in 2016, 2018, 2019 or 2020 either.</li> <li>Your own figures from September 2021 to January 2022</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Again, that suggests a fundamental, ongoing failure in the safeguard, doesn't it?  A. It does.  Q. Doesn't that need urgently addressing?  A. I think we are addressing it. But as I say, whilst it is tempting to think that you can just dive in there and fix this problem that has been clearly endemic for the last five years at least, given the numbers you have just given me, it is tempting, but it is not possible.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>and (2), I think have been a little lost along the way.</li> <li>Q. Yes, the vast majority of reports are rule 35(3) reports and it appears that rule 35(2) is not used at all?</li> <li>A. Certainly not in Gatwick, no.</li> <li>Q. We know, in relation to rule 35(2), from the Home Office figures that there were no rule 35(2) reports completed in Brook House in 2017. Indeed there weren't any in 2016, 2018, 2019 or 2020 either.</li> <li>Your own figures from September 2021 to January 2022 also confirm no rule 35(2) reports since PPG took over.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Again, that suggests a fundamental, ongoing failure in the safeguard, doesn't it?  A. It does.  Q. Doesn't that need urgently addressing?  A. I think we are addressing it. But as I say, whilst it is tempting to think that you can just dive in there and fix this problem that has been clearly endemic for the last five years at least, given the numbers you have just given me, it is tempting, but it is not possible.  There is something deeper that needs to happen which is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>and (2), I think have been a little lost along the way.</li> <li>Q. Yes, the vast majority of reports are rule 35(3) reports and it appears that rule 35(2) is not used at all?</li> <li>A. Certainly not in Gatwick, no.</li> <li>Q. We know, in relation to rule 35(2), from the Home Office figures that there were no rule 35(2) reports completed in Brook House in 2017. Indeed there weren't any in 2016, 2018, 2019 or 2020 either.</li> <li>Your own figures from September 2021 to January 2022 also confirm no rule 35(2) reports since PPG took over.</li> <li>That is of serious concern, isn't it?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Again, that suggests a fundamental, ongoing failure in the safeguard, doesn't it?  A. It does.  Q. Doesn't that need urgently addressing?  A. I think we are addressing it. But as I say, whilst it is tempting to think that you can just dive in there and fix this problem that has been clearly endemic for the last five years at least, given the numbers you have just given me, it is tempting, but it is not possible.  There is something deeper that needs to happen which is a cultural change programme and I think it ties in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>and (2), I think have been a little lost along the way.</li> <li>Q. Yes, the vast majority of reports are rule 35(3) reports and it appears that rule 35(2) is not used at all?</li> <li>A. Certainly not in Gatwick, no.</li> <li>Q. We know, in relation to rule 35(2), from the Home Office figures that there were no rule 35(2) reports completed in Brook House in 2017. Indeed there weren't any in 2016, 2018, 2019 or 2020 either. Your own figures from September 2021 to January 2022 also confirm no rule 35(2) reports since PPG took over. That is of serious concern, isn't it? A. It is of concern in light of the number of constant</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Again, that suggests a fundamental, ongoing failure in the safeguard, doesn't it?  A. It does.  Q. Doesn't that need urgently addressing?  A. I think we are addressing it. But as I say, whilst it is tempting to think that you can just dive in there and fix this problem that has been clearly endemic for the last five years at least, given the numbers you have just given me, it is tempting, but it is not possible.  There is something deeper that needs to happen which is a cultural change programme and I think it ties in together with some of the criticisms that I have read
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>and (2), I think have been a little lost along the way.</li> <li>Q. Yes, the vast majority of reports are rule 35(3) reports and it appears that rule 35(2) is not used at all?</li> <li>A. Certainly not in Gatwick, no.</li> <li>Q. We know, in relation to rule 35(2), from the Home Office figures that there were no rule 35(2) reports completed in Brook House in 2017. Indeed there weren't any in 2016, 2018, 2019 or 2020 either. Your own figures from September 2021 to January 2022 also confirm no rule 35(2) reports since PPG took over. That is of serious concern, isn't it? A. It is of concern in light of the number of constant supervisions that have been happening during that period</li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Again, that suggests a fundamental, ongoing failure in the safeguard, doesn't it?  A. It does.  Q. Doesn't that need urgently addressing?  A. I think we are addressing it. But as I say, whilst it is tempting to think that you can just dive in there and fix this problem that has been clearly endemic for the last five years at least, given the numbers you have just given me, it is tempting, but it is not possible.  There is something deeper that needs to happen which is a cultural change programme and I think it ties in together with some of the criticisms that I have read and I've heard about as part of this inquiry with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>and (2), I think have been a little lost along the way.</li> <li>Q. Yes, the vast majority of reports are rule 35(3) reports and it appears that rule 35(2) is not used at all?</li> <li>A. Certainly not in Gatwick, no.</li> <li>Q. We know, in relation to rule 35(2), from the Home Office figures that there were no rule 35(2) reports completed in Brook House in 2017. Indeed there weren't any in 2016, 2018, 2019 or 2020 either. Your own figures from September 2021 to January 2022 also confirm no rule 35(2) reports since PPG took over. That is of serious concern, isn't it? A. It is of concern in light of the number of constant supervisions that have been happening during that period of time, yes.</li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Again, that suggests a fundamental, ongoing failure in the safeguard, doesn't it?  A. It does.  Q. Doesn't that need urgently addressing?  A. I think we are addressing it. But as I say, whilst it is tempting to think that you can just dive in there and fix this problem that has been clearly endemic for the last five years at least, given the numbers you have just given me, it is tempting, but it is not possible.  There is something deeper that needs to happen which is a cultural change programme and I think it ties in together with some of the criticisms that I have read and I've heard about as part of this inquiry with a culture of disbelief. So where you have a culture
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>and (2), I think have been a little lost along the way.</li> <li>Q. Yes, the vast majority of reports are rule 35(3) reports and it appears that rule 35(2) is not used at all?</li> <li>A. Certainly not in Gatwick, no.</li> <li>Q. We know, in relation to rule 35(2), from the Home Office figures that there were no rule 35(2) reports completed in Brook House in 2017. Indeed there weren't any in 2016, 2018, 2019 or 2020 either. Your own figures from September 2021 to January 2022 also confirm no rule 35(2) reports since PPG took over. That is of serious concern, isn't it? A. It is of concern in light of the number of constant supervisions that have been happening during that period of time, yes. Q. Yes, and I mean so in 2017, there were 60 incidents</li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Again, that suggests a fundamental, ongoing failure in the safeguard, doesn't it?  A. It does.  Q. Doesn't that need urgently addressing?  A. I think we are addressing it. But as I say, whilst it is tempting to think that you can just dive in there and fix this problem that has been clearly endemic for the last five years at least, given the numbers you have just given me, it is tempting, but it is not possible.  There is something deeper that needs to happen which is a cultural change programme and I think it ties in together with some of the criticisms that I have read and I've heard about as part of this inquiry with a culture of disbelief. So where you have a culture that builds up, that essentially starts to think people
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>and (2), I think have been a little lost along the way.</li> <li>Q. Yes, the vast majority of reports are rule 35(3) reports and it appears that rule 35(2) is not used at all?</li> <li>A. Certainly not in Gatwick, no.</li> <li>Q. We know, in relation to rule 35(2), from the Home Office figures that there were no rule 35(2) reports completed in Brook House in 2017. Indeed there weren't any in 2016, 2018, 2019 or 2020 either.  Your own figures from September 2021 to January 2022 also confirm no rule 35(2) reports since PPG took over.  That is of serious concern, isn't it?</li> <li>A. It is of concern in light of the number of constant supervisions that have been happening during that period of time, yes.</li> <li>Q. Yes, and I mean so in 2017, there were 60 incidents of self-harm; there were, in the relevant period, 195</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Again, that suggests a fundamental, ongoing failure in the safeguard, doesn't it?  A. It does.  Q. Doesn't that need urgently addressing?  A. I think we are addressing it. But as I say, whilst it is tempting to think that you can just dive in there and fix this problem that has been clearly endemic for the last five years at least, given the numbers you have just given me, it is tempting, but it is not possible.  There is something deeper that needs to happen which is a cultural change programme and I think it ties in together with some of the criticisms that I have read and I've heard about as part of this inquiry with a culture of disbelief. So where you have a culture that builds up, that essentially starts to think people are just trying to game the system all the time and,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>and (2), I think have been a little lost along the way.</li> <li>Q. Yes, the vast majority of reports are rule 35(3) reports and it appears that rule 35(2) is not used at all?</li> <li>A. Certainly not in Gatwick, no.</li> <li>Q. We know, in relation to rule 35(2), from the Home Office figures that there were no rule 35(2) reports completed in Brook House in 2017. Indeed there weren't any in 2016, 2018, 2019 or 2020 either.  Your own figures from September 2021 to January 2022 also confirm no rule 35(2) reports since PPG took over.  That is of serious concern, isn't it?</li> <li>A. It is of concern in light of the number of constant supervisions that have been happening during that period of time, yes.</li> <li>Q. Yes, and I mean so in 2017, there were 60 incidents of self-harm; there were, in the relevant period, 195 new ACDTs opened and 248 in total. Sandra Calver</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Again, that suggests a fundamental, ongoing failure in the safeguard, doesn't it?  A. It does.  Q. Doesn't that need urgently addressing?  A. I think we are addressing it. But as I say, whilst it is tempting to think that you can just dive in there and fix this problem that has been clearly endemic for the last five years at least, given the numbers you have just given me, it is tempting, but it is not possible.  There is something deeper that needs to happen which is a cultural change programme and I think it ties in together with some of the criticisms that I have read and I've heard about as part of this inquiry with a culture of disbelief. So where you have a culture that builds up, that essentially starts to think people are just trying to game the system all the time and, therefore, it becomes a conflict about whether rule 35
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>and (2), I think have been a little lost along the way.</li> <li>Q. Yes, the vast majority of reports are rule 35(3) reports and it appears that rule 35(2) is not used at all?</li> <li>A. Certainly not in Gatwick, no.</li> <li>Q. We know, in relation to rule 35(2), from the Home Office figures that there were no rule 35(2) reports completed in Brook House in 2017. Indeed there weren't any in 2016, 2018, 2019 or 2020 either.  Your own figures from September 2021 to January 2022 also confirm no rule 35(2) reports since PPG took over.  That is of serious concern, isn't it?</li> <li>A. It is of concern in light of the number of constant supervisions that have been happening during that period of time, yes.</li> <li>Q. Yes, and I mean so in 2017, there were 60 incidents of self-harm; there were, in the relevant period, 195 new ACDTs opened and 248 in total. Sandra Calver accepted that in the light of those figures, there</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Again, that suggests a fundamental, ongoing failure in the safeguard, doesn't it?  A. It does.  Q. Doesn't that need urgently addressing?  A. I think we are addressing it. But as I say, whilst it is tempting to think that you can just dive in there and fix this problem that has been clearly endemic for the last five years at least, given the numbers you have just given me, it is tempting, but it is not possible.  There is something deeper that needs to happen which is a cultural change programme and I think it ties in together with some of the criticisms that I have read and I've heard about as part of this inquiry with a culture of disbelief. So where you have a culture that builds up, that essentially starts to think people are just trying to game the system all the time and, therefore, it becomes a conflict about whether rule 35 should or shouldn't be done, you have a problem there.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	and (2), I think have been a little lost along the way.  Q. Yes, the vast majority of reports are rule 35(3) reports and it appears that rule 35(2) is not used at all?  A. Certainly not in Gatwick, no.  Q. We know, in relation to rule 35(2), from the Home Office figures that there were no rule 35(2) reports completed in Brook House in 2017. Indeed there weren't any in 2016, 2018, 2019 or 2020 either.  Your own figures from September 2021 to January 2022 also confirm no rule 35(2) reports since PPG took over.  That is of serious concern, isn't it?  A. It is of concern in light of the number of constant supervisions that have been happening during that period of time, yes.  Q. Yes, and I mean so in 2017, there were 60 incidents of self-harm; there were, in the relevant period, 195 new ACDTs opened and 248 in total. Sandra Calver accepted that in the light of those figures, there should have been significantly more of both types of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Again, that suggests a fundamental, ongoing failure in the safeguard, doesn't it?  A. It does.  Q. Doesn't that need urgently addressing?  A. I think we are addressing it. But as I say, whilst it is tempting to think that you can just dive in there and fix this problem that has been clearly endemic for the last five years at least, given the numbers you have just given me, it is tempting, but it is not possible.  There is something deeper that needs to happen which is a cultural change programme and I think it ties in together with some of the criticisms that I have read and I've heard about as part of this inquiry with a culture of disbelief. So where you have a culture that builds up, that essentially starts to think people are just trying to game the system all the time and, therefore, it becomes a conflict about whether rule 35 should or shouldn't be done, you have a problem there.  Where we need to get to is an understanding that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>and (2), I think have been a little lost along the way.</li> <li>Q. Yes, the vast majority of reports are rule 35(3) reports and it appears that rule 35(2) is not used at all?</li> <li>A. Certainly not in Gatwick, no.</li> <li>Q. We know, in relation to rule 35(2), from the Home Office figures that there were no rule 35(2) reports completed in Brook House in 2017. Indeed there weren't any in 2016, 2018, 2019 or 2020 either.  Your own figures from September 2021 to January 2022 also confirm no rule 35(2) reports since PPG took over.  That is of serious concern, isn't it?</li> <li>A. It is of concern in light of the number of constant supervisions that have been happening during that period of time, yes.</li> <li>Q. Yes, and I mean so in 2017, there were 60 incidents of self-harm; there were, in the relevant period, 195 new ACDTs opened and 248 in total. Sandra Calver accepted that in the light of those figures, there should have been significantly more of both types of report, rule 35(1) and rule 35(2). Do you agree?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Again, that suggests a fundamental, ongoing failure in the safeguard, doesn't it?  A. It does.  Q. Doesn't that need urgently addressing?  A. I think we are addressing it. But as I say, whilst it is tempting to think that you can just dive in there and fix this problem that has been clearly endemic for the last five years at least, given the numbers you have just given me, it is tempting, but it is not possible.  There is something deeper that needs to happen which is a cultural change programme and I think it ties in together with some of the criticisms that I have read and I've heard about as part of this inquiry with a culture of disbelief. So where you have a culture that builds up, that essentially starts to think people are just trying to game the system all the time and, therefore, it becomes a conflict about whether rule 35 should or shouldn't be done, you have a problem there.  Where we need to get to is an understanding that this is part of the safeguarding procedures to make sure
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>and (2), I think have been a little lost along the way.</li> <li>Q. Yes, the vast majority of reports are rule 35(3) reports and it appears that rule 35(2) is not used at all?</li> <li>A. Certainly not in Gatwick, no.</li> <li>Q. We know, in relation to rule 35(2), from the Home Office figures that there were no rule 35(2) reports completed in Brook House in 2017. Indeed there weren't any in 2016, 2018, 2019 or 2020 either.  Your own figures from September 2021 to January 2022 also confirm no rule 35(2) reports since PPG took over.  That is of serious concern, isn't it?</li> <li>A. It is of concern in light of the number of constant supervisions that have been happening during that period of time, yes.</li> <li>Q. Yes, and I mean so in 2017, there were 60 incidents of self-harm; there were, in the relevant period, 195 new ACDTs opened and 248 in total. Sandra Calver accepted that in the light of those figures, there should have been significantly more of both types of report, rule 35(1) and rule 35(2). Do you agree?</li> <li>A. One would assume so, yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Again, that suggests a fundamental, ongoing failure in the safeguard, doesn't it?  A. It does.  Q. Doesn't that need urgently addressing?  A. I think we are addressing it. But as I say, whilst it is tempting to think that you can just dive in there and fix this problem that has been clearly endemic for the last five years at least, given the numbers you have just given me, it is tempting, but it is not possible.  There is something deeper that needs to happen which is a cultural change programme and I think it ties in together with some of the criticisms that I have read and I've heard about as part of this inquiry with a culture of disbelief. So where you have a culture that builds up, that essentially starts to think people are just trying to game the system all the time and, therefore, it becomes a conflict about whether rule 35 should or shouldn't be done, you have a problem there.  Where we need to get to is an understanding that this is part of the safeguarding procedures to make sure that people are fit to be detained as best as it is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>and (2), I think have been a little lost along the way.</li> <li>Q. Yes, the vast majority of reports are rule 35(3) reports and it appears that rule 35(2) is not used at all?</li> <li>A. Certainly not in Gatwick, no.</li> <li>Q. We know, in relation to rule 35(2), from the Home Office figures that there were no rule 35(2) reports completed in Brook House in 2017. Indeed there weren't any in 2016, 2018, 2019 or 2020 either.  Your own figures from September 2021 to January 2022 also confirm no rule 35(2) reports since PPG took over.  That is of serious concern, isn't it?</li> <li>A. It is of concern in light of the number of constant supervisions that have been happening during that period of time, yes.</li> <li>Q. Yes, and I mean so in 2017, there were 60 incidents of self-harm; there were, in the relevant period, 195 new ACDTs opened and 248 in total. Sandra Calver accepted that in the light of those figures, there should have been significantly more of both types of report, rule 35(1) and rule 35(2). Do you agree?</li> <li>A. One would assume so, yes.</li> <li>Q. She said nurses don't have a good understanding of</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Again, that suggests a fundamental, ongoing failure in the safeguard, doesn't it?  A. It does.  Q. Doesn't that need urgently addressing?  A. I think we are addressing it. But as I say, whilst it is tempting to think that you can just dive in there and fix this problem that has been clearly endemic for the last five years at least, given the numbers you have just given me, it is tempting, but it is not possible.  There is something deeper that needs to happen which is a cultural change programme and I think it ties in together with some of the criticisms that I have read and I've heard about as part of this inquiry with a culture of disbelief. So where you have a culture that builds up, that essentially starts to think people are just trying to game the system all the time and, therefore, it becomes a conflict about whether rule 35 should or shouldn't be done, you have a problem there.  Where we need to get to is an understanding that this is part of the safeguarding procedures to make sure that people are fit to be detained as best as it is possible for us to establish that as healthcare
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	and (2), I think have been a little lost along the way.  Q. Yes, the vast majority of reports are rule 35(3) reports and it appears that rule 35(2) is not used at all?  A. Certainly not in Gatwick, no.  Q. We know, in relation to rule 35(2), from the Home Office figures that there were no rule 35(2) reports completed in Brook House in 2017. Indeed there weren't any in 2016, 2018, 2019 or 2020 either.  Your own figures from September 2021 to January 2022 also confirm no rule 35(2) reports since PPG took over.  That is of serious concern, isn't it?  A. It is of concern in light of the number of constant supervisions that have been happening during that period of time, yes.  Q. Yes, and I mean so in 2017, there were 60 incidents of self-harm; there were, in the relevant period, 195 new ACDTs opened and 248 in total. Sandra Calver accepted that in the light of those figures, there should have been significantly more of both types of report, rule 35(1) and rule 35(2). Do you agree?  A. One would assume so, yes.  Q. She said nurses don't have a good understanding of rule 35(2) and that there is a significant gap in their	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Again, that suggests a fundamental, ongoing failure in the safeguard, doesn't it?  A. It does.  Q. Doesn't that need urgently addressing?  A. I think we are addressing it. But as I say, whilst it is tempting to think that you can just dive in there and fix this problem that has been clearly endemic for the last five years at least, given the numbers you have just given me, it is tempting, but it is not possible.  There is something deeper that needs to happen which is a cultural change programme and I think it ties in together with some of the criticisms that I have read and I've heard about as part of this inquiry with a culture of disbelief. So where you have a culture that builds up, that essentially starts to think people are just trying to game the system all the time and, therefore, it becomes a conflict about whether rule 35 should or shouldn't be done, you have a problem there.  Where we need to get to is an understanding that this is part of the safeguarding procedures to make sure that people are fit to be detained as best as it is possible for us to establish that as healthcare professionals. And that is not something that is easily
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>and (2), I think have been a little lost along the way.</li> <li>Q. Yes, the vast majority of reports are rule 35(3) reports and it appears that rule 35(2) is not used at all?</li> <li>A. Certainly not in Gatwick, no.</li> <li>Q. We know, in relation to rule 35(2), from the Home Office figures that there were no rule 35(2) reports completed in Brook House in 2017. Indeed there weren't any in 2016, 2018, 2019 or 2020 either.  Your own figures from September 2021 to January 2022 also confirm no rule 35(2) reports since PPG took over.  That is of serious concern, isn't it?</li> <li>A. It is of concern in light of the number of constant supervisions that have been happening during that period of time, yes.</li> <li>Q. Yes, and I mean so in 2017, there were 60 incidents of self-harm; there were, in the relevant period, 195 new ACDTs opened and 248 in total. Sandra Calver accepted that in the light of those figures, there should have been significantly more of both types of report, rule 35(1) and rule 35(2). Do you agree?</li> <li>A. One would assume so, yes.</li> <li>Q. She said nurses don't have a good understanding of</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Again, that suggests a fundamental, ongoing failure in the safeguard, doesn't it?  A. It does.  Q. Doesn't that need urgently addressing?  A. I think we are addressing it. But as I say, whilst it is tempting to think that you can just dive in there and fix this problem that has been clearly endemic for the last five years at least, given the numbers you have just given me, it is tempting, but it is not possible.  There is something deeper that needs to happen which is a cultural change programme and I think it ties in together with some of the criticisms that I have read and I've heard about as part of this inquiry with a culture of disbelief. So where you have a culture that builds up, that essentially starts to think people are just trying to game the system all the time and, therefore, it becomes a conflict about whether rule 35 should or shouldn't be done, you have a problem there.  Where we need to get to is an understanding that this is part of the safeguarding procedures to make sure that people are fit to be detained as best as it is possible for us to establish that as healthcare
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	and (2), I think have been a little lost along the way.  Q. Yes, the vast majority of reports are rule 35(3) reports and it appears that rule 35(2) is not used at all?  A. Certainly not in Gatwick, no.  Q. We know, in relation to rule 35(2), from the Home Office figures that there were no rule 35(2) reports completed in Brook House in 2017. Indeed there weren't any in 2016, 2018, 2019 or 2020 either.  Your own figures from September 2021 to January 2022 also confirm no rule 35(2) reports since PPG took over.  That is of serious concern, isn't it?  A. It is of concern in light of the number of constant supervisions that have been happening during that period of time, yes.  Q. Yes, and I mean so in 2017, there were 60 incidents of self-harm; there were, in the relevant period, 195 new ACDTs opened and 248 in total. Sandra Calver accepted that in the light of those figures, there should have been significantly more of both types of report, rule 35(1) and rule 35(2). Do you agree?  A. One would assume so, yes.  Q. She said nurses don't have a good understanding of rule 35(2) and that there is a significant gap in their	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Again, that suggests a fundamental, ongoing failure in the safeguard, doesn't it?  A. It does.  Q. Doesn't that need urgently addressing?  A. I think we are addressing it. But as I say, whilst it is tempting to think that you can just dive in there and fix this problem that has been clearly endemic for the last five years at least, given the numbers you have just given me, it is tempting, but it is not possible.  There is something deeper that needs to happen which is a cultural change programme and I think it ties in together with some of the criticisms that I have read and I've heard about as part of this inquiry with a culture of disbelief. So where you have a culture that builds up, that essentially starts to think people are just trying to game the system all the time and, therefore, it becomes a conflict about whether rule 35 should or shouldn't be done, you have a problem there.  Where we need to get to is an understanding that this is part of the safeguarding procedures to make sure that people are fit to be detained as best as it is possible for us to establish that as healthcare professionals. And that is not something that is easily

1	policy but there is something that needs more time.	1	Q. And, indeed, there is likely to be harm actually having
2	I think the other thing I would like to just say	2	been caused, because, if people are on ACDTs,
3	about that is that it might feel like a long time	3	self-harming, their mental health deteriorating, that is
4	between September and March, but when you take over	4	actual harm having been caused by them remaining in
5	a new service, it can take quite a long time to really	5	detention in the absence of the safeguards working, isn't it?
6	get under the skin of that service and understand what	7	
7	is really going on on the ground rather than just have	8	A. Potentially. Not everybody that self-harms is mentally
8 9	sort of documentation and numbers.	9	unwell or has a deteriorating mental health condition,
10	That has been a little bit hampered by Covid because	10	and I know that might sound odd, but as I mentioned
11	of the number of outbreaks and the limited access, but notwithstanding that, we have had quite a number of	11	earlier, there are a number of reasons why people would self-harm.
12	visits into the site.	12	It depends on where you want to put the threshold.
13	But as I said right at the very beginning, this	13	As I mentioned earlier, everybody's mental health will
14	inquiry has done us a huge favour, in the sense of being	14	deteriorate as a result of coming into detention.
15	able to really expose some of the issues that need	15	Q. Mr Wells seemed to suggest that the reason that the risk
16	attention from now on.	16	of harm to vulnerable detainees was accepted by PPG and
17	Q. Yes, Dr Oozeerally confirmed in his evidence to the	17	not being addressed immediately, was that PPG didn't
18	inquiry on 14 March, so over two weeks ago, that he is	18	want to bring in a series of changes to working practice
19	still not completing rule 35(2) reports and Dr and	19	that can be confusing to staff and he said he has
20	Sandra Calver gave evidence that she has tried to	20	discussed it with you and he also said:
21	encourage the completion of rule 35(2) reports with the	21	"I think we took a conscious decision that we wanted
22	introduction of her rule 35(2) pathway to no success,	22	to ensure that we had a full and robust process and
23	that GPs still are not completing rule 35(2) reports.	23	policy in place, rather than just making an immediate
24	Sandra Calver gave evidence a month ago today to the	24	snap decision to put something right."
25	inquiry.	25	He said:
	70 40-		7
	Page 197		Page 199
1	Has anyone taken up this issue with from senior	1	"As I said, I think this is about
2	management at PPG, has anyone taken up this issue with	2	a whole-system-approach review, rather than just putting
3	Dr Oozeerally, Dr Chaudhary or Sandra Calver as to what	3	in place, for want of a better phrase, a sticking
4	they are currently doing on the ground?	4	plaster over an issue."
5	A. Yes, so there was a contract review meeting between the	5	But isn't immediate action needed at least some
6	regional manager and the regional medical lead for that	6	immediate action needed to prevent harm coming to these
7	area, where the rule 35(2) were discussed with	7	vulnerable people who are currently in Brook House at
8	Dr Oozeerally. They have reached out to me for further	8	the moment?
9	conversations with them, which I have not yet managed to	9	A. So I think there are mitigating actions being taken to
10	undertake myself but, as I say, we have got this	10	look after people, and to reduce that risk of harm.
11	workshop in place.	11	That is the job of the healthcare department. So as
12	We were waiting I do acknowledge the delay that	12	mentioned earlier, the healthcare is not only there to
13 14	you have pointed out and that is a fair point but we	13 14	fulfil rules 34 and 35, they are there to deliver
15	were waiting until we took over Heathrow so that we could have the two teams together, as I mentioned	15	healthcare to people and to reduce risk and to manage health conditions, including mental health conditions
16	earlier.	16	and there is a mental health team and a psychiatrist
17	Q. Yes, your colleague, Mr Wells, gave evidence yesterday	17	there to do just that.
18	that a review is due to take place on 20 April into the	18	So whilst I appreciate the safeguards around rule 35
19	rule 35 process and that PPG are planning to develop its	19	are taking us some time to work through, that doesn't
20	own pathway to ensure compliance with the rules, but he	20	mean there is no action being taken to mitigate harm and
21	accepted that, in the meantime, as we know, rule 35(2)	21	risk.
22	reports are not being done, there is a risk of harm to	22	Q. It is not a complicated matter to, at the very least,
23	detainees, isn't there?	23	give an instruction to Sandra Calver and her staff
24	A. There is always a risk of harm to detainees, but, yes,	24	that to refer anyone who is on a constant watch on
25	I take your point.	25	an ACDT for a rule 35(2) assessment, and anyone who is
	D 100		D 200
	Page 198		Page 200
			50 (Pages 197 to 200)

1 on an ACDT at all for a rule 35(1) assessment, is it?	1 had we just written a policy and handed it to Gatwick,
2 Couldn't that instruction be given to Sandra Calver?	2 but I just take issue with the fact that it would be
3 A. I think the instruction has been given that everybody	3 effective because I know from experience that simply
4 who has an ACDT should have a mental health assessment,	4 issuing those instructions to sites, it doesn't it is
5 so that they have an understanding of their mental	5 not effective in changing custom and practice and it is
6 health and that may well lead on to a further	6 certainly not effective in changing the quality of
7 assessment, but I appreciate there haven't been any	7 the report and the likely effectiveness of that report
8 rule 35(2)s done as a result of that.	8 in actually ending detention. So that is why we have
9 Q. Nor, indeed, it seems, really, any rule 35(1)s recently?	9 chosen to go down a much deeper route of looking at
10 A. Agreed.	10 culture change and challenging custom and practice, in
Q. A corresponding instruction could be given to	order to actually fix the issue.
Dr Oozeerally, couldn't it, that where someone is on	12 Q. Yes, again, I am sure that is laudable and will bring
an ACDT, he should consider a rule 35(1) report and,	about or hopefully, at least, will begin to bring
where someone is on a constant watch, he should consider	about the types of enduring change, but what about the
15 a rule 35(2) report; couldn't there? Has that	people who are sitting on the constant watch on ACDT
16 instruction been given to him?	16 today in Brook House?
17 A. No.	17 A. I don't know anything about them. As I say, it is
18 Q. At least that would then cover the people you actually	18 something I can take back and I can find out what has
19 know about, who appear to be deteriorating in detention	19 been happening for them, whether they have actually had
by the fact that they are on an ACDT, wouldn't it?	20 a mental health assessment and whether they should be
21 A. That may be true. Again, I don't know the who is on	21 having an assessment under rule 35, but sat here at the
22 ACDTs or any of their conditions.	22 moment, I don't know.
23 Q. We know from Mr Hewer's evidence this morning that there	23 Q. Are you aware the IMB report of 2021 recommended to
are five people on ACDTs, two of whom are on a constant	NHS England that it should carry out a systematic and
25 watch.	25 ongoing review of vulnerable detainees to monitor the
Page 201	Page 203
-	
1 Has any consideration been given to getting them on	1 effect of continued detention on their wellbeing?
2 a rule 35(1) or rule 35(2) report?	2 A. Yes.
3 A. I don't know, but that is something I can go and find	3 Q. Do you know if that has been done by NHS England?
4 out.	4 A. Yes, I believe there was a visit, a safeguarding visit,
5 Q. Yes, please, and report back to us. Because, given	5 by NHS England. I can't remember the date off the top
6 those numbers, given that the numbers in Brook House are	6 of my head.
7 so low at the moment, of five reports, it would be easy	7 Q. Would you be able to find out?
8 enough to arrange those assessments speedily, wouldn't	8 A. We can find that, and we have a report from them and
9 it?	9 a series of recommendations that have been made.
10 A. I would imagine so, if they were required, yes.	Q. Would you be able to provide those to the inquiry,
11 Q. You could also, couldn't you, give an immediate simple	11 please?
instruction to Dr Oozeerally that if he completes	12 A. Yes, of course.
a part C, if he finds it necessary to complete a part C,	13 Q. Thank you. In relation to use of force, are you aware,
his "work-around", as you put it, in relation to	also, that the IMB 2021 report expressed concerns about
15 a vulnerable detainee's deterioration, self-harm,	15 the high incidence of use of force being used to deal
16 a suicide attempt or any other concern, he should also,	16 with self-harm?
at that time, complete either a rule 35(1) report, at	17 A. Yes.
least, or, if appropriate, a rule 35(2) report?	18 Q. Sandra Calver confirmed in her evidence that force is
19 A. That will be a conversation I am sure that we will have	19 used to relocate people to E wing, and, on E wing, to
as part of that pathway workshop in April.	deal with those at risk of self-harm or presenting with
21 Q. Shouldn't that be happening now	21 actual self-harm. Are you aware that is still currently
22 A. Well, I think	22 happening in Brook House?
23 Q that conversation?	23 A. I don't know.
A. I think it would be lovely, and I dare say I would have	Q. Would you agree that use of force risks exacerbating and
25 had a lot easier time in this particular conversation,	25 damaging further the mental health of vulnerable
Page 202	Page 204
	51 (Pages 201 to 204)

1	detainees and shouldn't happen unless it is to prevent	1 Dr Oozeerally wrote what has been referred to as
2	a risk to life?	2 a fitness-to-fly letter, and he stated in that letter:
3	A. I would agree with that. Certainly it does nothing to	3 "The above detainee is fit to fly and fit for
4	improve relationships, that is for sure.	4 detention. He will need a medical escort due to the
5	Q. And it should be a last resort?	5 nature of his medical condition. I am happy for
6	A. It should.	6 reasonable force to be used (C&R) in order to facilitate
7	Q. So it is a concern if it is still being used as,	7 the removal."
8	effectively, a custodial risk management tool to respond	8 Is PPG aware of that practice of GPs providing such
9	routinely to self-harm, isn't it?	9 letters currently?
10	A. Yes.	10 A. So of the use of force bit, I wasn't aware of that until
11	Q. Mr Wells accepted that that is a concern and warranted	11 this inquiry.
12	further exploration. Is that something that the senior	12 The fitness to fly, I was aware of. We have
13	management at PPG are going to do; to look into the	13 certainly come across this before when we had
14	resort to use of force by self-harm, the healthcare's	14 Campsfield House and also at Huntercombe, which is
15	role in not raising concerns or contraindications in	15 a foreign national prison where people can be deported
16	relation to that?	directly from, Huntercombe. And we put in place a new
17	A. So I think there are a couple of points in there.	17 policy after some discussion and some expert support
18	So I hadn't been previously aware sorry, I hadn't	around fitness to fly to just shift it very slightly
19	been aware until recently about the use of force for	away from saying, "Yes, this person is fit to fly" to
20	self-harm incidents, so I need to understand in more	20 "We know of no reason why this person is not fit to
21	detail whether that is custom and practice now and what	21 <b>fly".</b>
22	is being done about that.	Q. Yes, because the two are different?
23	There was a second part that you just asked me which	A. They're very different, and it is a level of
24	was I can't now remember.	responsibility that I don't think we can take, as
25	Q. That there should be exploration by PPG at a senior	a healthcare provider, and it is not right that we do.
	Page 205	Page 207
1	management level that it appears that healthcare staff	1 I have to say it was against some pushback, from the
_	8	i maye to say it was against some pushbaen, i om the
2	are not raising concerns or contraindications to the use	2 Home Office, who wanted fit-to-fly letters. But we
2	are not raising concerns or contraindications to the use of force, such that then force is being used routinely	2 Home Office, who wanted fit-to-fly letters. But we 3 managed to stick to our guns and that is certainly some
3	of force, such that then force is being used routinely	3 managed to stick to our guns and that is certainly some
3 4	of force, such that then force is being used routinely to respond to self-harm?	managed to stick to our guns and that is certainly some of the work that we will be undertaking with Gatwick to
3 4 5	of force, such that then force is being used routinely to respond to self-harm?  A. Yes, so I think we have recognised that not just in	managed to stick to our guns and that is certainly some of the work that we will be undertaking with Gatwick to get a shift in thinking away from saying, "This person
3 4 5 6	of force, such that then force is being used routinely to respond to self-harm?  A. Yes, so I think we have recognised that not just in immigration removal, but across the secure estates,	managed to stick to our guns and that is certainly some of the work that we will be undertaking with Gatwick to get a shift in thinking away from saying, "This person is fit to fly".
3 4 5 6 7	of force, such that then force is being used routinely to respond to self-harm?  A. Yes, so I think we have recognised that not just in immigration removal, but across the secure estates, there has been no training in healthcare roles and	managed to stick to our guns and that is certainly some of the work that we will be undertaking with Gatwick to get a shift in thinking away from saying, "This person is fit to fly".  Q. The expression of an approval of a use of force is of
3 4 5 6 7 8	of force, such that then force is being used routinely to respond to self-harm?  A. Yes, so I think we have recognised that not just in immigration removal, but across the secure estates, there has been no training in healthcare roles and responsibilities in use of force incidents.	managed to stick to our guns and that is certainly some of the work that we will be undertaking with Gatwick to get a shift in thinking away from saying, "This person is fit to fly".  Q. The expression of an approval of a use of force is of serious concern, if that is continuing, isn't it?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	of force, such that then force is being used routinely to respond to self-harm?  A. Yes, so I think we have recognised that not just in immigration removal, but across the secure estates, there has been no training in healthcare roles and responsibilities in use of force incidents.  That is a failing, I think, across the whole system,	managed to stick to our guns and that is certainly some of the work that we will be undertaking with Gatwick to get a shift in thinking away from saying, "This person is fit to fly".  Q. The expression of an approval of a use of force is of serious concern, if that is continuing, isn't it?  A. Yes. Again, I think highlighting what people's medical
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	of force, such that then force is being used routinely to respond to self-harm?  A. Yes, so I think we have recognised that not just in immigration removal, but across the secure estates, there has been no training in healthcare roles and responsibilities in use of force incidents.  That is a failing, I think, across the whole system, it is not peculiar to us as a provider. Our director of	managed to stick to our guns and that is certainly some of the work that we will be undertaking with Gatwick to get a shift in thinking away from saying, "This person is fit to fly".  Q. The expression of an approval of a use of force is of serious concern, if that is continuing, isn't it?  A. Yes. Again, I think highlighting what people's medical needs are or risks associated with use of force, is
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	of force, such that then force is being used routinely to respond to self-harm?  A. Yes, so I think we have recognised that not just in immigration removal, but across the secure estates, there has been no training in healthcare roles and responsibilities in use of force incidents.  That is a failing, I think, across the whole system, it is not peculiar to us as a provider. Our director of nursing and quality feels very strongly about this	managed to stick to our guns and that is certainly some of the work that we will be undertaking with Gatwick to get a shift in thinking away from saying, "This person is fit to fly".  Q. The expression of an approval of a use of force is of serious concern, if that is continuing, isn't it?  A. Yes. Again, I think highlighting what people's medical needs are or risks associated with use of force, is entirely appropriate; to say somebody is fit to have use
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	of force, such that then force is being used routinely to respond to self-harm?  A. Yes, so I think we have recognised that not just in immigration removal, but across the secure estates, there has been no training in healthcare roles and responsibilities in use of force incidents.  That is a failing, I think, across the whole system, it is not peculiar to us as a provider. Our director of nursing and quality feels very strongly about this because nurses are often put in a very challenging	managed to stick to our guns and that is certainly some of the work that we will be undertaking with Gatwick to get a shift in thinking away from saying, "This person is fit to fly".  Q. The expression of an approval of a use of force is of serious concern, if that is continuing, isn't it?  A. Yes. Again, I think highlighting what people's medical needs are or risks associated with use of force, is entirely appropriate; to say somebody is fit to have use of force is something quite different.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	of force, such that then force is being used routinely to respond to self-harm?  A. Yes, so I think we have recognised that not just in immigration removal, but across the secure estates, there has been no training in healthcare roles and responsibilities in use of force incidents.  That is a failing, I think, across the whole system, it is not peculiar to us as a provider. Our director of nursing and quality feels very strongly about this because nurses are often put in a very challenging position of being a single voice in a highly-charged	managed to stick to our guns and that is certainly some of the work that we will be undertaking with Gatwick to get a shift in thinking away from saying, "This person is fit to fly".  Q. The expression of an approval of a use of force is of serious concern, if that is continuing, isn't it?  A. Yes. Again, I think highlighting what people's medical needs are or risks associated with use of force, is entirely appropriate; to say somebody is fit to have use of force is something quite different.  Q. And completely inappropriate?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	of force, such that then force is being used routinely to respond to self-harm?  A. Yes, so I think we have recognised that not just in immigration removal, but across the secure estates, there has been no training in healthcare roles and responsibilities in use of force incidents.  That is a failing, I think, across the whole system, it is not peculiar to us as a provider. Our director of nursing and quality feels very strongly about this because nurses are often put in a very challenging position of being a single voice in a highly-charged situation and often they are unsure of their role and	managed to stick to our guns and that is certainly some of the work that we will be undertaking with Gatwick to get a shift in thinking away from saying, "This person is fit to fly".  Q. The expression of an approval of a use of force is of serious concern, if that is continuing, isn't it?  A. Yes. Again, I think highlighting what people's medical needs are or risks associated with use of force, is entirely appropriate; to say somebody is fit to have use of force is something quite different.  Q. And completely inappropriate?  A. I would agree.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	of force, such that then force is being used routinely to respond to self-harm?  A. Yes, so I think we have recognised that not just in immigration removal, but across the secure estates, there has been no training in healthcare roles and responsibilities in use of force incidents.  That is a failing, I think, across the whole system, it is not peculiar to us as a provider. Our director of nursing and quality feels very strongly about this because nurses are often put in a very challenging position of being a single voice in a highly-charged situation and often they are unsure of their role and responsibility.	managed to stick to our guns and that is certainly some of the work that we will be undertaking with Gatwick to get a shift in thinking away from saying, "This person is fit to fly".  Q. The expression of an approval of a use of force is of serious concern, if that is continuing, isn't it?  A. Yes. Again, I think highlighting what people's medical needs are or risks associated with use of force, is entirely appropriate; to say somebody is fit to have use of force is something quite different.  Q. And completely inappropriate?  A. I would agree.  15 Q. Is that something that is going to be raised, or is
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	of force, such that then force is being used routinely to respond to self-harm?  A. Yes, so I think we have recognised that not just in immigration removal, but across the secure estates, there has been no training in healthcare roles and responsibilities in use of force incidents.  That is a failing, I think, across the whole system, it is not peculiar to us as a provider. Our director of nursing and quality feels very strongly about this because nurses are often put in a very challenging position of being a single voice in a highly-charged situation and often they are unsure of their role and responsibility.  So we've just piloted a training course — I think	managed to stick to our guns and that is certainly some of the work that we will be undertaking with Gatwick to get a shift in thinking away from saying, "This person is fit to fly".  Q. The expression of an approval of a use of force is of serious concern, if that is continuing, isn't it?  A. Yes. Again, I think highlighting what people's medical needs are or risks associated with use of force, is entirely appropriate; to say somebody is fit to have use of force is something quite different.  Q. And completely inappropriate?  A. I would agree.  Q. Is that something that is going to be raised, or is being raised, with Dr Oozeerally and Dr Chaudhary who
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	of force, such that then force is being used routinely to respond to self-harm?  A. Yes, so I think we have recognised that not just in immigration removal, but across the secure estates, there has been no training in healthcare roles and responsibilities in use of force incidents.  That is a failing, I think, across the whole system, it is not peculiar to us as a provider. Our director of nursing and quality feels very strongly about this because nurses are often put in a very challenging position of being a single voice in a highly-charged situation and often they are unsure of their role and responsibility.  So we've just piloted a training course — I think in Yorkshire, is where it was being piloted — to look	managed to stick to our guns and that is certainly some of the work that we will be undertaking with Gatwick to get a shift in thinking away from saying, "This person is fit to fly".  Q. The expression of an approval of a use of force is of serious concern, if that is continuing, isn't it?  A. Yes. Again, I think highlighting what people's medical needs are or risks associated with use of force, is entirely appropriate; to say somebody is fit to have use of force is something quite different.  Q. And completely inappropriate?  A. I would agree.  Q. Is that something that is going to be raised, or is being raised, with Dr Oozeerally and Dr Chaudhary who appear to be undertaking that practice?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	of force, such that then force is being used routinely to respond to self-harm?  A. Yes, so I think we have recognised that not just in immigration removal, but across the secure estates, there has been no training in healthcare roles and responsibilities in use of force incidents.  That is a failing, I think, across the whole system, it is not peculiar to us as a provider. Our director of nursing and quality feels very strongly about this because nurses are often put in a very challenging position of being a single voice in a highly-charged situation and often they are unsure of their role and responsibility.  So we've just piloted a training course — I think in Yorkshire, is where it was being piloted — to look at just this, to support staff in raising concerns and	managed to stick to our guns and that is certainly some of the work that we will be undertaking with Gatwick to get a shift in thinking away from saying, "This person is fit to fly".  Q. The expression of an approval of a use of force is of serious concern, if that is continuing, isn't it?  A. Yes. Again, I think highlighting what people's medical needs are or risks associated with use of force, is entirely appropriate; to say somebody is fit to have use of force is something quite different.  Q. And completely inappropriate?  A. I would agree.  Q. Is that something that is going to be raised, or is being raised, with Dr Oozeerally and Dr Chaudhary who appear to be undertaking that practice?  A. Yes.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	of force, such that then force is being used routinely to respond to self-harm?  A. Yes, so I think we have recognised that not just in immigration removal, but across the secure estates, there has been no training in healthcare roles and responsibilities in use of force incidents.  That is a failing, I think, across the whole system, it is not peculiar to us as a provider. Our director of nursing and quality feels very strongly about this because nurses are often put in a very challenging position of being a single voice in a highly-charged situation and often they are unsure of their role and responsibility.  So we've just piloted a training course — I think in Yorkshire, is where it was being piloted — to look at just this, to support staff in raising concerns and to understand what they need to do and what their	managed to stick to our guns and that is certainly some of the work that we will be undertaking with Gatwick to get a shift in thinking away from saying, "This person is fit to fly".  Q. The expression of an approval of a use of force is of serious concern, if that is continuing, isn't it?  A. Yes. Again, I think highlighting what people's medical needs are or risks associated with use of force, is entirely appropriate; to say somebody is fit to have use of force is something quite different.  Q. And completely inappropriate?  A. I would agree. Q. Is that something that is going to be raised, or is being raised, with Dr Oozeerally and Dr Chaudhary who appear to be undertaking that practice?  A. Yes. Q. In relation to DSO 04 2020 on mental vulnerability, are
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	of force, such that then force is being used routinely to respond to self-harm?  A. Yes, so I think we have recognised that not just in immigration removal, but across the secure estates, there has been no training in healthcare roles and responsibilities in use of force incidents.  That is a failing, I think, across the whole system, it is not peculiar to us as a provider. Our director of nursing and quality feels very strongly about this because nurses are often put in a very challenging position of being a single voice in a highly-charged situation and often they are unsure of their role and responsibility.  So we've just piloted a training course — I think in Yorkshire, is where it was being piloted — to look at just this, to support staff in raising concerns and to understand what they need to do and what their responsibilities are, and that is being rolled out to	managed to stick to our guns and that is certainly some of the work that we will be undertaking with Gatwick to get a shift in thinking away from saying, "This person is fit to fly".  Q. The expression of an approval of a use of force is of serious concern, if that is continuing, isn't it?  A. Yes. Again, I think highlighting what people's medical needs are or risks associated with use of force, is entirely appropriate; to say somebody is fit to have use of force is something quite different.  Q. And completely inappropriate?  A. I would agree. Q. Is that something that is going to be raised, or is being raised, with Dr Oozeerally and Dr Chaudhary who appear to be undertaking that practice?  A. Yes. Q. In relation to DSO 04 2020 on mental vulnerability, are you aware that the policy background to the development
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	of force, such that then force is being used routinely to respond to self-harm?  A. Yes, so I think we have recognised that not just in immigration removal, but across the secure estates, there has been no training in healthcare roles and responsibilities in use of force incidents.  That is a failing, I think, across the whole system, it is not peculiar to us as a provider. Our director of nursing and quality feels very strongly about this because nurses are often put in a very challenging position of being a single voice in a highly-charged situation and often they are unsure of their role and responsibility.  So we've just piloted a training course I think in Yorkshire, is where it was being piloted to look at just this, to support staff in raising concerns and to understand what they need to do and what their responsibilities are, and that is being rolled out to Gatwick, but, off the top of my head, I don't know what	managed to stick to our guns and that is certainly some of the work that we will be undertaking with Gatwick to get a shift in thinking away from saying, "This person is fit to fly".  Q. The expression of an approval of a use of force is of serious concern, if that is continuing, isn't it?  A. Yes. Again, I think highlighting what people's medical needs are or risks associated with use of force, is entirely appropriate; to say somebody is fit to have use of force is something quite different.  Q. And completely inappropriate?  A. I would agree.  Q. Is that something that is going to be raised, or is being raised, with Dr Oozeerally and Dr Chaudhary who appear to be undertaking that practice?  A. Yes.  Q. In relation to DSO 04 2020 on mental vulnerability, are you aware that the policy background to the development of this DSO was some litigation in the cases of VC and
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	of force, such that then force is being used routinely to respond to self-harm?  A. Yes, so I think we have recognised that not just in immigration removal, but across the secure estates, there has been no training in healthcare roles and responsibilities in use of force incidents.  That is a failing, I think, across the whole system, it is not peculiar to us as a provider. Our director of nursing and quality feels very strongly about this because nurses are often put in a very challenging position of being a single voice in a highly-charged situation and often they are unsure of their role and responsibility.  So we've just piloted a training course — I think in Yorkshire, is where it was being piloted — to look at just this, to support staff in raising concerns and to understand what they need to do and what their responsibilities are, and that is being rolled out to Gatwick, but, off the top of my head, I don't know what date they are receiving that. Again, that is something	managed to stick to our guns and that is certainly some of the work that we will be undertaking with Gatwick to get a shift in thinking away from saying, "This person is fit to fly".  Q. The expression of an approval of a use of force is of serious concern, if that is continuing, isn't it?  A. Yes. Again, I think highlighting what people's medical needs are or risks associated with use of force, is entirely appropriate; to say somebody is fit to have use of force is something quite different.  Q. And completely inappropriate?  A. I would agree. Q. Is that something that is going to be raised, or is being raised, with Dr Oozeerally and Dr Chaudhary who appear to be undertaking that practice?  A. Yes. Q. In relation to DSO 04 2020 on mental vulnerability, are you aware that the policy background to the development of this DSO was some litigation in the cases of VC and MDA, where, in those cases, on two occasions, in 2018
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	of force, such that then force is being used routinely to respond to self-harm?  A. Yes, so I think we have recognised that not just in immigration removal, but across the secure estates, there has been no training in healthcare roles and responsibilities in use of force incidents.  That is a failing, I think, across the whole system, it is not peculiar to us as a provider. Our director of nursing and quality feels very strongly about this because nurses are often put in a very challenging position of being a single voice in a highly-charged situation and often they are unsure of their role and responsibility.  So we've just piloted a training course — I think in Yorkshire, is where it was being piloted — to look at just this, to support staff in raising concerns and to understand what they need to do and what their responsibilities are, and that is being rolled out to Gatwick, but, off the top of my head, I don't know what date they are receiving that. Again, that is something we can get to you, if that would be helpful.	managed to stick to our guns and that is certainly some of the work that we will be undertaking with Gatwick to get a shift in thinking away from saying, "This person is fit to fly".  Q. The expression of an approval of a use of force is of serious concern, if that is continuing, isn't it?  A. Yes. Again, I think highlighting what people's medical needs are or risks associated with use of force, is entirely appropriate; to say somebody is fit to have use of force is something quite different.  Q. And completely inappropriate?  A. I would agree. Q. Is that something that is going to be raised, or is being raised, with Dr Oozeerally and Dr Chaudhary who appear to be undertaking that practice?  A. Yes. Q. In relation to DSO 04 2020 on mental vulnerability, are you aware that the policy background to the development of this DSO was some litigation in the cases of VC and MDA, where, in those cases, on two occasions, in 2018 and 2019, the arrangements in the IRC discriminated
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	of force, such that then force is being used routinely to respond to self-harm?  A. Yes, so I think we have recognised that not just in immigration removal, but across the secure estates, there has been no training in healthcare roles and responsibilities in use of force incidents.  That is a failing, I think, across the whole system, it is not peculiar to us as a provider. Our director of nursing and quality feels very strongly about this because nurses are often put in a very challenging position of being a single voice in a highly-charged situation and often they are unsure of their role and responsibility.  So we've just piloted a training course — I think in Yorkshire, is where it was being piloted — to look at just this, to support staff in raising concerns and to understand what they need to do and what their responsibilities are, and that is being rolled out to Gatwick, but, off the top of my head, I don't know what date they are receiving that. Again, that is something we can get to you, if that would be helpful.  Q. Thank you. Yes, it would.	managed to stick to our guns and that is certainly some of the work that we will be undertaking with Gatwick to get a shift in thinking away from saying, "This person is fit to fly".  Q. The expression of an approval of a use of force is of serious concern, if that is continuing, isn't it?  A. Yes. Again, I think highlighting what people's medical needs are or risks associated with use of force, is entirely appropriate; to say somebody is fit to have use of force is something quite different.  Q. And completely inappropriate?  A. I would agree. Q. Is that something that is going to be raised, or is being raised, with Dr Oozeerally and Dr Chaudhary who appear to be undertaking that practice?  A. Yes. Q. In relation to DSO 04 2020 on mental vulnerability, are you aware that the policy background to the development of this DSO was some litigation in the cases of VC and MDA, where, in those cases, on two occasions, in 2018 and 2019, the arrangements in the IRC discriminated against people who suffer from serious mental illnesses
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	of force, such that then force is being used routinely to respond to self-harm?  A. Yes, so I think we have recognised that not just in immigration removal, but across the secure estates, there has been no training in healthcare roles and responsibilities in use of force incidents.  That is a failing, I think, across the whole system, it is not peculiar to us as a provider. Our director of nursing and quality feels very strongly about this because nurses are often put in a very challenging position of being a single voice in a highly-charged situation and often they are unsure of their role and responsibility.  So we've just piloted a training course — I think in Yorkshire, is where it was being piloted — to look at just this, to support staff in raising concerns and to understand what they need to do and what their responsibilities are, and that is being rolled out to Gatwick, but, off the top of my head, I don't know what date they are receiving that. Again, that is something we can get to you, if that would be helpful.	managed to stick to our guns and that is certainly some of the work that we will be undertaking with Gatwick to get a shift in thinking away from saying, "This person is fit to fly".  Q. The expression of an approval of a use of force is of serious concern, if that is continuing, isn't it?  A. Yes. Again, I think highlighting what people's medical needs are or risks associated with use of force, is entirely appropriate; to say somebody is fit to have use of force is something quite different.  Q. And completely inappropriate?  A. I would agree. Q. Is that something that is going to be raised, or is being raised, with Dr Oozeerally and Dr Chaudhary who appear to be undertaking that practice?  A. Yes. Q. In relation to DSO 04 2020 on mental vulnerability, are you aware that the policy background to the development of this DSO was some litigation in the cases of VC and MDA, where, in those cases, on two occasions, in 2018 and 2019, the arrangements in the IRC discriminated
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	of force, such that then force is being used routinely to respond to self-harm?  A. Yes, so I think we have recognised that not just in immigration removal, but across the secure estates, there has been no training in healthcare roles and responsibilities in use of force incidents.  That is a failing, I think, across the whole system, it is not peculiar to us as a provider. Our director of nursing and quality feels very strongly about this because nurses are often put in a very challenging position of being a single voice in a highly-charged situation and often they are unsure of their role and responsibility.  So we've just piloted a training course — I think in Yorkshire, is where it was being piloted — to look at just this, to support staff in raising concerns and to understand what they need to do and what their responsibilities are, and that is being rolled out to Gatwick, but, off the top of my head, I don't know what date they are receiving that. Again, that is something we can get to you, if that would be helpful.  Q. Thank you. Yes, it would.	managed to stick to our guns and that is certainly some of the work that we will be undertaking with Gatwick to get a shift in thinking away from saying, "This person is fit to fly".  Q. The expression of an approval of a use of force is of serious concern, if that is continuing, isn't it?  A. Yes. Again, I think highlighting what people's medical needs are or risks associated with use of force, is entirely appropriate; to say somebody is fit to have use of force is something quite different.  Q. And completely inappropriate?  A. I would agree. Q. Is that something that is going to be raised, or is being raised, with Dr Oozeerally and Dr Chaudhary who appear to be undertaking that practice?  A. Yes. Q. In relation to DSO 04 2020 on mental vulnerability, are you aware that the policy background to the development of this DSO was some litigation in the cases of VC and MDA, where, in those cases, on two occasions, in 2018 and 2019, the arrangements in the IRC discriminated against people who suffer from serious mental illnesses

1	assistance to support them to make representations about	1	independent doctor reviews whilst maintaining healthcare
2	their detention or their medical treatment. Were you	2	provision due to a lack of space and resources.
3	aware of the background to the introduction of that DSO?	3	Do you agree that detained people should be
4	A. No, I wasn't.	4	facilitated to get medical assessments needed in respect
5	Q. The DSO has been the subject of some criticism for	5	of their detention to the extent relevant for their
6	example, from Medical Justice for not addressing the	6	immigration applications?
7	issue that a lack of independent assistance to support	7	A. So I think if I can just widen that ever so slightly,
8	those people means that discrimination may still occur;	8	because there is a tension that is inherent in the
9	it depends the DSO depends upon wing officers and	9	system that we have in place at the moment between the
10	healthcare recognising concerns about lack of mental	10	role of provision of healthcare and the assessment of
11	capacity, the mental condition being assessed and	11	somebody's fitness to remain in detention.
12	recognised, and the detained person engaging, and there	12	That can create and I think Dr Oozeerally did
13	is no provision in the DSO for any independent advocacy	13	discuss this a little in his evidence around that
14	for the detained person.	14	detention, particularly if sorry, that tension,
15	Would you agree that that is still a concern, if	15	particularly if the doctor disagrees with an individual
16	there is a lack of independent advocacy for those who	16	about their fitness for detention. That can have
17	have serious mental illness or may lack capacity?	17	a damaging impact on the relationship.
18	A. Yes, I think it is a concern.	18	I would prefer to be in the position where we were
19	Q. There is nothing about independent advocacy in your	19	providing healthcare and other people were assessing the
20	witness statement. Did you know about this gap in the	20	fitness for detention, as a separate process, but that
21	system?	21	is not the position that we are in at the moment. So we
22	A. No. I think it is a simple answer, and now you say it,	22	are, as discussed, working on how we make the system
23	it makes complete sense, but at the time I wrote the	23	work effectively.
24	statement, it was not something that was on my mind.	24	But independent advocacy will play a role in that
25	Q. It seems from the evidence the inquiry has heard that	25	without a doubt. The space issues are very real in
	Page 209		Page 211
1	there doesn't seem to be a routine consideration of	1	Gatwick. I don't know how many people in the room have
2	mental capacity in relation to those who have	2	been able to visit healthcare there, but there are four
3	vulnerabilities or mental health issues.	3	rooms, one of which is a pharmacy, one is an office and
4	Again, if that is right, that is of concern, isn't	4	two clinical rooms, so there is a tiny amount of space
5	it?	5	in which to deliver any kind of healthcare. So it is
6	A. Well, mental capacity is a dynamic thing. There is not	6	a constant tension, I think, and a balance between the
7	a sort of single point where you say this person does or	7	various different priorities.
8	doesn't have mental capacity, except in extreme	8	Q. You would accept that a detained person has a right to
9	circumstances, so that is something I would expect to be	9	access the necessary evidence to advance their
10	happening on a regular basis as a dynamic assessment of	10	immigration case in detention or to challenge their
11	somebody.	11	detention?
12	Q. And if it is not, it is a concern?	12	A. That right is written into law, I believe.
13	A. It would be a concern. I have no evidence either way,	13	Q. And restrictions placed upon their access to independent
14	except I can't be sure. I thought I had heard of	14	experts can impair their right of access to legal
15	a case recently where they had assessed mental capacity,	15	remedies?
16	but I can't be 100 per cent sure it was Gatwick.	16	A. I don't think there is any intent to restrict that. It
17	Q. Are there plans for PPG to commission any independent	17	is a simple, practical issue about space available in
18	advocacy service into Brook House?	18	order to provide that.
19	A. Not that I know of, but it is certainly something we can	19	Q. So what steps are PPG taking in order to address those
20	look at with our commissioners.	20	problems?
21	Q. Yes. And so, would you plan to do that?	21	A. Again, discussion with our Serco colleagues, one of the
22	A. I will raise it with our regional manager to talk to our	22	similarities between an immigration removal centre and
23	commissioning colleagues around that.	23	a prison is the fact that, providing healthcare in these
24	Q. Just finally then, at paragraph 84 of your statement,	24	environments, we are not in total control of our
25	you mention potential future problems with supporting	25	environment and a great deal of partnership working is
	D 240		D 212
	Page 210		Page 212
			53 (Pages 200 to 212)

1	required in order to make things work effectively. So	1
2	a discussion with Serco about whether other spaces are	MR STEVEN HEWER (sworn)1
3	available, whether we can expand some of the clinical	2
4	space in order to provide more services certainly,	Examination by MS MOORE1
5	I know there has been discussion around the dental	Questions from THE CHAIR155
6	suite, for example, which I believe is still currently	Questions from THE CHAIR133
7	a toilet, but is going to be converted at some stage.	DR SARAH BROMLEY (sworn)157
8	So they are trying to get creative about finding	5
9	space in order to deliver healthcare, but those are	Examination by MS SIMCOCK158
10	conversations, and, as you heard from Serco earlier,	6 Questions from THE CHAIR213
11	there is a limit to what they can do to the built	7
12	environment.	8
13	MS SIMCOCK: Thank you. Chair, I don't have any further	9
14	questions for this witness.	10   11
	THE CHAIR: Thank you very much, Ms Simcock.	12
15	• • •	13
16	Questions from THE CHAIR  THE CHAIR. Dr Browley, it is not a question as such it is	14
17	THE CHAIR: Dr Bromley, it is not a question as such, it is	15 16
18	just really to reiterate what Ms Simcock has said	17
19 20	around I think, as you will appreciate from the	18
	question that I asked yesterday of Mr Wells, I would	19
21	like to understand fully the and obviously you have	20
22	explained something around the rationale for delaying	21 22
23	the review of rule 35, but I think, as Ms Simcock said,	23
24	and as my question was yesterday, I want to fully	24
25	understand what is happening at the moment for those	25
	Page 213	Page 215
1	people who were on constant watches, so I would be	
2	grateful if you could provide the inquiry with some	
3	further information about that.	
4	A. Sure, yes.	
5	THE CHAIR: Thank you very much.	
6	MS SIMCOCK: Chair, I understand that due to a technical	
7	issue at the beginning of the broadcast, the witness's	
8	name was missed, so I just wonder, could you just,	
9	please, again, state your full name for the inquiry,	
10	please?	
11	A. That is a very nice, easy question, thank you.	
12	Dr Sarah Bromley.	
13	MS SIMCOCK: Thank you, thank you, Dr Bromley.	
14	THE CHAIR: Thank you very much for coming this afternoon.	
15	I very much appreciate your evidence. Thank you,	
16	Dr Bromley.	
17	MS SIMCOCK: 10.00 am on Monday for the evidence of	
18	Mr Riley.	
19	THE CHAIR: Thank you very much.	
20	(3.17 pm)	
21	(The inquiry adjourned until 10.00 am on Monday,	
22	4 April 2022)	
23		
24		
25	INDEX	
	Page 214	
1	1 age 214	

				Page 210
	212:9,13,14	acting 146:17	147:13 199:17	afternoon 214:14
A 106.11	accommodation	192:16	addressing 118:10	agenda 151:17
abilities 106:11	2:2 29:23 35:8	action 6:14 8:5	118:12 180:6	aggressive 145:3
ability 32:10 63:7	35:17,23 37:25	29:11 46:3 55:23	196:5,6 209:6	aggressively
119:14,17 136:13	38:19 154:24	55:24 58:21 63:9	adds 48:17 50:1	143:15
181:24 able 4:2 8:14 48:2	account 6:23 24:4	71:6 148:15	82:7 88:21	ago 2:12 24:2,5
82:25 93:16	36:15 75:3 79:5	151:4,9,18 152:7	adduced 1:17,19	42:24 67:7 191:6
97:19 100:16	80:11 86:1	200:5,6,20	9:4 158:9	191:11 197:18,24
102:2,8 116:3	190:13	actions 6:15 8:12	adequate 43:15	agree 27:22,25
119:2 136:16	accountable 80:12	19:20 21:17,17	130:3 175:11	28:8 33:18 36:23
151:24 172:7,8	accounting 28:24	21:17 58:22	adequately 93:24	48:21 49:16,19
176:23 179:25	accounts 79:19	62:14 71:19	adhere 45:24	61:17 67:4 79:6
192:8 197:15	accredited 132:5	78:15 101:19	adjourned 214:21	87:3 89:11 96:13
204:7,10 212:2	accurate 76:21	111:11 136:9	adjournment	103:17 104:4
absence 50:5	accurately 93:5	147:14 150:22	157:20	105:5 106:16
112:13 127:23	ACDT 19:23 22:7	200:9	adjust 36:15	113:11 116:2
169:6 199:5	22:13,23 23:3,10	activities 11:7,10	admin 13:2	118:23 120:13
absolutely 164:12	24:2 25:14 26:4	11:11,12,15,16	administrative	144:18 149:7
183:6 195:14	99:20 107:12	11:17 85:1,6,9,10	88:22 159:18	161:13,23 162:16
absorb 45:5	112:12,14,24,25	85:11,15,18	admitted 75:4	166:18 167:5
<b>abuse</b> 3:19	114:19 115:14	activity 101:5,10	admitting 78:2	168:25 169:7
abused 74:25	117:15 119:19	102:6 111:22	adopting 171:2	170:13,15 171:22
abusive 62:9 147:1	156:24 200:25	163:18 164:9	adrenaline 75:16	175:21 176:9,10
academic 45:19	201:1,4,13,20	acts 107:16	adult 2:20 22:7	186:14,18,25
academical 60:24	203:15	actual 32:16 186:2	161:13	187:7 190:8
accept 33:22 66:5	<b>ACDTs</b> 100:2	199:4 204:21	<b>Adults</b> 19:16	191:6,12 192:6
66:9 67:8 68:25	114:18,24 116:15	adapted 161:4	20:23 25:11	193:5 194:21
69:2 76:7,9,12,23	117:7 194:18	add 120:5 139:4	90:18 91:7,20,22	195:23 204:24
79:5 86:19	195:19 199:2	139:12,12,21,22	92:12 116:10,11	205:3 208:14
143:25 149:17	201:22,24	183:21	116:16 117:1,2	209:15 211:3
159:14 166:7	achieve 166:11,12	added 56:15 68:15	118:18 119:3	agreed 33:19
176:17 184:22	172:9	116:16 117:1,10	167:10 173:20	36:22 39:9 44:10
188:3,13 189:1	achieved 5:18	117:17	174:3,15,20	96:7,9 116:6
191:1 212:8	achieving 166:6	additional 11:10	advance 95:11	162:13,17 167:12
acceptable 66:25	acknowledge 51:7	11:11 34:24 35:2	96:9 97:6 162:20	167:19 171:15
179:20	160:12 181:22	36:16 51:23	212:9	172:13 179:6
accepted 33:24	198:12	85:14 118:10	advanced 17:17	201:10
36:3 68:13 74:14	acknowledged	141:17 191:23	154:5	agreeing 5:10
78:23 79:1	111:8	address 6:14 8:13	advantage 136:12	agreement 16:18
129:18 186:8,20	acknowledging	20:25 32:7 58:16	advice 139:9	17:11 18:4,6
192:3 194:19,25	27:19 171:7	58:17,21 60:14	150:12	23:4,8 24:9,23
198:21 199:16	acknowledgment	61:18 71:19	advise 151:16	25:10 32:21
205:11	111:15	151:14,18 163:10	advised 139:10	33:17 36:9,19
accepting 34:16	acquired 38:16	180:4 212:19	advising 121:18	Aid 49:3 109:13
80:10	acronym 56:4,6	addressed 29:7	advocacy 209:13	alive 7:25 101:22
access 4:2 11:7	act 63:4 71:25	62:10,14 81:15 81:16 118:10	209:16,19 210:18 211:24	<b>allegation</b> 17:3 138:22
89:13,15,17,18	86:25 94:5,14			
89:21 113:15	144:13 acted 78:23	136:10 139:10 141:9 142:5	advocating 50:3	allegations 3:3
197:10 208:25	acteu /0.23	141.7 142.3	affront 184:9	53:10,13
	<u> </u>	<u>l</u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				Page 217
n 1544	1.40.00	171 14 172 0 11	07.00.00.10.00.0	1100 10
alleged 54:1	142:20	171:14 172:9,11	87:23 88:10 89:8	aspect 102:19
146:15	annual 42:2,3,3,8	187:22	102:11 136:16	135:16
alleviate 120:14	130:12 147:17	appointments	144:7	aspects 84:13
allocate 148:12	answer 92:22	118:2 160:18,21	arguably 116:14	131:1,18
allocated 51:12	105:6,7,15	161:8 164:21	argue 166:25	asphyxiation
52:8 55:7 92:20	121:11 164:12	165:3 166:5,18	187:13 188:7	131:19
102:5 104:9	167:23 173:19	168:16 170:13,15	arose 4:18 100:6	assault 146:15
111:20,21 154:21	177:18 189:22	172:20,20 175:4	arrange 202:8	assaults 62:16,20
166:20 176:19	209:22	175:6 192:2	arranged 166:17	assess 19:11 45:21
allocation 172:19	answered 119:7	appreciate 124:14	arrangement	95:2 168:23
172:23	154:23	157:12,15 166:9	36:17,23,23	170:20 177:13
allow 39:6 54:2	answers 22:18	180:13 181:11	arrangements	assessed 209:11
74:9 90:22	anticipated 14:7	200:18 201:7	13:19 51:24	210:15
136:13,25	15:7,10 37:23	213:19 214:15	87:16 90:21	assessing 211:19
allowed 4:19	anxiety 175:15	Appreciative	208:23	assessment 144:15
102:17	anxious 187:25	45:20	arranging 166:5	144:20 145:11,12
allowing 122:1	188:7	approach 31:1	arrival 170:20	145:16 160:13
allows 85:2,3	anybody 112:3	35:21 46:19,20	171:2	161:17 163:3
136:5	187:13 188:5,8	61:13 171:2	arrive 100:25	165:23 166:10
alluded 57:11	anymore 119:10	178:3	173:14	169:13 171:5,6,8
107:10 122:5	anyway 33:15	appropriate 86:14	arrived 4:12 102:3	171:9 178:12
alluding 194:1	apart 39:8	90:25 94:11 96:4	103:3 125:16	188:15,25 189:2
alternative 170:19	<b>APCM</b> 56:2,3	98:4 129:24	185:9	189:3,16,25
<b>Altman</b> 78:15	apologised 69:24	144:1 148:15	arriving 101:16	190:11,16 200:25
altogether 61:10	apparent 98:23	150:21 151:8,18	art 85:12	201:1,4,7 203:20
amazing 94:2	apparently 83:25	202:18 208:11	article 122:8,12	203:21 210:10
amber 46:12	142:2	appropriately	126:1 138:20	211:10
amend 139:4,7,10	appear 169:19	91:5 120:1	aside 24:17 60:13	assessments 46:9
139:11,17,24	201:19 208:17	134:10	74:9	103:16 174:21
amending 141:20	appearance 84:17	appropriateness	asked 35:25 39:20	179:25 192:2
142:9	appeared 93:4	17:13 69:4 95:21	40:19 65:16,20	202:8 211:4
amendment 36:20	appearing 184:13	approval 208:7	65:21 67:6 68:3	assigning 108:15
37:19	appears 7:22	approved 97:6	68:11 70:8,16	assist 50:8 51:8
amendments	161:19 186:12	approximate	71:23 72:3,5,19	119:7 132:16
142:3	191:9 193:3	156:9	73:17 74:22 75:1	133:13
<b>amount</b> 10:11	194:4 206:1	approximately	75:9 76:8,17	assistance 24:18
33:20 38:23	application 90:2	38:4,5 155:9	77:5,15 78:15	49:6 51:23 98:15
160:9 164:13	applications 211:6	<b>April</b> 1:1 68:6	99:3,4,16,21	209:1,7
212:4	<b>applied</b> 39:16 54:4	198:18 202:20	106:8,12,18	assistant 20:12,15
amounted 105:2	143:9	214:22	114:22 122:6	27:7 72:24 88:6
105:14	applies 18:10	<b>Arabic</b> 102:14	129:6 139:23	134:22,23 135:20
amounts 115:22	apply 98:3	area 20:13 35:6	147:15 150:5	135:23 152:2
analysis 32:23	applying 34:17	38:18 40:17 85:1	151:10,20,21	assisted 7:3 72:20
47:6	186:9	88:7 98:15,17	152:12,14,17	102:15,17 104:19
and/or 90:1	appointed 132:2	106:6 111:3	155:20 156:22	142:14
annex 11:23 12:3	appointed 132.2	144:15,16 190:2	177:15 181:18	associated 38:17
54:18,21 96:11	161:21 162:14	198:7	205:23 213:20	111:9 208:10
96:12 187:20	165:9,17,22	areas 27:16 35:9	asking 124:14	association 95:9
announcement	166:6 168:17,18	39:16 84:8,10	152:13	99:6
announcement	100.0 100.17,10	37.10 07.0,10	152.15	77.0
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				Page 218
			l	
<b>assume</b> 45:15	127:19	awful 183:21	behaviour 28:6	84:25
48:17 73:2,5	authentically 48:3	B	29:12,16 31:21	bit 7:5 37:23 52:12
126:12 145:24	authorisation		54:3 58:12,19	57:20 68:13 85:4
172:22 194:22	96:11,22	<b>B</b> 11:23 12:3 86:24	62:12 65:7 95:15	89:4 103:19
assumed 165:25	authorise 54:25	96:11,12 141:1	146:23,24 147:10	109:23 131:5
assurance 118:11	96:12,20 151:24	Bachelors 158:15	152:20	161:14 197:9
130:5 142:15	authorised 54:23	back 23:24 26:11	behavioural 43:21	207:10
164:6	authority 91:1	33:16 41:18	believe 40:12	<b>blade</b> 145:10
assure 92:17	availability 17:16	111:10 115:7	72:23 78:13 83:4	<b>blanket</b> 144:21,22
149:18	112:4	118:3 127:20	129:8 138:8	<b>blue</b> 107:11
assured 149:20	available 65:14	151:20 182:21	139:7 150:13	<b>board</b> 103:12
asylum 35:5,16,23	119:13,16 132:17	202:5 203:18	155:12 157:10	108:11 112:11,13
36:24 37:1	133:21 155:18	background 2:5	204:4 212:12	<b>board's</b> 103:22
100:10,18,25	212:17 213:3	61:19 64:6	213:6	104:25
101:18,23 122:13	average 14:7 15:7	208:20 209:3	believed 111:16	<b>boat</b> 102:12
125:16	15:10 52:17,19	<b>bad</b> 79:3 106:12	139:8,17	<b>boats</b> 100:14
attaches 30:20	52:19 84:1 108:3	154:16	beneficial 112:22	101:24 103:4
attack 63:25	averaging 25:22	balance 185:21	113:12,13	104:1 106:15
attempt 74:11	42:17	191:18 212:6	benefit 33:8	125:16
193:14 202:16	avoid 33:9 154:18	banging 188:10	170:24	<b>bodies</b> 28:10
attempted 25:5,18	avoidance 152:24	Barford 20:17	benefits 146:6	body 21:15 88:24
attempts 125:11	avoiding 33:4	<b>base</b> 103:8	best 92:13,21	89:3 130:7,20
attend 18:19 87:17	awaiting 64:1	<b>based</b> 32:8 106:9	105:7 106:10,11	137:20 190:1
89:25 91:24,25	aware 5:21 6:6,12	110:13 122:19	119:13,16 120:3	body-worn 135:1
92:1 113:3,4	6:18 7:25 8:1	145:11 149:19	131:15 154:23	137:22
114:12,19 135:11	28:20 29:6 38:3	basically 29:11	171:3 181:24	boiling 115:18
136:13,16,25	48:8 56:20 58:13	119:25 137:18	192:16,18 196:22	Bosworth 48:6
160:21 161:8	68:1 75:8 76:2	<b>basis</b> 2:21 19:17	better 37:19 52:12	50:1 51:4,16
162:15	81:14,16 87:9	20:24 29:14,18	80:19 89:15,17	86:22 88:13
attended 20:12	88:17 91:13	31:24 39:3 59:25	92:24 98:18	183:24
attending 81:24	92:15 94:13	88:8 89:19 98:20	113:15,15 140:6	Bosworth's 184:3
attends 20:11	98:17 101:3	110:5,5,6 132:24	140:20 167:14	<b>bottom</b> 15:15,18
110:19 160:18	106:22 109:21	132:25 133:1	170:20 171:3	55:12,23 56:1
attention 19:10	110:10 112:25	177:13 210:10	179:1 181:20	boxes 163:7
88:25 89:9	113:2 116:22	<b>bear</b> 75:16 187:2	200:3	<b>Boxing</b> 122:12
197:16	117:25 118:6	<b>bed</b> 112:5	beyond 154:4	brackets 56:1
attitude 151:11	128:3 129:13,14	bedding-in 34:14	<b>Bhui</b> 86:4	<b>branch</b> 29:11
attract 16:14,23	133:23 138:12,22	Bedford 3:8	<b>Bhui's</b> 86:19	152:19
attrition 42:16	139:3 150:13	bedroom 69:21	<b>bid</b> 7:1,3,18 10:8	<b>brave</b> 81:5
audit 8:18 164:5	155:10,15 165:1	98:18 144:9	11:5 13:6,11,13	breach 20:2
audited 134:19	165:10,24 166:2	145:7,20	13:15 14:18 15:2	breached 167:16
auditing 13:23	168:9,12 172:19	beds 153:21	39:20 85:10	167:22 168:1,7
134:17	175:13,17 178:8	began 100:25	<b>bidders</b> 10:7 11:17	break 17:19 83:7
auditory 188:24	184:2,9,17 195:6	beginning 197:13	12:15 13:20	83:11
August 34:7 39:12	195:16 203:23	214:7	bidding 13:5	breakdown 13:14
101:5 107:13	204:13,21 205:18	<b>begun</b> 173:1	bigger 15:15	<b>breaks</b> 109:17
108:2 124:20	205:19 207:8,10	<b>behalf</b> 1:24 105:10	biggest 124:20,21	brief 30:8 54:20
126:23	207:12 208:20	115:10 147:15	125:2,3	59:6 122:22,24
August-wise	209:3	151:11 157:17	biometric 84:24	briefed 64:2
0		behaving 143:15		
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				Page 219
		1		
briefer 189:10	175:10 177:16	186:7 192:3	102:12 108:16	45:22 86:12
briefing 65:17	178:21 186:13	194:18 197:20,24	136:12 175:23	102:9 170:21
briefings 19:14	187:24 189:20	198:3 200:23	178:10 183:2	191:24 193:23
briefly 63:12	194:8 200:7	201:2 204:18	208:21,22	CEO 29:7,9
83:16 92:7 95:9	202:6 203:16	cam 21:15	cashless 86:1	certain 10:6,25
100:7	204:22 210:18	camera 137:21	Castle 49:9 106:4	27:14 34:14 45:5
bring 30:15 57:13	brought 3:14	Campsfield 159:4	111:4 154:16	84:8 98:5 111:24
102:8 118:10	121:16 141:14	207:14	catch 129:4	111:25 112:2
143:7 180:15	Brown 80:22	capacity 118:1	category 14:7	certainly 159:5
199:18 203:12,13	81:12 Programus 82:20	121:8 129:3	86:24	160:6 161:24
bringing 106:21	Brown's 82:20	153:15 208:25	caught 126:23	166:2 174:5
120:22 141:2	bruises 18:14	209:11,17 210:2	127:18	177:24 178:25
181:8	bubble 10:25	210:6,8,15	cause 32:23 71:14	179:25 186:7
Britain 100:18 broadcast 214:7	<b>build</b> 172:6	cardiac 63:13,24	71:17,18	189:7,17 193:2 194:5 195:24
	<b>building</b> 50:8	care 17:15 28:4 49:4 50:22 51:1	caused 21:1,2	203:6 205:3
broader 171:9	83:16,24 85:5		199:2,4	
<b>broadly</b> 53:13 <b>broken</b> 193:10	86:22 87:3,7 88:24 89:3,5	93:9 94:12 104:8 105:9,17,17	causes 80:2 CCTV 21:15 55:10	207:13 208:3 210:19 213:4
<b>Bromley</b> 157:17	143:20 147:8	103.9,17,17	135:1 137:22	cetera 19:5 27:2
157:22,23 158:6	builds 196:16	109.3,14 120.2,3	cease 95:25	31:5 34:15 35:22
213:17 214:12,13	<b>built</b> 84:1,4,5,7,14	171:1,15 175:5	cent 3:20 5:4,17	69:20 84:10
213.17 214.12,13	165:23 213:11	184:15 191:19	13:12,16,16	85:25 86:3
bronze 132:3	<b>bullet</b> 4:17 102:25	cared 71:21 94:11	14:10,10,11 16:4	102:11,13,15
Brook 2:1,15,20	103:5 123:17	104:7 105:16	16:7,8,14,23	114:5 131:19
6:24 7:2,9 8:15	bunny 68:10	caring 105:9	34:20 47:15,20	132:9 136:15
10:2 12:5 13:7	business 8:8	121:17	60:10 97:5 113:3	137:25 151:17
35:7 45:15 49:13	123:11,15	carried 61:2	125:5,7 127:21	chair 1:3,4,17
49:18 51:21	busy 109:2 129:1	141:24 148:18	149:2 150:3	22:16,20 40:18
52:13 63:3,18,22	140:13	164:21 189:25	178:10 210:16	72:3,20 83:6,8,13
68:23 71:13	bypass 63:25 64:4	carries 108:10	centre 2:20 10:23	99:3,16,21
72:25 79:19	193:7	carry 23:19 130:1	12:17 23:9 26:7	138:12,15 150:5
83:15 86:6 87:22		142:15 203:24	29:21,22 31:22	155:3,4,7,8,13,16
88:3,3 92:6,12	C	cascade 134:2	31:23 35:15	155:19 156:6,14
93:22 94:3,25	C 54:18,21 117:19	case 21:7 22:15	39:24 40:5 41:13	156:18,21 157:12
95:5 100:10	192:5,7,20,23	25:25 33:18	41:17 42:21	157:16,18 158:2
101:1 103:7,24	193:4,16 202:13	42:24 78:9 79:21	50:21 52:11 60:5	213:13,15,16,17
104:4,23 105:1	202:13	81:24 82:5 98:9	60:21 79:23	214:5,6,14,19
105:12 106:9	C&R 134:5 207:6	99:1,8 113:7,14	80:21 83:25	215:3,6
110:13 113:8	call 13:24 36:20	113:25 114:14	84:11 86:6 88:10	<b>chaired</b> 135:20,23
114:24 115:20	47:7 71:7 135:7	116:19 117:5,14	89:14 92:21 96:5	<b>challenge</b> 68:14,24
120:8 122:1,7	149:23	135:14 143:6	96:18 102:5	170:8 192:14,19
123:22 126:2	called 12:23 17:23	145:16,19 166:1	103:11,16 120:15	212:10
129:7,21 132:15	19:1 20:17 45:19	179:4 187:19,21	121:16 122:14,25	challenged 68:11
134:10 137:20	58:8 68:14 72:1	190:9 210:15	129:9 143:9	69:19,19 70:5
145:15 147:5,19	calling 68:10 70:1	212:10	153:24 180:24	challenges 83:24
147:23 151:19	Callum 64:18,23	case-by-case 98:1	187:5 212:22	84:3,4 87:4,6
153:2 154:9	65:2 71:24	98:20	centre's 103:2,9	challenging
156:23 157:1	calm 102:16	cases 20:23 25:21	centred 148:6	140:15,16 203:10
164:17 168:2,8	Calver 92:5	54:14 96:17	centres 2:8 6:8,17	206:12
	164:16 168:15			
		-	•	-

				Page 220
<b>chance</b> 190:24	<b>chose</b> 38:17	45:4	214:14	aamplainant 57.10
change 21:3 33:14	chosen 203:9	close 81:4 176:22	comment 4:16	complainant 57:19 complaint 17:1
35:13 45:10,11	Chris 20:17	closed 69:21 81:10	66:3 72:9,11,13	57:3,7,21,23
53:14 60:15,21	Christmas 127:20	159:5	82:8,13,14 90:10	82:20 138:7
62:5 80:9,17	chunk 15:15,18	closing 8:16	92:13,25 96:1	147:17 148:3,11
82:24 84:7	circa 41:16	closing 8.10	106:2 122:15	148:13
125:13 128:9	circumstances	cock 68:8,15 70:2	129:6 179:21	complaints 16:25
138:23 144:5	23:18 26:1,11	code 53:17 142:12	180:17,19 183:2	20:5,6 55:10
155:13 182:10,10	58:17 77:24	147:11	192:8	57:18 58:1 146:8
183:11 196:12	97:25 98:4,7,10	cohorts 11:1	commented 86:22	147:3,19,24
203:10,14	99:1,17 103:22	collateral 48:18	88:13	148:1,6,9,19,22
changes 9:23 10:5	104:25 105:13	colleague 158:25	comments 65:18	148:24 149:5,8
84:15 103:9	112:3 123:2	163:9 175:2	68:10 71:23	149:24
128:3,3 150:23	143:18 148:5	181:18 198:17	146:20	complement 42:19
173:2 199:18	152:5,8 161:15	colleagues 210:23	commission	44:17
changing 33:5	179:18 181:11	212:21	210:17	complete 12:15
80:18 84:17	190:18 193:5,17	College 158:16,17	commissioned	140:4 141:25
153:17 203:5,6	210:9	Collier 128:12,15	118:17 191:20	161:1 167:6
channel 35:22	civilised 184:9	130:4 131:21	commissioners	171:8 180:18
100:13 101:24	claim 100:18	132:15 133:12,24	210:20	189:5 202:13,17
103:4 104:1	claims 117:21,25	136:3 139:23	commissioning	209:23
106:15	clarification 139:6	142:13 143:1	210:23	completed 8:13
channels 63:8 89:1	139:19 141:21	Collier's 73:21,25	committee 135:18	61:5 78:17 124:5
89:10	clarified 139:2	74:2 113:19	common 3:23	124:11,13,15
<b>chap</b> 20:17	clarify 93:16	128:24 143:25	144:6,8	132:21 135:7
characteristics	clarifying 95:8	144:19	communicated	168:16 186:13
101:15	classed 14:20	column 16:3	162:10	188:1,12 191:1
charter 95:12	classes 85:12	combination 103:6	communicating	194:7
102:24 103:7,23	clause 18:21	come 7:5 19:10	143:19	completely 18:13
105:1 107:4,25	Clayton 71:12	20:1,8 24:13	communication	63:2 174:23
122:21 123:10	cleaning 13:2	39:4 57:12 93:9	89:1,10 102:10	181:22 208:13
124:22 154:10	clear 4:23 36:6	95:2 111:16	102:19	completes 202:12
Chaudhary	59:10 69:12	113:19 130:15,17	communications	completing 165:20
178:20 181:15	99:25 111:11	133:4 136:9	89:13 90:25	181:15 197:19,23
182:16 183:20	143:22 144:3	148:14 153:20	114:8	completion 166:14
198:3 208:16	152:24 160:12	163:12 169:9,11	community 88:18	166:15 197:21
check 24:15 25:19	174:14	171:22 183:16	165:4 191:20,22	complexities 51:8
47:7,12 61:20,24	clear-cut 166:8	184:21 187:9,17	company 29:3	compliance 20:13
61:25 62:1	<b>clearly</b> 74:8 82:23	207:13	45:19 46:8	20:19 26:14 33:8
142:18,19 156:19	161:22 162:11	comes 23:11,25	152:16	90:17 127:21
157:11 182:22	181:7 196:8	130:19 135:24	company's 159:9	198:20
checking 55:18	clinical 131:12	168:25	compared 74:5	compliant 164:24
109:14	158:23 160:1	<b>coming</b> 35:22	121:8 125:7	compliantly 74:15
<b>checks</b> 10:16	163:20 182:13	41:11 66:3 98:22	168:3	complicated
142:15	190:1 212:4	107:3 121:19	compassion 82:9	200:22
<b>children</b> 38:16,20	213:3	153:16 157:14	competitions	complied 25:20
38:22 136:23	clinically 94:1	169:17 181:17	85:22,22 86:2	<b>comply</b> 11:5 16:17
137:5	175:14	187:13 188:6,23	competitive 13:19	17:10 18:3,9
<b>choice</b> 74:24 154:8	clinicians 44:12	199:14 200:6	40:22 41:25	24:1 25:10 29:20

199:12 202:1   200:1					Page 221
111:23 166:19				1	
complying 119:8 comprehensive comperhensive compensated 103:6 compensated 103:6 compensated 103:6 concentrating 75:14 concern 58:2 conditions 41:1 concern 58:2 171:15,17,18 173:16,17,22,23 187:8 191:15 2003:2,22 7 (225:20 127:12,13 137:16 1421 213 137: 164:11 177: 261:22 180:5 193:13 138:5,6,6,8 147:4 149:17 151:12 150:6 conducting 149:22 175:1 178:22 180:5 193:13 139:12 confidence 148:25 179:1 179:12 200:16 205:7,11 200:16 205:7,11 206:18 201:21 202:16 205:7,11 200:18 209:15 202:22 162:25 153:17 200:16 205:7,11 200:16 205:18 209:15 202:15 202:24 108:3 129:15 202:24 108:3 129:15 202:24 110:18 109:22 20:113.14 20:19 20:113.14 20:19 20:113.14 20:19 20:113.14 20:19 20:113.14 20:19 20:113.14 20:19 20:113.14 20:19 20:113.14 20:19 20:113.14 20:19 20:113.14 20:19 20:113.14 20:19 20:14 20:1					
comprehensive d.22 93:13         condition 21:3 63:24 64:3 66:4 187:11 199:8 207:5 209:11 conditions 41:1 concern 58:2 71:15,17,18 75:124 75:22 772:225 80:3 92:3 94:22 108:7 122:7 200:15,15 201:22 108:7 122:7 200:15,15 201:22 108:7 122:7 108:7 122:7 200:15,15 201:22 108:7 122:7 200:15,15 201:22 condone 65:7 conduct 36:12 200:15,15 201:22 condone 65:7 constant 70:15 210:417 210:14 17:15 180:1 210:41,12,13 195:2 202:16 205:7,11 208:8 209:15,18 210:4,12,13 200:16 205:7,11 208:8 209:15,18 210:4,12,13 210:14,12,13 210					
4:2 93:13	1 0			· /	
compressed 103:6 concentrating         187:11 199:8 conditions 41:1 concern 58:2 files         119:1 122:3 considering         88:1,22,25 9:6,10 conversation 66:4 concern 58:2 files         103:23 105:1 conversation 66:4 considering         113:1 122:3 considering         88:1,22,25 9:6,10 conversation 66:4 considering         113:1 21:3 13:7 conversation 66:4 considering         11:24 12:13 13:7 conversation 66:4 considering         11:24 12:13 13:7 considering         13:21 14:4 15:11 conversation 66:4 considering         13:22 1 4:4 15:11 conversation 66:4 conversation 66:4 conversation 70:15 constant 70	_				
concentrating 75:14         207:5 209:11 conditions 4:1 63:13 81:6 173:8 71:15,17;18         207:5 209:11 conditions 4:1 63:13 81:6 173:8 76:22,25 77:2,25 187:8 191:15 200:15,15 201:22 condone 65:7 conduct 36:12         137:8 160:4 consistency 53:9 consistent 46:20 consonant 184:16 constant 70:15 71:2 104:17         9:16,17,22 11:21 13:21 144 15:11 13:21 144 15:11 13:21 144 15:11 13:21 144 15:11 13:21 144 15:11 13:22 142:19:19 200:15,15 201:22 consonant 184:16 constant 70:15 71:2 104:17         9:16,17,22 11:21 13:21 144 15:11 13:21 144 15:11 13:21 144 15:11 23:22,10,11,12 36:15,20 37:16 36:15,20 37:16 36:15,10,37:16 36:15,10,37:16 36:15,20 37:16 36:15,20 37:16 36:15,20 37:16 36:15,10,37:16 36:15,10,37:16 36:15,20 37:16 36:15,20 37:16 36:15,10,37:16 36:15,10,37:16 36:15,20 37:16 36:15,20 37:16 36:15,20 37:16 36:15,20 37:16 36:15,20 37:16 36:15,20 37:16 36:15,20,22 30:14,44,14 47:8 53:20 54:13 47:8 53:20 54:13 47:8 22,10,11,12 36:15,20 37:16 47:8 27:10,11,12 47:8 53:20 54:13 47:8 10:17 47:8 10:17 47:10 41:17 47:8 10:17 47:8 10:17 47:8 10:17 47:10 41:17 47:10 41:17					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
concern 58:14	_				
concern 58:2         63:13 81:6 173:8         164:11         13:21 14:4 15:11         164:10 180:12           71:15,17,18         173:16,17,22,23         173:16,17,22,23         173:16,17,22,23         173:22 17         173:22 17         173:22 17         173:25:20 12:22         200:15,15 201:22         constent 46:20         28:11,14 29:19         200:19,23,25         conversations           135:4 137:15         135:4 137:15         135:54 137:15         135:54 137:15         107:22,24 108:3         39:10 40:4 41:14         193:21 198:9         162:22 164:5           135:54 137:15         149:17 151:12         165:18,21 174:25         162:19         107:22,24 108:3         39:10 40:4 41:14         193:21 198:9         132:1 198:9         132:1 198:9         132:1 198:9         133:18 198:18         162:22 164:5         36:15,20 37:16         47:2 50.37:16         47:3 52.0 34:13         47:3 52.0 34:13         47:3 52.0	S				
71:15,17,18 76:22,25 77:2,25 187:8 191:15 200:15,15 201:22 108:7 122:7 125:20 127:12,13 135:4 137:15 138:5,6,6,8 147:4 149:17 151:12 165:18,21 174:25 175:1 178:22 180:5 193:13 194:12,13 195:2 202:16 205:7,11 208:8 209:15,18 210:4,12,13 208:8 209:15,18 210:4,12,13 208:8 209:15,18 210:4,12,13 208:8 209:15,18 210:4,12,13 208:8 209:15,18 210:4,12,13 201:14,1			S		
76:22,25 77:2,25         187:8 191:15         consistent 46:20         28:11,14 29:19         202:19,23,25         converted 219,23,25           80:3 92:3 94:22         200:15,15 201:22         condone 65:7         consum 184:16         consum 184:16         28:11,14 29:19         202:19,23,25         converted 21:22         converted 21:21         147:12 150:6         converted 21:21         32:2,5 33:9,12         converted 21:37         converted 21:37         162:22 164:5         33:1,2 33:9,12         converted 21:37         20:114-24 203:15         118:16 120:21,23         118:16 120:21,23         118:16					
80:3 92:3 94:22 108:7 122:7         200:15,15 201:22 condone 65:7         consonant 184:16 constant 70:15         32:2,5 33:9,12 34:2,11,1,12 162:6         conversations 162:22 164:5         182:20 164:5         182:20 164:5         182:20 164:5         182:21 183:18         182:21 183:18         182:21 183:18         182:21 183:18         182:21 183:18         182:21 183:18         182:21 183:18         193:21 198:9         213:10         conversations 182:19         182:19 183:18         193:21 198:9         213:10         conversations 4:14:14         193:21 198:9         213:10         converted 213:7         converted 213:7<	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
108:7   122:7   conduce 65:7   constant 70:15   71:2 104:17   36:15;200 127:12,13   135:4 137:15   138:5,6,6,8 147:4   149:17   151:12   162:19			consistent 46:20	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	202:19,23,25
125:20 127:12,13   135:4 137:15   138:5,6,6,8 147:4   49:17 151:12   165:18,21 174:25   162:19   162:19   162:19   162:14 175:1   175:21 178:22   162:19   149:7 178:17   169:50,132   149:7 178:17   169:50,132   149:7 178:17   169:50,132   149:7 178:17   169:18   149:7 178:17   169:50,132   149:7 178:17   169:50,22 200:24   112:24 115:1   111:24,25 118:13   132:25 157:9   194:11   132:25 157:9   194:11   132:25 157:9   194:11   132:25 157:9   194:11   132:25 157:9   194:11   132:25 157:9   194:11   132:25 157:9   194:11   132:25 157:9   194:11   132:25 157:9   194:11   132:25 157:9   194:11   132:25 157:9   195:20,22 200:24   110:8   133:17 196:18   180:21   195:20,22 200:24   110:8   133:17 196:18   180:21   195:20,22 200:24   110:8   133:17 196:18   180:21   195:20,22 200:24   110:8   130:24   133:17 196:18   180:21   133:17 196:18   180:21   133:17 196:18   180:21   133:17 196:18   180:21   133:17 196:18   130:24   130:24   130:24   130:24   100:21   130:24	80:3 92:3 94:22	200:15,15 201:22	consonant 184:16	32:2,5 33:9,12	
135:4 137:15   138:5,6,6,8 147:4   147:12 150:6   108:5,13 109:16   43:3,9 44:4,14   43:3,9 44:4,14   43:3,9 44:4,14   47:8 53:20 54:13   156:24,24 157:1   59:2,3,4 60:24   converted 213:7   converted 20:12   149:7 178:17   202:16 205:7,11   208:8 209:15,18   210:4,12,13   194:11   confirm 1:10 12:3   132:25 157:9   132:25 157:9   212:6 214:1   23:14 132:2   concerning 81:7   confism 199:19   confusing 199:19   confusing 199:19   s2:12 86:20   connected 174:16   connected 174:20   context all:11   111:5,8   111:11 15:12,22   116:114,18 185:15   137:8 167:1   137:8 167:1   137:8 167:1   138:13 153:15   contractual 19:11   continue 39:6   contractual 19:11   contractual 19:11   contractual 19:11   contractual 19:12   contractual 19:11   contractual 19:12   contractual 19:13   contractual 19:13   contractual 19:14   contractual 19:15   contractual 19:14   contractual 19:15   contractual 19:15   contractual 19:14   contractual 19:15   contractual 19:15   contractual 19:15   context 30:10   contractual 19:11   contractual 19:11   contractual 19:11   contractual 19:11   contractual 19:11   contractual 19:11   contractual 19:12   contractual 19:11   contractual 19:13   contractual 19:13   contractual 19:14   contractual 19:15   contractual 19:14   contractual 1	108:7 122:7	condone 65:7	constant 70:15	34:2,10,11,12	162:22 164:5
138:5,6,6,8 147:4	125:20 127:12,13	conduct 36:12			182:19 183:18
149:17 151:12   165:18,21 174:25   162:19   156:24,24 157:1   59:23,34 60:24   converted 213:7   confidence 148:25   157:5 194:13   78:1 101:12   convinced 172:9   194:12,13 195:2   202:16 205:7,11   208:8 209:15,18   210:4,12,13   concerned 22:12   184:12   194:11   confirm 1:10 12:3   132:25 157:9   132:14 132:22   142:18   confiantly 100:1,4   confiantly 1	135:4 137:15	45:21 53:17	107:22,24 108:3	39:10 40:4 41:14	193:21 198:9
165:18,21 174:25   162:19   156:24,24 157:1   59:2,3,4 60:24   convey 108:12   convey 108:14	138:5,6,6,8 147:4	147:12 150:6	108:5,13 109:16	43:3,9 44:4,14	213:10
175:1 178:22   180:5 193:13   194:7 178:17   201:14;24 203:15   202:16 205:7,11   208:8 209:15,18   210:4,12,13   208:8 209:15,18   210:4,12,13   206:encerned 22:12   2184:12   206:encerned 22:12   2184:12   206:encerned 40:20   184:12   207:17 204:18	149:17 151:12	conducting 149:22	112:14 115:1	47:8 53:20 54:13	converted 213:7
175:1 178:22   180:5 193:13   194:7 178:17   195:20,22 200:24   111:24,25 118:13   194:12,13 195:2   202:16 205:7,11   208:8 209:15,18   210:4,12,13   132:25 157:9   194:11   confirmed 40:20   184:12   confirmed 40:20   186:21   197:17 204:18   confirmed 40:20   180:21   198:5   contact 141:6   180:21   contact 96:14   198:5,19 103:12   connected 174:16   ennected 174:16   ensequences   179:11   consider 93:3   179:11   ensequences   179:11   ensequences   179:12   ensequences   179:13   ensequences   179:11   ensequences   180:21   ensequences   179:11   ensequences   180:22   entertually-wise   ensequences   179:11   ensequences   180:22   entertually-wise   ensequences   179:11   ensequences   180:21   ensequences   179:11   ensequences   180:22   entertually-wise   ensequences   179:11   ensequences   180:21   ensequences   179:11   ensequences   180:22   entertually-wise   ensequences   179:11   ensequences   180:21   ensequences   179:11   ensequences   180:22   entertually-wise   ensequences   179:11   ensequences   180:21   ensequences   179:11   ensequences   179:11   ensequences   179:12   ensequences   179:11   ensequences   179:12   ensequences   179:13   ensequences	165:18,21 174:25	162:19	156:24,24 157:1	59:2,3,4 60:24	convey 108:12
194:12,13 195:2   202:16 205:7,11   208:8 209:15,18   210:4,12,13   208:8 209:15,18   210:4,12,13   208:8 209:15,18   210:4,12,13   208:8 209:15,18   210:4,12,13   208:8 209:10   208:12   208:13   208:14   208:13   208:14   208:13   208:14   208:13   208:14   208:13   208:14   208:14   208:14   208:15   208:14   208:16   208:14   208:16   208:14   208:16   208:14   208:15   208:14   208:16   20	175:1 178:22	confidence 148:25	157:5 194:13	78:1 101:12	convinced 172:9
202:16 205:7,11 208:8 209:15,18 210:4,12,13 concerned 22:12 184:12         confirm 1:10 12:3 132:25 157:9 194:11         212:6 214:1 constantly 100:1,4 constantly	180:5 193:13	149:7 178:17	195:20,22 200:24	111:24,25 118:13	coordinator
208:8 209:15,18 210:4,12,13         132:25 157:9 194:11         constantly 100:1,4 constraints 106:13         142:20 149:15 152:14 153:9         coordinators 142:21           184:12         confirmed 40:20 197:17 204:18 concerning 81:7         180:21 180:21         198:5 180:21         198:5 198:5         copp 72:20 81:2 copp 72:20 81:2 copp 72:20 81:2 copp 72:20 81:2 copp 72:20 81:2 copp 72:20 81:2 copp 72:20 81:2 contained 192:22 contained 192:22 c	194:12,13 195:2	confident 182:11	201:14,24 203:15	118:16 120:21,23	134:23 141:9
210:4,12,13   concerned 22:12   184:12   confirmed 40:20   197:17 204:18   conficer 131:7   concerning 81:7 configuration 196:18   180:21   180:21   contact 141:6   198:5   198:5   confinced 192:22   contains 9:10   contact 9:12   contact 8:10   contract 8:10   dontract 8:10   contract 8:10   contract 8:10   contract 8:10   contract 8:10   contract 8:10   dontract 8:10   contract 8:10   dontract 8:10   contract 8:10   contract 8:10   dontract 8:10   dontra	202:16 205:7,11	<b>confirm</b> 1:10 12:3	212:6 214:1	123:14 132:22	142:18
concerned 22:12 184:12         confirmed 40:20 197:17 204:18         contact 141:6 180:21         156:17 195:6 198:5         cope 72:20 81:2 coping 50:15           concerns 4:14,23 5:11,24 6:6,13,15 58:19 68:19 82:22 86:20         confused 134:7 confusing 199:19 confusion 152:25         contact 141:6 180:21         contract's 30:10 contractors 4:10 contentious         copy 56:7,13 57:4 copy 56:7,13 57:4           91:16,23 96:14 98:5,19 103:12 107:2 108:13 109:22,24 110:8 110:11 111:5,8 111:11 115:12,22 116:5 118:6         connected 174:16 connected 174:16 connected 174:16 connected 174:16 connected 174:20 context 31:13 57:10 67:2         contracts 4:10 context 31:13 57:10 67:2         contracts 4:10 context 31:13 conscious 199:11 context all 19:11 26:14 32:16 33:14 39:21 130:24         corporate 1:24 correct 2:3,9,13 9:14 10:9,14 12:7 14:13 23:12           111:11 115:12,22 116:5 118:6 120:16 131:6 120:16 131:6 120:16 131:6 120:16 131:6 120:16 131:6 120:17 14;14 128:7 137:8 167:1 137:8 167:1 137:8 167:1 138:13 153:15 189:24 190:2,7 190:13 204:14 205:15 206:2,18 209:10 180:91 164:13 considerable 160:9 164:13 consideration 136:19 162:2         contact 141:6 180:21 contained 192:22 contractors 4:10 contracts 8:10 contracts 4:10 contracts 8:10 contracts 4:21 contractual 19:11 26:14 32:16 33:14 39:21 20:13,22 33:14 39:21 59:23 90:15 contractual 19:11 26:14 32:16 33:14 39:21 20:13,22 30:13,21 32:19 30:13,21 32:19 30:14 10:21 14:18 20:14	208:8 209:15,18	132:25 157:9	constantly 100:1,4	142:20 149:15	coordinators
concerned 22:12 184:12         confirmed 40:20 197:17 204:18         contact 141:6 180:21         156:17 195:6 198:5         cope 72:20 81:2 coping 50:15           concerns 4:14,23 5:11,24 6:6,13,15 58:19 68:19 82:22 86:20         confused 134:7 confusing 199:19 confusion 152:25         contact 141:6 180:21         contract's 30:10 contractors 4:10 contentious         copy 56:7,13 57:4 copy 56:7,13 57:4           91:16,23 96:14 98:5,19 103:12 107:2 108:13 109:22,24 110:8 110:11 111:5,8 111:11 115:12,22 116:5 118:6         connected 174:16 connected 174:16 connected 174:16 connected 174:16 connected 174:20 context 31:13 57:10 67:2         contracts 4:10 context 31:13 57:10 67:2         contracts 4:10 context 31:13 conscious 199:11 context all 19:11 26:14 32:16 33:14 39:21 130:24         corporate 1:24 correct 2:3,9,13 9:14 10:9,14 12:7 14:13 23:12           111:11 115:12,22 116:5 118:6 120:16 131:6 120:16 131:6 120:16 131:6 120:16 131:6 120:16 131:6 120:17 14;14 128:7 137:8 167:1 137:8 167:1 137:8 167:1 138:13 153:15 189:24 190:2,7 190:13 204:14 205:15 206:2,18 209:10 180:91 164:13 considerable 160:9 164:13 consideration 136:19 162:2         contact 141:6 180:21 contained 192:22 contractors 4:10 contracts 8:10 contracts 4:10 contracts 8:10 contracts 4:21 contractual 19:11 26:14 32:16 33:14 39:21 20:13,22 33:14 39:21 59:23 90:15 contractual 19:11 26:14 32:16 33:14 39:21 20:13,22 30:13,21 32:19 30:13,21 32:19 30:14 10:21 14:18 20:14	210:4,12,13	194:11		152:14 153:9	142:21
184:12         197:17 204:18         180:21         198:5         coping 50:15           concerns 4:14,23         5:11,24 6:6,13,15         confused 134:7         contains 9:10         contractor 8:12         copy 56:7,13 57:4           58:19 68:19         confusing 199:19         confusing 199:19         content 9:6 147:12         contracts 8:10         29:1 49:2 151:15         core 10:11,12 11:9           98:5,19 103:12         connected 174:16         connected 174:16         contents 116:2         contracts 4:10         core 10:11,12 11:9           107:2 108:13         109:22,24 110:8         129:15         130:24         contracts 4:2         correct 2:3,9,13           110:11 111:5,8         110:11 111:5,8         129:15         130:24         33:14 39:21         9:14 10:9,14           115:14,18:6         179:11         consequences         67:14         contractually         30:13,21 32:19           145:22 146:2         179:11         continue 39:6         42:12 54:11         140:8         53:22 57:17           151:14,18 185:15         175:7 179:12         138:13 153:15         205:15 206:2         90:13 204:14           209:10         180:9,16 185:1         178:12         continued 160:3         192:21         100:20,23 105:22           190:13 204:14         209:10         160	T	confirmed 40:20	contact 141:6	156:17 195:6	cope 72:20 81:2
concerning 81:7 concerns 4:14,23         conflict 131:7 133:17 196:18 contains 9:10 contains 9:10 content 9:6 147:12 content s:10 contracts 8:10 29:14 92:25 15:15 concerted 174:16 connected 174:16 connection 174:20 Connolly 129:13 109:22,24 110:8 110:11 111:5,8 110:11 111:11 11:5,8 110:11 111:11:5,8 110:11 111:11 11:11	184:12	197:17 204:18	180:21	198:5	_
concerns 4:14,23         133:17 196:18         contains 9:10         contractor 8:12         copy 56:7,13 57:4           5:11,24 6:6,13,15         58:19 68:19         confusing 199:19         content 9:6 147:12         contractors 4:10         core 10:11,12 11:9           82:22 86:20         confusion 152:25         connected 174:16         contents 116:2         contracts 8:10         29:1 49:2 151:15         core 10:11,12 11:9           98:5,19 103:12         connection 174:20         context 31:13         57:10 67:2         contractual 19:11         26:14 32:16         9:14 10:9,14         9:14 10:9,14           109:22,24 110:8         129:15         130:24         33:14 39:21         9:14 10:9,14         12:7 14:13 23:12           110:11 111:5,8         conscious 199:21         contextually-wise         67:14         contactually         99:23 90:15         27:21 29:4 30:2           116:5 118:6         179:11         continue 39:6         42:12 54:11         140:8         53:22 57:17           147:6 148:21         137:8 167:1         138:13 153:15         205:15 206:2         90:13 94:16           151:14,18 185:15         175:7 179:12         167:21 168:1         contracty 139:8         95:13 96:19           189:24 190:2,7         180:9,16 185:1         continued 160:3         178:12 185:2         control 17:17 <th>concerning 81:7</th> <td>conflict 131:7</td> <td>contained 192:22</td> <td>contract's 30:10</td> <td></td>	concerning 81:7	conflict 131:7	contained 192:22	contract's 30:10	
5:11,24 6:6,13,15         confusing 199:19         content 9:6 147:12         contractors 4:10         115:23 150:19           58:19 68:19         82:22 86:20         91:16,23 96:14         98:5,19 103:12         144:18         29:1 49:2 151:15         28:2           91:16,23 96:14         98:5,19 103:12         connected 174:16         contents 116:2         contracts' 4:21         corporate 1:24           107:2 108:13         109:22,24 110:8         129:15         130:24         33:14 39:21         9:14 10:9,14           11:11 11:5,8         conscious 199:21         contextually-wise         67:14         59:23 90:15         27:21 29:4 30:2           11:11 11:5,12,22         179:11         continue 39:6         90:20 137:22,23         35:12 37:6,11           120:16 131:6         127:14,14 128:7         83:14 123:10         140:8         53:22 57:17           145:22 146:2         137:8 167:1         138:13 153:15         205:15 206:2         90:13 94:16           151:14,18 185:15         175:7 179:12         167:21 168:1         contractually         58:10 78:14           189:24 190:2,7         180:9,16 185:1         175:7 179:12         167:21 168:1         contracts 3:10         100:20,23 105:22           190:13 204:14         201:13,14         201:13,14         27:15 32:10         100:20,		133:17 196:18	contains 9:10	contractor 8:12	copy 56:7,13 57:4
58:19 68:19         confusing 199:19         contentious         144:18         contracts 8:10         core 10:11,12 11:9           91:16,23 96:14         connected 174:16         connected 174:16         contents 116:2         contracts' 4:21         corporate 1:24           98:5,19 103:12         connolly 129:13         57:10 67:2         26:14 32:16         9:14 10:9,14           109:22,24 110:8         129:15         130:24         33:14 39:21         12:7 14:13 23:12           110:11 111:5,8         conscious 199:21         contextually-wise         59:23 90:15         27:21 29:4 30:2           110:11 115:12,22         consequences         67:14         contractually         30:13,21 32:19           116:5 118:6         179:11         continue 39:6         90:20 137:22,23         35:12 37:6,11           120:16 131:6         127:14,14 128:7         83:14 123:10         140:8         53:22 57:17           145:22 146:2         137:8 167:1         138:13 153:15         205:15 206:2         90:13 94:16           151:14,18 185:15         175:7 179:12         167:21 168:1         contracts 4:21         100:20,23 105:22           190:13 204:14         201:13,14         178:12 185:2         control 17:17         107:5 108:9           205:15 206:2,18         209:10         160:9 164:13		confused 134:7	<b>content</b> 9:6 147:12	contractors 4:10	
82:22 86:20         confusion 152:25         144:18         29:1 49:2 151:15         28:2           91:16,23 96:14         connected 174:16         contents 116:2         contracts' 4:21         corporate 1:24           98:5,19 103:12         Connolly 129:13         57:10 67:2         26:14 32:16         9:14 10:9,14           109:22,24 110:8         129:15         130:24         33:14 39:21         12:7 14:13 23:12           110:11 111:5,8         conscious 199:21         contextually-wise         59:23 90:15         27:21 29:4 30:2           111:11 115:12,22         consequences         67:14         contractually         30:13,21 32:19           120:16 131:6         179:11         continue 39:6         90:20 137:22,23         35:12 37:6,11           145:22 146:2         127:14,14 128:7         83:14 123:10         contraindications         58:10 78:14           147:6 148:21         137:8 167:1         138:13 153:15         205:15 206:2         90:13 94:16           151:14,18 185:15         175:7 179:12         167:21 168:1         contracty 139:8         95:13 96:19           189:24 190:2,7         180:9,16 185:1         178:12 185:2         continued 160:3         192:21         100:20,23 105:22           190:13 204:14         205:15 206:2,18         205:15 32:10         112:23 11		confusing 199:19	contentious	contracts 8:10	<b>core</b> 10:11,12 11:9
91:16,23 96:14         connected 174:16         contents 116:2         contracts' 4:21         corporate 1:24           98:5,19 103:12         107:2 108:13         Connolly 129:13         57:10 67:2         26:14 32:16         9:14 10:9,14           109:22,24 110:8         129:15         130:24         33:14 39:21         12:7 14:13 23:12           110:11 115:12,22         conscious 199:21         contextually-wise         59:23 90:15         27:21 29:4 30:2           110:15 118:6         179:11         consider 93:3         42:12 54:11         140:8         30:13,21 32:19           145:22 146:2         137:8 167:1         138:13 153:15         140:8         53:22 57:17           147:6 148:21         137:8 167:1         138:13 153:15         205:15 206:2         90:13 94:16           189:24 190:2,7         180:9,16 185:1         178:12 185:2         continued 160:3         192:21         100:20,23 105:22           190:13 204:14         205:15 206:2,18         209:10         160:9 164:13         continues 187:7         27:15 32:10         112:23,24 124:3           concluded 57:21         57:24 150:18         136:19 162:2         37:2 208:8         122:1 131:23         127:8,11 133:3	82:22 86:20	· ·	144:18	29:1 49:2 151:15	-
98:5,19 103:12         connection 174:20         context 31:13         contractual 19:11         correct 2:3,9,13           107:2 108:13         109:22,24 110:8         129:15         130:24         33:14 39:21         12:7 14:13 23:12           110:11 111:5,8         conscious 199:21         contextually-wise         59:23 90:15         27:21 29:4 30:2           110:5 118:6         consider 93:3         179:11         continue 39:6         30:13,21 32:19           120:16 131:6         127:14,14 128:7         83:14 123:10         140:8         53:22 57:17           145:22 146:2         137:8 167:1         138:13 153:15         205:15 206:2         58:10 78:14           151:14,18 185:15         175:7 179:12         167:21 168:1         continued 160:3         192:21           190:13 204:14         201:13,14         continued 160:3         192:21         100:20,23 105:22           190:10         160:9 164:13         continues 187:7         27:15 32:10         112:23 116:4           209:10         160:9 164:13         continues 187:7         121:19,22,25         125:15 126:11,17           57:24 150:18         136:19 162:2         37:2 208:8         122:1 131:23         127:8,11 133:3	91:16,23 96:14		contents 116:2	contracts' 4:21	corporate 1:24
107:2 108:13         Connolly 129:13         57:10 67:2         26:14 32:16         9:14 10:9,14           109:22,24 110:8         129:15         33:14 39:21         12:7 14:13 23:12           110:11 111:5,8         conscious 199:21         contextually-wise         59:23 90:15         27:21 29:4 30:2           110:5 118:6         179:11         continue 39:6         30:13,21 32:19         30:13,21 32:19           120:16 131:6         120:16 131:6         42:12 54:11         140:8         53:22 57:17           145:22 146:2         137:8 167:1         138:13 153:15         205:15 206:2         58:10 78:14           151:14,18 185:15         175:7 179:12         167:21 168:1         contractually         58:10 78:14           189:24 190:2,7         180:9,16 185:1         167:21 168:1         205:15 206:2         90:13 94:16           190:13 204:14         201:13,14         continued 160:3         192:21         100:20,23 105:22           209:10         160:9 164:13         continues 187:7         27:15 32:10         112:23 116:4           200:13,14         consideration         136:19 162:2         37:2 208:8         122:1 131:23         127:8,11 133:3					_
109:22,24 110:8       129:15       130:24       33:14 39:21       12:7 14:13 23:12         110:11 111:5,8       111:11 115:12,22       59:23 90:15       27:21 29:4 30:2         116:5 118:6       179:11       continue 39:6       90:20 137:22,23       35:12 37:6,11         120:16 131:6       127:14,14 128:7       83:14 123:10       140:8       53:22 57:17         145:22 146:2       137:8 167:1       138:13 153:15       205:15 206:2       90:13 94:16         151:14,18 185:15       175:7 179:12       167:21 168:1       contrary 139:8       95:13 96:19         189:24 190:2,7       180:9,16 185:1       178:12 185:2       continued 160:3       192:21       100:20,23 105:22         190:13 204:14       201:13,14       178:12 185:2       control 17:17       107:5 108:9         209:10       160:9 164:13       continues 187:7       111:19 120:18       121:21,24 124:3         concluded 57:21       57:24 150:18       136:19 162:2       37:2 208:8       122:1 131:23       127:8,11 133:3	· ·	Connolly 129:13	57:10 67:2	26:14 32:16	
110:11 111:5,8         conscious 199:21         contextually-wise         59:23 90:15         27:21 29:4 30:2           111:11 115:12,22         consequences         67:14         continue 39:6         90:20 137:22,23         35:12 37:6,11           120:16 131:6         consider 93:3         42:12 54:11         140:8         53:22 57:17           145:22 146:2         127:14,14 128:7         83:14 123:10         contraindications         58:10 78:14           151:14,18 185:15         175:7 179:12         138:13 153:15         205:15 206:2         90:13 94:16           189:24 190:2,7         180:9,16 185:1         continued 160:3         192:21         100:20,23 105:22           190:13 204:14         201:13,14         considerable         186:1 204:1         27:15 32:10         107:5 108:9           209:10         160:9 164:13         continues 187:7         27:15 32:25         125:15 126:11,17           57:24 150:18         136:19 162:2         37:2 208:8         122:1 131:23         127:8,11 133:3	109:22,24 110:8		130:24	33:14 39:21	12:7 14:13 23:12
111:11 115:12,22       consequences       67:14       continue 39:6       30:13,21 32:19         116:5 118:6       179:11       continue 39:6       90:20 137:22,23       35:12 37:6,11         120:16 131:6       127:14,14 128:7       83:14 123:10       140:8       53:22 57:17         145:22 146:2       127:14,14 128:7       83:14 123:10       contraindications       58:10 78:14         147:6 148:21       137:8 167:1       138:13 153:15       205:15 206:2       90:13 94:16         151:14,18 185:15       175:7 179:12       167:21 168:1       contractually       95:13 96:19         189:24 190:2,7       180:9,16 185:1       167:21 168:1       continued 160:3       192:21       100:20,23 105:22         190:13 204:14       201:13,14       178:12 185:2       control 17:17       107:5 108:9         209:10       160:9 164:13       continues 187:7       27:15 32:10       112:23 116:4         209:10       160:9 164:13       continuing 35:7       121:19,22,25       125:15 126:11,17         57:24 150:18       136:19 162:2       37:2 208:8       122:1 131:23       127:8,11 133:3		conscious 199:21	contextually-wise	59:23 90:15	27:21 29:4 30:2
116:5 118:6       179:11       continue 39:6       90:20 137:22,23       35:12 37:6,11         120:16 131:6       120:16 131:6       42:12 54:11       140:8       53:22 57:17         145:22 146:2       127:14,14 128:7       83:14 123:10       contraindications       58:10 78:14         147:6 148:21       137:8 167:1       138:13 153:15       205:15 206:2       90:13 94:16         151:14,18 185:15       175:7 179:12       167:21 168:1       contrary 139:8       95:13 96:19         189:24 190:2,7       180:9,16 185:1       continued 160:3       192:21       100:20,23 105:22         190:13 204:14       201:13,14       178:12 185:2       control 17:17       107:5 108:9         205:15 206:2,18       160:9 164:13       continues 187:7       27:15 32:10       112:23 116:4         209:10       160:9 164:13       continues 187:7       111:19 120:18       121:21,24 124:3         concluded 57:21       57:24 150:18       136:19 162:2       37:2 208:8       122:1 131:23       127:8,11 133:3			v		
120:16 131:6       consider 93:3       42:12 54:11       140:8       53:22 57:17         145:22 146:2       127:14,14 128:7       83:14 123:10       58:10 78:14         147:6 148:21       137:8 167:1       138:13 153:15       205:15 206:2       90:13 94:16         151:14,18 185:15       175:7 179:12       167:21 168:1       contrary 139:8       95:13 96:19         189:24 190:2,7       180:9,16 185:1       continued 160:3       192:21       100:20,23 105:22         205:15 206:2,18       201:13,14       178:12 185:2       control 17:17       107:5 108:9         209:10       160:9 164:13       continues 187:7       27:15 32:10       112:23 116:4         209:10       160:9 164:13       continues 187:7       111:19 120:18       121:21,24 124:3         27:24 150:18       136:19 162:2       37:2 208:8       122:1 131:23       127:8,11 133:3	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	_			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
145:22 146:2       127:14,14 128:7       83:14 123:10       contraindications       58:10 78:14         147:6 148:21       137:8 167:1       138:13 153:15       205:15 206:2       90:13 94:16         151:14,18 185:15       175:7 179:12       167:21 168:1       contrary 139:8       95:13 96:19         180:9,16 185:1       continued 160:3       192:21       100:20,23 105:22         190:13 204:14       201:13,14       considerable       186:1 204:1       27:15 32:10       112:23 116:4         209:10       160:9 164:13       continues 187:7       111:19 120:18       121:21,24 124:3         concluded 57:21       consideration       continuing 35:7       121:19,22,25       125:15 126:11,17         57:24 150:18       136:19 162:2       37:2 208:8       122:1 131:23       127:8,11 133:3				,	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
147:6 148:21       137:8 167:1       138:13 153:15       205:15 206:2       90:13 94:16         151:14,18 185:15       175:7 179:12       167:21 168:1       55:13 96:19         189:24 190:2,7       180:9,16 185:1       178:12 185:2       192:21       100:20,23 105:22         190:13 204:14       201:13,14       178:12 185:2       control 17:17       107:5 108:9         209:10       160:9 164:13       continues 187:7       111:19 120:18       121:21,24 124:3         concluded 57:21       consideration       continuing 35:7       121:19,22,25       125:15 126:11,17         57:24 150:18       136:19 162:2       37:2 208:8       122:1 131:23       127:8,11 133:3					
151:14,18 185:15       175:7 179:12       167:21 168:1       contrary 139:8       95:13 96:19         189:24 190:2,7       180:9,16 185:1       continued 160:3       192:21       100:20,23 105:22         190:13 204:14       201:13,14       178:12 185:2       control 17:17       107:5 108:9         205:15 206:2,18       160:9 164:13       continues 187:7       27:15 32:10       112:23 116:4         209:10       160:9 164:13       continues 187:7       111:19 120:18       121:21,24 124:3         concluded 57:21       consideration       continuing 35:7       121:19,22,25       125:15 126:11,17         57:24 150:18       136:19 162:2       37:2 208:8       122:1 131:23       127:8,11 133:3		-			
189:24 190:2,7       180:9,16 185:1       continued 160:3       192:21       100:20,23 105:22         190:13 204:14       201:13,14       178:12 185:2       control 17:17       107:5 108:9         205:15 206:2,18       160:9 164:13       201:13,14<					
190:13 204:14       201:13,14       178:12 185:2       control 17:17       107:5 108:9         205:15 206:2,18       209:10       160:9 164:13       201:13,14       27:15 32:10       112:23 116:4         209:10       160:9 164:13       201:13,14       201	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			· ·	
205:15 206:2,18 209:10       considerable 160:9 164:13 concluded 57:21 57:24 150:18       186:1 204:1 continues 187:7 continuing 35:7 121:19,22,25 125:15 126:11,17 13:23       112:23 116:4 121:21,24 124:3 121:19,22,25 125:15 126:11,17 121:19,22,25 125:15 126:11,17 121:19,22,25 125:15 126:11,17 125:15 126		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		-	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
209:10       160:9 164:13       continues 187:7       111:19 120:18       121:21,24 124:3         concluded 57:21       consideration       136:19 162:2       37:2 208:8       121:19,22,25       125:15 126:11,17         121:19,22,25       122:1 131:23       127:8,11 133:3					
concluded 57:21         consideration         continuing 35:7         121:19,22,25         125:15 126:11,17           57:24 150:18         136:19 162:2         37:2 208:8         122:1 131:23         127:8,11 133:3	•				
57:24 150:18					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
			S		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
				,	,
		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				Page 222
100011000	l	1		l
139:9 140:22	create 51:19	159:9 168:19	59:9,12 115:5	debrief 74:3,3,6,22
148:20 152:23	211:12	currently 13:15	163:18	75:1,11,24 76:7
153:3 157:4	Creating 51:7	20:17,18 37:2,8	date 5:3 61:7	76:11,13,18,21
160:24,25	creative 213:8	38:10,10,20	126:10,24 128:2	77:12
correctly 31:4	credit 14:9	51:21 52:20	128:2 161:25	<b>December</b> 100:21
139:10 141:25	credits 85:23 86:1	59:20,23 110:24	162:8,18 170:9	101:6 147:18
correlate 104:13	<b>critical</b> 14:11,12	114:25 135:23,24	174:13 180:11	190:7 195:9,21
correlation 49:17	14:24 15:23 16:1	136:1 137:5	183:1 204:5	decency 69:4
125:9	16:6,10 184:6	156:1,23 157:5	206:22	151:17
corresponding	criticised 4:20	160:16 161:19	dated 46:4 138:25	decent 84:9
196:1 201:11	criticises 143:3	163:16 166:17,20	<b>Dave</b> 64:12,16,19	decide 37:24 102:5
cost 13:11 14:6,14	criticism 191:10	169:20 176:14	day 10:11,12 11:9	decided 102:7
15:6	209:5	177:8 187:3,6	25:7,17,22 75:17	111:21 163:10
costs 28:21	criticisms 174:12	189:21 198:4	88:23 118:5	178:3
Council 3:8	196:13	200:7 204:21	122:12 131:9	decision 58:25
country 6:17	crossed 100:13	207:9 213:6	134:5 152:4,6	95:18,20 112:18
100:17	101:24 103:25	<b>curve</b> 162:23	155:17 175:4	113:10 118:20
<b>counts</b> 10:16	106:14	custodial 2:6	176:16	119:5 154:6,9
<b>couple</b> 67:7 90:9	crossing 103:4	44:23 50:6 205:8	days 52:14,17	162:15 166:12
151:20 155:5	cruel 184:17	custody 26:10	137:23 193:1	167:8 169:14
159:4 187:16	<b>CSU</b> 73:19 88:11	46:14 99:12	daytime 12:4,5	181:25 199:21,24
192:25 205:17	98:2,13,24 99:7	110:6 174:10	40:7	decision-making
course 28:20 43:1	99:11,25 157:2	<b>custom</b> 170:5,8	<b>DCF9</b> 148:11	131:24 154:2
43:5 44:5 63:3	157:10	182:6 183:11	<b>DCM</b> 73:12 74:5,8	decisions 4:9
83:18 97:4	cultural 47:2	203:5,10 205:21	74:10,12,12	112:17 121:22
118:20 121:12	53:14 60:15,21	customer 33:12	78:11,12 113:24	147:14
126:7,9 134:5	62:5 73:1 80:17		DCMs 12:4,5,6,23	decline 161:20
171:16 172:10	196:12	D	35:11 36:9 39:24	decoration 84:11
175:16 178:21	culturally-wise	<b>D</b> 214:25	40:13 46:13	dedicated 142:21
183:23 185:7	69:3 78:5	<b>D1527</b> 62:21 68:5	131:21	deducting 14:1
187:11 189:11	<b>culture</b> 3:19 31:6,6	70:12 72:10	<b>DCO</b> 41:23,24	deductions 9:13
190:15,20 191:22	36:12 39:17	<b>D1914</b> 63:24	146:17	deeper 196:11
191:25 192:20	41:12 45:7,10,18	206:25	<b>DCOs</b> 12:4,6,6,25	203:9
204:12 206:16	45:21 46:2 47:4	<b>D1914's</b> 66:4	35:11 36:8 38:13	deescalating
<b>court</b> 159:17	47:17 48:6 51:15	<b>D1978</b> 73:24 74:6	38:23 39:25 40:8	143:23
cover 10:10 79:2	53:3,5,8,12,16,21	74:9,10	40:13 41:21,22	default 184:13
173:10 201:18	54:5 55:10 59:3	<b>D4</b> 46:16	88:16	defensible 131:23
covered 36:19	59:13,17 60:20	<b>D5</b> 47:23	deal 91:5 112:9	deficiencies
195:8	61:9,16,19 62:3	<b>D865</b> 78:17	163:1 170:4	103:14 179:4,7
covering 88:6	66:20,24,25 80:8	<b>D9</b> 46:21	173:7 174:9	179:19 180:8
covers 130:23	121:13 147:8	daily 25:9 31:24	204:15,20 212:25	deficiency 180:2
131:3 163:21	172:17 182:6,10	88:8 108:2 110:6	dealing 165:12	<b>define</b> 175:24
174:3	196:15,15 203:10	damaging 185:4	deals 102:21	188:19
Covid 10:18 11:1	culture-wise 89:19	204:25 211:17	dealt 63:19 98:9	defined 16:16
39:5 40:23 41:19	cultures 85:13	Dan 64:21,25	102:21	173:21 177:16
85:4 114:4	cumulative 115:22	dangerous' 122:14	death 15:25 18:7	definitely 62:11
126:19 153:7	current 1:25 41:24	dare 202:24	deaths 25:1	173:4 185:17
197:9	47:13 52:17 81:4	dashboard 27:2	debatable 172:5	definition 188:22
CQC 3:5,9	81:6 148:22	data 24:19,21 25:8	debate 182:4	delay 56:2 79:1
3 2 3 . 5 , 5	01.01.0.22	31:3,15 57:23,25		2011, 2012 / 211
		<u> </u>		<u> </u>

				Page 223
100.10	   .			
198:12	deputy 54:24	212:8	122:14,25 143:9	48:1 61:23 62:6
delaying 213:22	111:3 152:2	detainee 10:22	154:2 159:15,21	80:17 173:14
delays 165:23	derogate 111:25	15:24 17:15 46:1	160:2,3,5 161:12	180:4
176:14	derogating 36:14	46:16 57:3,5,20	161:16 162:8	development 46:8
deliberate 16:19	37:20 39:8	63:24 65:5 66:6	166:13 167:2,8,9	47:18 50:15 61:3
deliver 18:24	derogation 26:25	68:4,4,8,8,10,15	167:15,16,21	61:3 208:20
32:11 44:5,11	36:2 37:16 39:4	70:2 74:15,17,23	168:25 169:5,15	diagnosed 176:11
49:2,4 130:11	derogations 39:9	78:17,19 81:25	169:17 170:23	diagnosis 190:8
171:1 200:13	<b>DES</b> 106:6	86:8 89:23 103:3	171:16,19,20	dictate 121:15
212:5 213:9	describe 45:20	105:3 108:23	172:12 173:9,18	die 66:19
delivered 130:5	84:16 100:21	113:23 114:16	175:14,21 176:7	dies 63:14,14
131:12,13 132:4	described 9:2 68:7	116:19 120:8	176:8 178:13	64:13,13 65:1,1
133:19 160:23	68:9 74:5 121:11	121:10 125:14	179:13,16 180:10	65:20,21 66:6,7
delivering 44:15	154:16 165:9	129:17 135:9,13	180:17 181:19	difference 181:9
delivery 33:11	176:25 179:7	136:3,6 146:20	183:2,3,25 184:7	181:10 183:9
87:1,5 110:21	184:8 195:9	149:24 172:12	184:25 185:2,3	190:17
130:15,18	describes 81:24	180:17 207:3	185:25 186:2	different 7:10,16
Demian 20:18	description 9:15	detainee's 95:15	187:12,14,15	9:7 17:19 18:6
demographic 45:1	12:12 59:6	108:13 146:24	188:6,8,23	33:3 64:8 68:4
demographics	<b>design</b> 87:6 152:13	202:15	190:23,25 191:4	74:4 83:2 85:13
153:14	designated 30:5	detainees 3:4	191:4,10,15,17	93:17 100:17
denial 67:15,19	designed 45:21	10:18 43:22	192:22 193:19	101:25 103:10
79:21 82:9	52:6 86:7 134:2	47:19 49:10,24	199:5,14 201:19	111:1,1 112:8
denied 71:25	designing 9:22	50:17 62:9 66:8	203:8 204:1	133:21 145:6
dental 213:5	<b>despite</b> 13:8 28:8	68:20 81:6 87:12	207:4 209:2	151:15 159:15
dep's 88:2	70:8 105:21	90:23 97:21	211:5,11,14,16	179:7 181:7
department 91:14	141:19 179:13	103:3,11,25	211:20 212:10,11	189:9 190:10
93:13 200:11	191:10	104:5,21,22	deteriorate 188:22	207:22,23 208:12
depend 26:16	<b>DET</b> 114:16	105:13 107:24	199:14	212:7
188:18	detail 7:5 8:7,22	108:12,16 109:24	deteriorating	differently 139:8
depending 33:19	12:15 15:5 23:23	112:16 113:22	191:3,9 199:3,8	166:23
42:16 57:10	56:15 57:20 68:2	116:14 125:18	201:19	differs 9:17
80:19 97:25 98:7	107:8 115:13	127:17 130:24	deterioration	difficult 40:21
98:15,16 99:1	117:13,19 118:5	145:24 146:18	175:22,25 185:5	43:23 74:25 87:2
144:25 152:7	163:12 188:14	159:16 160:19	193:15 202:15	97:18 104:11
155:17	205:21	161:20,25 162:12	determine 21:12	106:10,15 109:6
depends 10:18	details 13:6	168:8 175:13	100:17	109:6 120:5,24
22:3 23:18 26:22	detained 18:14	198:23,24 199:16	determined 14:20	120:25 164:3
57:6 80:9 137:18	21:25 47:1,1	203:25 205:1	21:8	173:19 178:1
152:5 173:22	55:13 73:19	detainees' 184:16	detrimental	188:15
199:12 209:9,9	83:21 86:18	detention 6:16	112:22 188:8	difficulties 86:15
deploy 74:7	88:18 90:7 92:18	23:9 29:21,22	detrimentally	86:18 106:13
deployed 128:4	93:6 94:4,17	43:17 45:17 46:2	173:9,18	143:20 187:25
132:18	98:10 111:12	46:14 47:4 48:9	develop 49:14	difficulty 44:2
deployment	113:9 125:6	48:11,16 51:24	52:14 198:19	109:15 143:19
127:15	146:13 156:23	52:18 60:20 61:4	developed 60:23	dimensions 62:4
deported 207:15	167:5 187:21	85:7 91:4 92:18	132:14	<b>direct</b> 49:17
depression 175:15	191:21 196:22	92:20 96:18	developing 7:1	142:16 161:14
depth 163:1	209:12,14 211:3	103:15 111:17	41:12 47:2,3	180:20
	1	1	1	1

				1 agc 22+
directed 173:12	125:22 126:1	55:17	41:16	193:8 203:3,5,6
direction 47:17	177:11 180:22	documentation	drawn 3:9 11:23	effectively 81:20
62:5 80:20 93:10	198:7 199:20	21:12,20 23:25	43:13	92:11 159:1
153:17 190:20	211:22	142:2,22 174:19	draws 88:16	166:24 167:10,24
directions 115:16	discusses 81:12,21	197:8	drive 41:4 60:20	185:23 192:18
directly 81:16	discussing 39:20	documents 1:12	106:14 138:10	205:8 211:23
148:12 161:10	70:11	56:25 59:14	driven 149:16	213:1
			driven 149.10 drivers 60:22	
207:16	discussion 27:12	122:19 137:20		effectiveness 46:22
director 2:1,11,14	36:4 47:21 79:15	138:18,19	<b>DSO</b> 208:19,21	203:7
2:19 6:10 20:15	90:1 110:3	doing 78:4 106:10	209:3,5,9,13	efficacy 148:22
27:7 45:14 54:24	144:17 193:24	109:5,16 169:19	<b>DSOs</b> 23:10 29:24	efficiency 31:8
72:24 73:16 88:6	207:17 212:21	178:6 193:12	90:17	either 25:17 51:21
105:11 134:22,23	213:2,5	198:4	<b>Dublin</b> 100:12,23	89:25 102:13
135:20,23 152:2	discussions 24:11	<b>DOM</b> 40:9 89:25	103:8,23 105:1	147:3 153:25
152:2 158:21	47:4 110:14	132:7 150:9	due 1:25 13:10	165:3 189:21
206:10	173:5	151:3 152:1,3,3,9	21:10,13 22:9	194:9 196:25
directors 20:12	dismissed 129:13	<b>DOMs</b> 12:23	24:22 101:4	202:17 210:13
<b>directs</b> 179:13	129:16	38:13,23 40:13	103:22 153:7,9	elderly 173:24
180:16	dispensation	40:14 132:2,3,9	198:18 207:4	electronic 29:1
<b>disagree</b> 41:6,7,9	122:10 126:15,18	152:10	211:2 214:6	152:15
42:10 105:5	127:3	Donnelly 78:11	<b>Duncan</b> 147:15,18	element 13:11
disagrees 211:15	disruptive 43:23	79:7	Duracell 68:10	131:10,13 134:1
disbelief 196:15	dissatisfied 82:22	door 31:5 69:21	duty 191:23	134:6
disciplinary 58:21	distinct 121:17	74:18	dying 111:14	elements 13:10
141:23 142:6,11	distinguish 43:21	doors 84:10	dynamic 15:13	191:19 194:1
146:11,22 148:17	distinguishing	doubled 125:4	210:6,10	<b>email</b> 89:16
disciplines 41:17	44:3	doubt 211:25		emotional 47:23
<b>disclose</b> 27:9 172:8	distress 50:18	download 138:9	E	48:2
disclosed 138:18	distressing 72:20	downloaded 138:1	E 18:14 40:15	<b>employ</b> 12:16
187:24	108:23	138:3	88:11 97:24	employed 40:2
disclosure 165:16	disturbing 108:12	<b>Dr</b> 45:19 60:25	98:13,17,24 99:7	79:18 119:4,4
165:21	dive 196:7	86:4,19 131:16	99:12 204:19,19	156:1
disconnect 113:9	Dix 43:19 73:16	157:17,22,23	214:25	employee 49:6,8
discover 192:11	74:4,5,8,10,12,14	158:6 165:7,14	E1 73:12	144:12
discrepancy 75:2	76:17,23 79:4	166:25 168:14	earlier 83:20	employees 53:10
discriminated	99:3,23	176:13 178:8,19	152:14 172:13	81:4,10
208:23	doctor 131:13	178:20,20,23	198:16 199:10,13	employer 144:12
discrimination	158:10 171:6	179:6,17,18	200:12 213:10	enable 172:7
209:8	179:14 180:16	180:10 181:15,15	earliest 161:11	enabling 191:14
discuss 8:6 9:6,19	189:18 211:1,15	182:16,16 183:19	169:16,16	encourage 33:14
20:23 24:12 27:4	<b>DoctorPA</b> 177:9	183:20 193:3	early 38:6 54:4	85:17 160:20
32:6 45:17 73:7	doctors 118:11,14	197:17,19 198:3	easier 11:24	161:7 197:21
79:11,14 80:6	173:15 182:25	198:3,8 201:12	113:15 202:25	encouragement
92:2 134:17	document 5:6 46:2	202:12 207:1	easily 196:24	63:7
140:20 211:13	56:18 80:8	208:16,16 211:12	easy 202:7 214:11	encroach 74:7,23
discussed 19:13,15	102:24 112:7	213:17 214:12,13	education 11:12	endemic 196:8
20:8 21:11 26:14	122:7 138:21	214:16 215:4	85:12	endorse 116:5
59:21 62:8 79:13	143:10	dramatic 103:13	effect 14:1 112:22	enduring 203:14
90:16 110:4	documentary 2:24	dramatically	115:22 204:1	enforced 59:20
70.10 110.7	documentary 2.24	ui amancany	effective 168:18	chibi ccu 37.20
	<u> </u>			<u> </u>

				Page 225
101.1		1.61.10.100.	1	1
101:4	158:24 192:10	161:18 199:7	170:17 189:6,8,8	expecting 101:1
enforcement 102:6	212:24	201:3	189:13 215:2,5	experience 81:10
111:22 149:24	equivalent 191:21	everybody's	example 4:1,5,11	92:10 101:22
154:3	191:22	199:13	4:25 5:11 18:13	159:2,6,9 171:25
engaged 24:6	errors 33:10 75:7	evidence 1:4,21,24	21:3,24 22:6	174:9 192:9
47:20	80:10	3:19 5:18 17:6	23:24 24:17 25:1	203:3
engagement 87:11	escape 15:25	40:18 43:14 55:9	25:12 26:17	experienced 82:21
114:16 172:1	escort 207:4	55:17 62:13 65:9	28:12 30:16	experiences 4:6
engaging 209:12	escorting 2:8	65:10,13 67:23	31:18 39:25 40:6	expert 76:11
England 118:17	Esparto 100:21	67:25 69:7,11,15	42:25 45:1 46:10	113:20 128:12
177:6,23 203:24	101:5 102:12	69:16,18 71:22	46:13 54:25 55:1	130:16 207:17
204:3,5	especially 40:23	73:2,16,20 74:14	55:4 80:15 87:17	expertise 131:12
enhancing 46:22	essential 176:8	76:23 77:1,3,4,5	89:23 94:18	143:25 190:1
ensure 4:10 23:22	essentially 196:16	77:18,19 79:4,18	98:11 108:2,19	experts 212:14
25:19 31:21,25	establish 196:23	80:2,2,6 83:14	110:20 111:24	explain 13:14
45:24 46:19	established 55:22	86:5 91:12 92:5	119:18 130:25	explained 70:22
48:24 53:9 54:4	169:3 195:25	93:16 97:4	137:4 143:18	143:18 183:19
71:6 102:4	establishments	115:13 128:20,25	145:2 154:8	213:22
116:25 126:12	144:7 159:12	129:18 148:22	165:17 173:24	explaining 161:20
129:24 142:22	estate 6:7,21 170:7	150:4 155:23	176:1 177:10,13	162:6
177:12 182:24	180:3	156:11 157:14,17	181:6 209:6	explanation 77:5,7
183:6 184:23	estates 206:6	158:12 163:4	213:6	exploration 190:3
198:20 199:22	et 19:5 27:2 31:5	164:13,15,18,19	examples 31:3,3	205:12,25
ensured 121:10	34:15 35:22	164:20,21 165:2	61:18 62:7 68:2	<b>explore</b> 166:22
ensuring 31:18 36:12 91:4 183:4	69:20 84:10	165:7,14,16	78:8 87:14	167:24 187:10
	85:25 86:3	166:3 168:10,14 176:13 177:20	115:17 143:13 187:16	explored 50:11,12
entered 70:22 74:12 78:16	102:11,13,15 114:5 131:19	178:15 179:3,6		50:13 163:22
entering 188:8	132:9 136:15	178.13 179.3,0	excerpts 65:12 excluded 81:3	expose 197:15 express 185:14
enticements 85:21	137:25 151:17	186:7,10,20	excuse 165:5	express 183.14 expressed 204:14
enticing 85:19	ethical 28:8 31:20	187:18 192:3	exercise 172:25	expression 208:7
entire 82:5	ethically 28:5	193:3 195:13	exercised 159:18	extended 10:11
entirely 37:21	29:12,15 152:19	193.3 193.13	exists 21:20	37:2,6 39:15
208:11	ethics 29:11	198:17 201:23	191:23	extent 4:4 47:1
entitled 16:15	142:12	204:18 209:25	exited 69:22	78:1 82:24 88:17
56:23 57:2,3	EU 100:11,19	210:13 211:13	exited 09.22 expand 213:3	211:5
122:13 139:7	evaluated 143:17	210:13 211:13	expand 213.3 expect 44:2 60:19	external 45:19
entrance 84:24	event 20:8 65:16	evidenced 104:2	63:10 65:7 67:3	130:4,7,20 132:5
entry 46:16	70:5,11 72:14	evident 80:16	71:18 76:25	190:1
entry 40.10 environment	73:22 75:1 78:16	ex 147:2	77:23 81:4 94:12	externally 130:14
48:22 84:4,5,7,15	79:7,23 82:11	exacerbating	147:11 148:3	externally 130.14 extra 75:5,10
86:14,19 105:19	127:6,7 140:1	204:24	153:15,16,17	extraordinary
109:1 111:17	events 29:3 59:6	exact 75:21 97:11	189:3 190:5	32:9
159:6,15 160:7	63:21 72:21 73:3	exactly 64:15	210:9	extreme 62:7
161:4 165:6	73:18 74:4 75:15	142:8 168:11	expectation	108:16 210:8
171:23,23 172:17	127:9,10 143:3	185:10	183:20	extremely 109:2,4
178:2 212:25	147:1	examination 1:7	expectations	
213:12	everybody 85:19	158:1 162:1	177:25	F
environments	110:10 121:1	164:25 165:1,8	expected 69:13,13	fabricate 76:14
		100.1,0	F	face 18:17 114:9,9
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				Page 226
11410101011		1.50.11	0 147 16	a n
114:10,10,10,11	32:16,25 33:2,16	150:11	firm 147:16	follow 119:19,25
146:24 190:15	33:19,20 45:23	feeds 56:17 59:12	first 2:10 4:17 7:1	followed 7:7 26:3
Facebook 71:23	79:1,20 106:22	feel 32:22 65:4,22	13:23 33:4 34:10	29:3 71:14,16
faced 76:10 124:20	141:25 148:18	72:1 92:3 139:15	34:10 46:16 49:3	120:1 152:16,19
facilitate 207:6	179:10,12 186:16	188:7,21 197:3	50:2,10 61:18	following 17:15
facilitated 211:4	186:20 187:3	feeling 48:3	74:12 76:21	<b>food</b> 115:16
facilities 3:25	196:2	187:25	86:23 88:14	189:13,15,18,19
83:16	<b>failures</b> 14:9,20,24	feels 86:6 206:11	95:21 106:24	<b>fooled</b> 71:24
facility 83:18 95:5	15:24 16:2 24:21	fellow 158:17,18	109:13 129:12	footage 21:15,16
154:10	27:9,9,10,24	felt 3:20 70:21	159:5 160:11	55:18 63:12 68:7
facing 88:18	28:17,17,19	81:3 82:25 182:5	164:22 167:5	70:1 72:4 74:3,8
fact 1:19 15:14	30:17 31:7 33:4	female 4:7 146:25	168:22 173:7,13	74:17 76:5,10,20
24:19 73:9 75:21	33:9 34:18 59:16	<b>fifth</b> 16:3	177:4 195:19	79:22 135:1
87:3 101:23	60:7 149:19	<b>figure</b> 15:9 97:11	<b>firstly</b> 112:24	136:15 137:19,21
111:12 119:20	190:10	figures 38:7	151:21	137:22,24 138:1
126:1 143:17	fair 7:9 41:13,21	147:24 156:19	<b>fit</b> 166:13 196:22	138:9
168:15 179:13	73:2,5 80:4	194:7,10,19	207:3,3,19,20	force 17:8,13,15
183:1 192:13	110:1 112:15	filling 42:18	208:6,11	17:16 23:14,16
201:20 203:2	120:11 148:4,25	<b>film</b> 66:7,14	<b>fit-to-fly</b> 208:2	26:20 39:5,7
212:23	149:1 150:1	filtering 167:14	<b>fitness</b> 207:12,18	46:5,6 55:9 58:9
<b>factor</b> 39:3 120:11	162:23 180:19	<b>final</b> 146:16	211:11,16,20	58:15,19 59:5,6
<b>factors</b> 32:9 38:1	198:13	156:22 181:25	fitness-to-fly 207:2	62:15 63:12 64:2
41:4 55:22	fairly 104:20	<b>finally</b> 4:8 13:5	<b>five</b> 114:25 134:5	64:3 65:5,23,23
182:14 190:19	142:2	55:21 59:5 71:22	164:23 196:9	66:4,10 67:2,9
facts 55:21	fairness 149:6	72:19 117:21	201:24 202:7	72:6,8 73:24
factual 140:22	fake 71:25	143:1 153:4	fix 196:8 203:11	74:24 76:8,9,15
factually 116:4	<b>fall</b> 91:8	210:24	<b>fixed</b> 9:11 14:11	77:11 85:18
Faculty 158:18	falls 29:25	financial 9:12	196:25	104:12 110:2
174:6 178:16	false 28:24	13:12 14:2 27:23	flexible 35:21	113:20 120:17
fail 18:24 19:5	familiar 73:21	28:10 30:12 33:5	<b>flight</b> 103:7 115:21	122:9,14,21,23
45:24 187:7	familiarise 113:24	34:9 85:23	flights 95:12	122:24 123:1,6
<b>failed</b> 31:12 76:7	families 2:20	financially 28:13	100:22,23 101:5	123:19,22 124:1
78:18 180:9	38:20,21	<b>find</b> 3:19 40:25	102:12,25 103:8	124:22,25 125:2
<b>failing</b> 17:21 18:2	family 82:1	97:19 99:6 164:3	104:10 107:4	125:4,6,10,21
33:4 70:17 71:2	fantastic 105:8	180:1 193:8,11	123:10 154:10	126:3,4,12,22,22
168:21,24 172:14	109:5	202:3 203:18	flip 123:25	127:1,2,5,17,22
195:1 206:9	far 45:16 71:1	204:7,8	floor 78:17 87:12	128:5,8,9,11,12
failings 33:14	92:15 100:2	finding 30:25	fluid 115:17	129:20,25 130:1
failure 14:6,15	155:10 172:21	184:18 213:8	fly 207:3,12,18,19	130:6,16,23
16:17 17:5,10	181:3	<b>findings</b> 3:13 5:8	207:21 208:6	131:17,24 132:19
18:3,9,20,22 20:6	Farrell 43:19	6:12,19 55:20	focus 1:23 44:8	133:13,25 134:17
21:10,13 22:10	150:4,4	105:12 106:4,19	46:17 120:9	134:19,23 135:6
22:14,23 23:15	Farsi 102:14	150:8 153:5	123:11 131:23	135:17,24 136:7
23:17 24:1,8,14	<b>favour</b> 197:14	finds 202:13	185:22	137:2,25 138:16
24:22 25:9 27:4	feasible 166:16	fine 19:4 64:11	focused 46:19,19	140:24 141:3,20
27:17,19 29:20	features 9:2	92:16 138:15	focuses 134:1	141:25 142:14,16
29:25 30:3,6,6,11	fed 7:8 152:13,17	fined 28:21	focusing 68:17,21	142:18,21 143:1
30:22,24,25	fee 14:2	finish 37:5	68:25 70:9 163:6	143:2,5,23 144:1
31:10,10 32:12	feedback 150:5,7	finished 137:9	folder 1:14	144:4,9,24
51.15,10 52.12	130454011 130.3,7	13/17	1010011111	1 , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

145:18,21 154:14					Page 227
1883   20413,15		10510		1	1
204:18,24 205:14	′				
205:19 206:3,3.8   Friday 1: 207:16   207:6,10 208:7. 208:10,12   front 1:12 34:4   53:5 63:4 68:3,8   170:22   178:16   68:20 69:3 70:2   178:16   678:20 69:23 70:2   178:16   679:20 fored 2:12 62:12 62:12 62:12 62:13   68:42 10:25   679:11 10:19 49:13 62:23   68:5 87:19 34:3 47:8 81:2   81:1 149:20   144:18:21 19:20   183:14 189:7   60:31 180:16   183:14 189:7   60:32 22 6:8 27:1   142:5   60:42 27:24 111:15   70:22 168:24 20:22   674:24 111:15   70:22 168:24 20:22   70:23 20:21   70:20 10:19 49:13 10:12   70:22 10:19 49:13 62:23   70:19 49:13 62:23   70:22 10:19 49:13 62:23   70:22 10:19 49:13 62:23   70:19 49:13 62:23   70:19 49:13 62:23   70:19 49:13 62:23   70:19 49:13 62:23   70:19 49:13 62:23   70:19 49:13 62:23   70:19 49:13 62:23   70:19 49:13 62:23   70:19 49:13 62:23   70:19		_ ·			
207:6.10 208:7   frightening 171:25   froot 1:12 34:4   forces 58:14   53:5 63:4 68:3.8   forcign 207:15   foresis 174:6   f	′				
This is a contract of the co	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
The content of the	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	o o		S	0
Toreign 207:15	*				O
Foresic 174:6   170:22   frustrated 69:22   frozotten 195:5   form 42:12 62:12   62:17 65:8 67:19   fulfil 172:15   32:00:13   34:13 47:8 81:2   156:21   156:21 173:14 17:12   156:21 158:14 17:12   156:21 158:14 17:12   156:22   179:13 180:16   14:4 18:21 19:20   183:14 189:7   20:3 21:14,18   160:22   22:12 23:19,21   160:22   179:13 180:16   14:25   57:6 60:4 62:1   67:10:21   6		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0 0
178:16	<u> </u>		T		
Torgotten 195:5			168:4 210:25	· ·	
Triangle				· ·	
62:17 65:8 67:19 83:5 135:7.9 148:11 149:20 179:13 180:16 183:14 189:7 formal 88:15,25 89:10 27:8 29:10 30:14 142:5 formed 44:22 57:26 411:15 formed 44:22 formed 44:22 formed 44:22 formed 44:22 formed 44:22 formed 44:22 formed 45:21 formed 45:25 formed 45:21 formed 45:25 formed 49:8 81:7 formed 44:22 formed 49:8 81:7 formed 49:					
83:5 135:7,9 148:11 149:20 179:13 180:16 183:14 189:7 formal 88:15,25 89:10 22:1,2 23:19,21 60rmally 129:20 27:8 29:10 30:14 142:5 57:6 60:4 62:1 179:20 179:10:21 179:10:21 179:10:21 179:10:21 179:10:21 179:10:21 179:10:21 179:10:21 179:10:21 179:10:21 179:10:21 179:10:21 179:10:21 179:10:21 179:10:21 179:20 179:20 179:20 179:20 179:20 179:20 179:20 179:20 179:20 179:20 179:10:21 179:10:21 179:10:21 179:10:21 179:10:21 179:10:21 179:10:21 179:20 179:20 179:20 179:20 179:20 179:20 179:10:21 179:10:21 179:10:21 179:10:21 179:10:21 179:10:21 179:20 179		_			-
148:11 149:20				•	
179:13 180:16	-				
183:14 189:7					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
formal 88:15,25         22:1,2 23:19,21         G4S's 30:10         46:12 68:14 73:2         188:17 7:18 0:1 102:11         175:10 176:18           formally 129:20         23:22 26:8 27:1         G71 10:21         46:12 68:14 73:2         77:1 80:1 102:11         175:10 176:18           formed 84:22         57:6 60:4 62:1         game 196:17         121:16 118:11         183:21 185:13         183:21 185:13           formed 84:22         77:24 111:15         gap 194:24 209:20         46:12 16:21 15:22         150:12 15:22         197:7 205:13           formed 79:8 81:7         126:8 128:16         gaps 4:21         gates 84:25         177:20 178:23         good 13;4,89           forms 51:18         160:10 170:16         170:16         172:4 199:22         Gatwick 2:1,14         196:910 201:2,3         138:19         189:1 193:17         177:11,14,17         178:4 181:2           forum 89:20         fully 4:25 6:12         19:12,15 25:25         66:01 170:16         134:5 6:24         188:19         189:1 193:17         177:11,14,17         178:4 181:2           85:11 173:6         46:6 49:19 56:20         62:18 69:5 78:6         81:4 87:13 91:13         180:7 18:6         188:19 193:17         178:4 181:2         60:11 60:21         188:12 187:5,9         189:1 193:17         179:11 189:5,8         188:19 193:17         177:11,14				0	
89:10 60:10 142:5 60:10 142:5 57:6 60:4 62:1 142:5 60:4 62:2 60:4 62:1 142:5 60:4 62:1 142:5 60:4 62:1 142:5 60:4 62:1 142:5 60:4 62:1 142:5 134:5,6,24 143:5 138 142:1 150:19 158:4,9 141:25 175:18 162:1 164:25 166:10 170:16 172:4 199:22 14:18 61:12 15:10 176:18 112:16 118:11 14:2:14 148:4 190:22:14 177:20 178:23 179:3,22 182:24 179:3,22 182:24 179:3,22 182:24 179:3,22 182:24 179:3,22 182:24 179:0 172:4 199:27 17:1,14 17:1,16 162:1 176:4 177:1 18:20 172:1 15:22 179:3,22 182:24 179:3,22 182:24 179:3,22 182:24 179:3,22 182:24 179:3,22 182:24 179:3,22 182:24 179:3,22 182:24 179:3,22 182:24 179:3		· ·			
Triangle   Common	formal 88:15,25	22:1,2 23:19,21		46:12 68:14 73:2	158:8 172:2,24
142:5					
formed 84:22 former 49:8 81:7 former 49:8 81:7 former 49:8 81:7 formerly 47:1         126:8 128:16 gaps 4:21 gate 84:25 gates 84:9,20,24 gate 84:25         150:12 155:22 gates 197:7 205:13         197:7 205:13         208:15 213:7 good 1:3,4,8,9 gates 84:9,20,24 gathering 21:23         162:12 176:4 gathering 21:23 gates 84:9,20,24 gathering 21:23         162:12 176:4 gathering 21:23 gates 84:9,20,24 gathering 21:23         172:20 178:23 good 1:3,4,8,9 good 1:3,4,89 good 1:	formally 129:20	27:8 29:10 30:14	<u> </u>	112:16 118:11	183:21 185:13
former 49:8 81:7         126:8 128:16         gaps 4:21         gate 84:25         162:12 176:4         208:15 213:7           formerly 47:1         134:5,6,24         gate 84:25         177:20 178:23         good 1:3,4,8,9         95:15 96:5 113:7           formighty 59:25         166:10 170:16         gathering 21:23         182:25 183:18         134:2 142:23         177:11,14,17           formard 9:20         172:4 199:22         Gatwick 2:1,14         196:9,10 201:2,3         178:1 18:15         177:11,14,17           forward 11:22         14:9         46:6 49:19 56:20         57:13 56:11 81:5         201:11,16 202:1         178:11,16 202:1         188:19 194:23           80:18 84:23         19:12,15 25:25         51:13 56:11 81:5         87:14,21 126:19         90:16 140:2         188:19 194:23           85:11 173:6         46:6 49:19 56:20         46:6 49:19 56:20         57:13 56:11 81:5         87:14,21 126:19         90:16 140:2         20:15 177:1         188:19 194:23           182:1 103:2 125:4         104:15         104:15         183:12 187:59         19:45 203:1         156:9 174:11         166:5 171:7,14         177:9,11 189:5,8           four 3:6 38:23         104:15         function 9:1         104:15         general 27:22 34:2         42:10 52:13         113:7 129:23         166:2 17:7:1         17		57:6 60:4 62:1	U	147:4 148:4	190:22 192:19
formerly 47:1         134:5,6,24         gate 84:25         177:20 178:23         good 1:3,4,8,9           forms 51:18         150:19 158:4,9         gates 84:9,20,24         179:3,22 182:24         good 1:3,4,8,9           forms 51:18         160:11 164:25         gates 84:9,20,24         179:3,22 182:24         good 1:3,4,8,9           forming 51:18         160:10 170:16         138:19         179:3,22 182:24         179:3,22 182:24         179:3,22 182:24         95:15 96:5 113:7           forma 61:12         172:4 199:22         24:9         Gatwick 2:1,14         196:9,10 201:2,3         177:11,14,17         177:11,14,17           forward 11:22         214:9         35:6,24 38:12         200:5,6         188:19 194:23         188:19 194:23         20:15,17         178:4 181:2         200:5,6         188:19 194:23         188:19 194:23         20:15 177:1         178:4 181:2         200:15,6         188:19 194:23         20:15 177:1         178:4 181:2         200:15 177:1         178:4 181:2         200:15 177:1         178:4 181:2         200:15,6         188:19 194:23         20:15 177:1         20:15 177:1         178:14 181:2         20:15 177:1         20:15 177:1         20:15 177:1         20:15 177:1         20:15 177:1         20:15 177:1         20:15 177:1         20:15 177:1         20:15 177:1         20:15 177:1	<b>formed</b> 84:22	77:24 111:15	0 1	150:12 155:22	197:7 205:13
forms 51:18         150:19 158:4,9         gates 84:9,20,24         179:3,22 182:24         95:15 96:5 113:7           141:25 175:18         162:1 164:25         Gathering 21:23         182:25 183:18         134:2 142:23           forum 89:20         172:4 199:22         Gatwick 2:1,14         196:9,10 201:2,3         178:11,14,17           forward 11:22         214:9         Cathering 21:23         189:1 193:17         179:11,14,17           forward 11:22         121:9         Gatwick 2:1,14         196:9,10 201:2,3         178:4 181:2           80:18 84:23         19:12,15 25:25         62:18 69:5 78:6         87:14,21 126:19         62:18 69:5 78:6         87:14,21 126:19         62:18 69:5 78:6         87:14,21 126:19         180:7 181:6         180:7 181:6         183:12 187:5,9         163:17         171:1,16         70:15 103:8         183:12 187:5,9         194:5 203:1         156:9 174:11         177:9,11 189:5,8         6Ps 9:15 96:5 113:7           61:8 131:15         104:15         fundamental 21:2         20:21 208:4         179:3,22 182:24         6Ps 9:15 96:5 113:7           17:1,10         419:4 155:13         194:5 203:1         156:9 174:11         177:9,11 189:5,8         6Ps 9:15 96:5 113:7           17:1,10         42:12 26:12 53:2         73:13 103:19         49:25 50:15,19         77:25 85:15	former 49:8 81:7	126:8 128:16	<u> </u>	162:12 176:4	208:15 213:7
141:25 175:18         162:1 164:25         gathering 21:23         182:25 183:18         134:2 142:23           fortnightly 59:25         166:10 170:16         172:4 199:22         214:9         Gatwick 2:1,14         196:9,10 201:2,3         177:11,14,17           forward 11:22         214:9         7:20 8:3 12:20         35:6,24 38:12         201:11,16 202:1         178:4 181:2           80:18 84:23         19:12,15 25:25         51:13 56:11 81:5         202:5,6         gives 45:23 59:6         governance 20:13           85:11 173:6         46:6 49:19 56:20         87:14,21 126:19         159:3 170:5         163:17         163:17         governance 20:13           82:1 103:2 125:4         144:18 213:21,24         183:12 187:5,9         194:5 203:1         163:17         giving 1:24 109:17         GP 164:21 165:3,9           138:25 146:21         104:15         206:21 208:4         201:16 212:1         government         121:15           138:25 146:21         fundamental         general 27:22 34:2         42:10 52:13         113:7 129:23         16:22,24 17:20         179:23 197:23         178:21 189:5,8           Fraser 70:15,17         further 5:6 24:11         24:12 26:12 53:2         generallising 45:3         31:15,18 46:10         31:15,18 46:10         32:19,23 197:23         179:23 197:23         207:8         <	formerly 47:1	134:5,6,24	0	177:20 178:23	<b>good</b> 1:3,4,8,9
fortnightly 59:25         166:10 170:16         138:19         189:1 193:17         177:11,14,17           forward 11:22         214:9         35:6,24 38:12         201:11,16 202:1         188:19 194:23         178:4 181:2           80:18 84:23         49:12,15 25:25         35:6,24 38:12         201:11,16 202:1         188:19 194:23           85:11 173:6         46:6 49:19 56:20         87:14,21 126:19         159:3 170:5         163:17         20:15 177:1           found 68:5 78:16         81:4 87:13 91:13         180:7 181:6         183:12 187:5,9         194:5 203:1         159:3 170:5         143:13 148:25         government           178:9 183:25         function 90:11         104:15         104:15         104:15         104:15         104:15         104:15         104:15         113:7 129:23         16:22,24 17:20         179:23 179:23         179:23 179:23         179:23 179:23         179:23 197:23         179:23 197:23         179:23 197:23         179:23 197:23         179:23 197:23         179:23 197:23         179:23 197:23         179:23 197:23         179:24 123:8         179:24 123:8         179:24 123:8         179:24 123:8         179:24 123:8         179:24 123:8         179:24 123:8         179:24 123:8         179:24 123:8         179:24 123:8         179:24 123:8         179:24 123:8         179:11,18,17         <	forms 51:18	150:19 158:4,9		179:3,22 182:24	95:15 96:5 113:7
forum 89:20         172:4 199:22         Gatwick 2:1,14         196:9,10 201:2,3         178:4 181:2           forward 11:22         214:9         7:20 8:3 12:20         35:6,24 38:12         201:11,16 202:1         182:12 184:8           80:18 84:23         19:12,15 25:25         51:13 56:11 81:5         85:11 173:6         46:6 49:19 56:20         57:14,21 126:19         159:3 170:5         180:7 181:6         180:7 181:1         180:7 181:1         180:7 181:	141:25 175:18	162:1 164:25	0	182:25 183:18	134:2 142:23
forward 11:22         214:9         7:20 8:3 12:20         201:11,16 202:1         182:12 184:8           14:18 61:12         fully 4:25 6:12         35:6,24 38:12         202:5,6         188:19 194:23           80:18 84:23         19:12,15 25:25         51:13 56:11 81:5         87:14,21 126:19         90:16 140:2         20:15 177:1           187:10         62:18 69:5 78:6         81:4 87:13 91:13         180:7 181:6         90:16 140:2         20:15 177:1           82:1 103:2 125:4         144:18 213:21,24         183:12 187:5,9         163:17         giving 1:24 109:17         166:5 171:7,14           178:9 183:25         function 90:11         194:5 203:1         178:18         69:16 40:2         69:16:21 109:17           138:25 146:21         104:15         206:21 208:4         210:16 212:1         206:21 208:4         210:16 212:1         4:15 5:6 8:5 9:5         678 92:6 158:17         177:9,11 189:5,8         678 92:6 158:17         177:9 178:1,18         177:9 178:1,18         177:9 178:1,18         177:9 178:1,18         177:9 178:1,18         177:9 178:1,18         177:9 178:1,18         177:9 178:1,18         177:9 178:1,18         177:9 178:1,18         177:9 178:1,18         177:9 178:1,18         177:9 178:1,18         177:9 178:1,18         179:23 132:14         183:15,18 46:10         53:6,15 59:25         51:5,7,11	fortnightly 59:25	166:10 170:16		189:1 193:17	177:11,14,17
14:18 61:12         fully 4:25 6:12         35:6,24 38:12         202:5,6         188:19 194:23           80:18 84:23         19:12,15 25:25         51:13 56:11 81:5         gives 45:23 59:6         governance 20:13           85:11 173:6         46:6 49:19 56:20         87:14,21 126:19         159:3 170:5         143:13 148:25         governance 20:13           82:1 103:2 125:4         144:18 213:21,24         180:7 181:6         163:17         government         121:15           four 3:6 38:23         function 90:11         194:5 203:1         156:9 174:11         178:18         177:9,11 189:5,8           61:8 131:15         104:15         206:21 208:4         210:16 212:1         201:20 3:12,16         4:15 5:6 8:5 9:5         4:15 5:6 8:5 9:5         177:9,11 189:5,8         42:10 52:13         177:9,11 189:5,8         42:10 52:13         177:9,11 189:5,8         42:10 52:13         177:9,11 189:5,8         42:10 52:13         177:9,11 189:5,8         42:10 52:13         177:9,11 189:5,8         42:10 52:13         177:9,11 189:5,8         42:10 52:13         183:12 187:5,9         188:19 194:23         190:15 14:11         166:51 71:7,11         106:21 11         178:18         177:9,11 189:5,8         42:10 52:13         177:9,11 189:5,8         42:10 52:13         177:9,11 189:5,2         177:9,17 18:1,1         47:20 52:13         19:20 30:22,24	forum 89:20	172:4 199:22	-	196:9,10 201:2,3	178:4 181:2
80:18 84:23 85:11 173:6 46:6 49:19 56:20 187:10 62:18 69:5 78:6 81:4 87:13 91:13 82:1 103:2 125:4 178:9 183:25 61:8 131:15 138:25 146:21 212:2 6138:25 146:21 213:15 103:17 24:15 203:1 24:10 52:13 20:16 140:2 20:15 177:1 206:21 208:4 210:16 212:1 206:21 208:4 210:16 212:1 206:21 208:4 210:16 212:1 206:21 208:4 210:16 212:1 206:21 208:4 210:16 212:1 206:21 208:4 210:16 212:1 206:21 208:4 210:16 212:1 206:21 208:4 210:16 212:1 206:21 208:4 210:16 212:1 201:14 15:29 20:15 177:1 206:21 103:17 21:15  64:15 5:6 8:5 9:5 210:16 212:1 21:15 64:21 163:17 21:15 64:15 5:6 8:5 9:5 21:10:16 212:1 21:15 64:15 5:6 8:5 9:5 21:10:16 212:1 22:10:16 212:1 23:15 69:16 4:0:2 20:15 177:1 206:21 208:4 210:16 212:1 206:21 208:4 210:16 212:1 206:21 208:4 210:16 212:1 200:12 208:4 210:16 212:1 200:12 208:4 210:16 212:1 200:12 208:4 210:16 212:1 200:12 208:4 210:16 212:1 200:12 208:4 210:16 212:1 200:12 208:4 210:16 212:1 200:12 208:4 210:16 212:1 200:12 208:4 210:16 212:1 200:12 208:4 210:16 212:1 200:12 208:4 210:16 212:1 200:12 208:4 210:16 212:1 200:12 208:4 210:16 212:1 21:15 64:15 5:6 8:5 9:5 177:91 189:58 61:20 3:12,16 4:15 5:6 8:5 9:5 177:91 179:1 189:5,8 61:20 3:12,16 4:15 5:6 8:5 9:5 177:91 179:23 197:23 207:8 207:8 207:8 207:8 207:8 207:8 207:8 200:12 03:12,16 20:12 03:12,16	forward 11:22	214:9		201:11,16 202:1	182:12 184:8
85:11 173:6 187:10 46:6 49:19 56:20 187:14,21 126:19 159:3 170:5 180:7 181:6 82:1 103:2 125:4 178:9 183:25 function 90:11 four 3:6 38:23 61:8 131:15 138:25 146:21 212:2 37:15 103:8 212:2 37:15 103:8 46:6 49:19 56:20 87:14,21 126:19 159:3 170:5 180:7 181:6 183:12 187:5,9 194:5 203:1 206:21 208:4 210:16 212:1 general 27:22 34:2 42:10 52:13 113:7 129:23 113:7 129:23 113:7 129:23 113:15,18 46:10 generally 38:18 49:25 50:15,19 71:1,10 24:12 26:12 53:2 fraud 28:22,24 free 10:22 85:2,3 freedom 147:16 free quent 108:18 109:17 173:23  46:6 49:19 56:20 87:14,21 126:19 159:3 170:5 180:7 181:6 180:7 181:6 183:12 187:5,9 194:5 203:1 183:12 187:5,9 194:5 203:1 178:18 go 1:20 3:12,16 4:15 5:6 8:5 9:5 9:19 14:4 15:22 178:22 179:2,21 179:23 197:23 207:8 graduate 50:5 51:5,7,11 graduates 51:12 graduates 51:12 grand 124:8 grand 124:8 grand 124:8 grand 126:20,21 graph 107:10,11 115:14	14:18 61:12	fully 4:25 6:12	-	202:5,6	188:19 194:23
187:10         62:18 69:5 78:6         159:3 170:5         143:13 148:25         government           found 68:5 78:16         81:4 87:13 91:13         180:7 181:6         163:17         giving 1:24 109:17         GP 164:21 165:3,9           82:1 103:2 125:4         function 90:11         194:5 203:1         156:9 174:11         166:5 171:7,14           four 3:6 38:23         functions 9:9         104:15         206:21 208:4         206:21 208:4         178:18         GPs 92:6 158:17           138:25 146:21         37:15 103:8         42:10 52:13         13:7 129:23         16:22 34:2         61:2 13:1         62:10 52:13         177:9 178:1,18         678 92:6 158:17         679 92:6 158:17         69 12 14:4 15:22         69 12 14:4 15:22         69 12 14:4 15:22         69 12 14:4 15:22         69 12 14:4 15:22         69 12 14:4 15:22         69 12 14:4 15:22         69 12 14:4 15:22         69 12 14:4 15:22         69 12 14:4 15:22	80:18 84:23	19:12,15 25:25		gives 45:23 59:6	governance 20:13
found 68:5 78:16         81:4 87:13 91:13         180:7 181:6         163:17         giving 1:24 109:17         GP 164:21 165:3,9           four 3:6 38:23         function 90:11         194:5 203:1         156:9 174:11         166:5 171:7,14           four 3:6 38:23         functions 9:9         104:15         206:21 208:4         178:18         177:9,11 189:5,8           61:8 131:15         fundamental         37:15 103:8         210:16 212:1         42:10 52:13         42:10 52:13         9:19 14:4 15:22         177:9,17 189:5,8           framework 53:24         frank 77:24         196:2         113:7 129:23         191:24         9:19 14:4 15:22         179:23 197:23           fraud 28:22,24         further 5:6 24:11         24:12 26:12 53:2         generally 38:18         31:15,18 46:10	85:11 173:6	46:6 49:19 56:20	•	90:16 140:2	20:15 177:1
82:1 103:2 125:4	187:10	62:18 69:5 78:6		143:13 148:25	government
178:9 183:25         function 90:11         194:5 203:1         156:9 174:11         166:5 171:7,14           four 3:6 38:23         functions 9:9         104:15         210:16 212:1         go 1:20 3:12,16         GPs 92:6 158:17           138:25 146:21         37:15 103:8         42:10 52:13         9:19 14:4 15:22         177:9,11 189:5,8           framework 53:24         further 5:6 24:11         general 27:22 34:2         42:10 52:13         16:22,24 17:20         179:23 197:23           frank 77:24         further 5:6 24:11         generalising 45:3         generally 38:18         31:15,18 46:10         graduate 50:5           fraud 28:22,24         55:16 60:21 64:1         77:25 85:15         61:22 68:2 79:17         graduates 51:12           freedom 147:16         107:23 132:14         104:22 128:11         104:22 128:11         107:8,9 112:7         graph 107:10,11           109:17 173:23         165:21,22 173:3         180:3         115:14	<b>found</b> 68:5 78:16	81:4 87:13 91:13	180:7 181:6	163:17	121:15
178:9 183:25         function 90:11         194:5 203:1         156:9 174:11         166:5 171:7,14           four 3:6 38:23         functions 9:9         206:21 208:4         178:18         177:9,11 189:5,8           61:8 131:15         104:15         general 27:22 34:2         4:15 5:6 8:5 9:5         GPs 92:6 158:17           138:25 146:21         37:15 103:8         42:10 52:13         9:19 14:4 15:22         177:9 178:1,18           212:2         37:15 103:8         42:10 52:13         113:7 129:23         16:22,24 17:20         179:23 197:23           frank 77:24         further 5:6 24:11         generalising 45:3         generally 38:18         31:15,18 46:10         graduate 50:5           71:1,10         24:12 26:12 53:2         fere 10:22 85:2,3         55:16 60:21 64:1         77:25 85:15         32:19 85:1 87:4         graduates 51:12         graduates 51:12         graduates 51:12         grand 124:8         grand 124:8         grand 124:8         grand 124:8         grand 124:8         graph 107:10,11           109:17 173:23         165:21,22 173:3         180:3         119:24 123:8         115:14	82:1 103:2 125:4	144:18 213:21,24	183:12 187:5,9	giving 1:24 109:17	<b>GP</b> 164:21 165:3,9
61:8 131:15 138:25 146:21 212:2 framework 53:24 frank 77:24 Fraser 70:15,17 71:1,10 fraud 28:22,24 free 10:22 85:2,3 freedom 147:16 freedom 147:16 frequent 108:18 104:15  104:15  104:15  104:15 fundamental 37:15 103:8 42:10 52:13 113:7 129:23 191:24 generalising 45:3 generally 38:18 49:25 50:15,19 77:25 85:15 104:15  210:16 212:1 general 27:22 34:2 4:15 5:6 8:5 9:5 9:19 14:4 15:22 179:23 197:23 179:23 197:23 207:8 graduate 50:5 51:5,7,11 graduates 51:12 grand 124:8 grand 124:8 grand 124:8 grand 124:8 grand 124:8 grand 124:8 grand 126:20,21 frequent 108:18 109:17 173:23 165:21,22 173:3 180:3	178:9 183:25		194:5 203:1	156:9 174:11	166:5 171:7,14
138:25 146:21         fundamental         general 27:22 34:2         4:15 5:6 8:5 9:5         177:9 178:1,18           212:2         37:15 103:8         149:4 155:13         113:7 129:23         16:22,24 17:20         179:23 197:23           frank 77:24         196:2         191:24         19:20 30:22,24         207:8           Fraser 70:15,17         further 5:6 24:11         generally 38:18         31:15,18 46:10         graduate 50:5           71:1,10         24:12 26:12 53:2         55:16 60:21 64:1         49:25 50:15,19         53:6,15 59:25         51:5,7,11           free 10:22 85:2,3         73:13 103:19         77:25 85:15         82:19 85:1 87:4         grand 124:8           frequent 108:18         141:9 155:2         133:14 152:1,5         107:8,9 112:7         graph 107:10,11           109:17 173:23         165:21,22 173:3         180:3         119:24 123:8         115:14	four 3:6 38:23	functions 9:9		178:18	177:9,11 189:5,8
138:25 146:21         fundamental         general 27:22 34:2         4:15 5:6 8:5 9:5         177:9 178:1,18           212:2         37:15 103:8         42:10 52:13         9:19 14:4 15:22         178:22 179:2,21           framework 53:24         149:4 155:13         113:7 129:23         16:22,24 17:20         179:23 197:23           frank 77:24         196:2         191:24         19:20 30:22,24         207:8           Fraser 70:15,17         24:12 26:12 53:2         generally 38:18         31:15,18 46:10         graduate 50:5           71:1,10         24:12 26:12 53:2         55:16 60:21 64:1         49:25 50:15,19         53:6,15 59:25         51:5,7,11           free 10:22 85:2,3         73:13 103:19         77:25 85:15         82:19 85:1 87:4         graduate 51:12           frequent 108:18         141:9 155:2         104:22 128:11         88:7,9 99:11         graph 107:10,11           109:17 173:23         165:21,22 173:3         180:3         119:24 123:8         115:14	61:8 131:15	104:15		<b>go</b> 1:20 3:12,16	
212:2       37:15 103:8       42:10 52:13       9:19 14:4 15:22       178:22 179:2,21         framework 53:24       149:4 155:13       113:7 129:23       16:22,24 17:20       179:23 197:23         frank 77:24       196:2       191:24       19:20 30:22,24       207:8         Fraser 70:15,17       further 5:6 24:11       24:12 26:12 53:2       generally 38:18       31:15,18 46:10       graduate 50:5         71:1,10       55:16 60:21 64:1       49:25 50:15,19       53:6,15 59:25       51:5,7,11       51:5,7,11         free 10:22 85:2,3       73:13 103:19       77:25 85:15       82:19 85:1 87:4       graduates 51:12         freedom 147:16       107:23 132:14       104:22 128:11       88:7,9 99:11       granted 126:20,21         frequent 108:18       141:9 155:2       133:14 152:1,5       107:8,9 112:7       graph 107:10,11         109:17 173:23       165:21,22 173:3       180:3       119:24 123:8       115:14	138:25 146:21	fundamental	U	,	177:9 178:1,18
framework 53:24       149:4 155:13       113:7 129:23       16:22,24 17:20       179:23 197:23         frank 77:24       further 5:6 24:11       generalising 45:3       31:15,18 46:10       graduate 50:5         fraud 28:22,24       55:16 60:21 64:1       49:25 50:15,19       77:25 85:15       61:22 68:2 79:17       graduates 51:12         freedom 147:16       107:23 132:14       107:23 132:14       104:22 128:11       88:7,9 99:11       grand 124:8         frequent 108:18       141:9 155:2       165:21,22 173:3       180:3       119:24 123:8       115:14	212:2	37:15 103:8		9:19 14:4 15:22	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Fraser 70:15,17 71:1,10 fraud 28:22,24 free 10:22 85:2,3 freedom 147:16 frequent 108:18 109:17 173:23 frake 77:15,17 further 5:6 24:11 24:12 26:12 53:2 generally 38:18 49:25 50:15,19 77:25 85:15 104:22 128:11 133:14 152:1,5 180:3 freedom 147:16 109:17 173:23	framework 53:24	149:4 155:13	113:7 129:23	16:22,24 17:20	179:23 197:23
Fraser 70:15,17         further 5:6 24:11         generalising 45:3         31:15,18 46:10         graduate 50:5           71:1,10         24:12 26:12 53:2         55:16 60:21 64:1         49:25 50:15,19         53:6,15 59:25         51:5,7,11           free 10:22 85:2,3         73:13 103:19         77:25 85:15         82:19 85:1 87:4         graduate 50:5           freedom 147:16         107:23 132:14         104:22 128:11         88:7,9 99:11         granted 126:20,21           frequent 108:18         141:9 155:2         133:14 152:1,5         107:8,9 112:7         graph 107:10,11           109:17 173:23         165:21,22 173:3         180:3         119:24 123:8         115:14	frank 77:24			· ·	207:8
71:1,10 fraud 28:22,24 free 10:22 85:2,3 freedom 147:16 frequent 108:18 109:17 173:23  24:12 26:12 53:2 55:16 60:21 64:1 73:13 103:19 77:25 85:15 104:22 128:11 113:14 152:1,5 180:3  53:6,15 59:25 61:22 68:2 79:17 82:19 85:1 87:4 88:7,9 99:11 107:8,9 112:7 119:24 123:8  51:5,7,11 graduates 51:12 grand 124:8 grand 126:20,21 119:24 123:8		<b>further</b> 5:6 24:11	generalising 45:3	· ·	graduate 50:5
fraud 28:22,24       55:16 60:21 64:1       49:25 50:15,19       61:22 68:2 79:17       graduates 51:12         free 10:22 85:2,3       73:13 103:19       77:25 85:15       82:19 85:1 87:4       grand 124:8         freedom 147:16       107:23 132:14       104:22 128:11       88:7,9 99:11       granted 126:20,21         frequent 108:18       141:9 155:2       133:14 152:1,5       107:8,9 112:7       graph 107:10,11         109:17 173:23       165:21,22 173:3       180:3       119:24 123:8       115:14	*	24:12 26:12 53:2	generally 38:18	· ·	S
free 10:22 85:2,3       73:13 103:19       77:25 85:15       82:19 85:1 87:4       grand 124:8         freedom 147:16       107:23 132:14       104:22 128:11       88:7,9 99:11       granted 126:20,21         frequent 108:18       141:9 155:2       133:14 152:1,5       107:8,9 112:7       graph 107:10,11         109:17 173:23       165:21,22 173:3       180:3       119:24 123:8       115:14	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		49:25 50:15,19	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	7 7
freedom 147:16       107:23 132:14       104:22 128:11       88:7,9 99:11       granted 126:20,21         frequent 108:18       141:9 155:2       133:14 152:1,5       107:8,9 112:7       graph 107:10,11         109:17 173:23       165:21,22 173:3       180:3       119:24 123:8       115:14	,		77:25 85:15		S
frequent 108:18     141:9 155:2     133:14 152:1,5     107:8,9 112:7     graph 107:10,11       109:17 173:23     165:21,22 173:3     180:3     119:24 123:8     115:14	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		104:22 128:11		S
109:17 173:23			133:14 152:1,5	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
				· ·	· ·
		,	generally-wise		
			l	l .	I

				Page 228
			l	l <b></b>
grassroots 61:13	70:12 74:6 75:22	86:12,13,15,18	heard 13:10,12	high 75:17 86:12
grateful 109:4	75:25 80:12 96:3	90:23 91:3 93:18	30:9 43:10,14,17	108:14 119:21
214:2	124:12 134:9	94:5,13 97:22	44:13 48:5 49:8	123:18 124:24
great 19:22 103:11	163:25 164:9	98:24 109:13	62:20 63:11,21	160:17 175:13
162:25 170:4	170:9 182:19	116:15,20 135:12	64:5 66:6 68:12	176:4 178:7
174:9 212:25	happening 32:12	137:15 144:12	78:11 79:21	186:10 195:22,24
greater 88:22	67:16 82:11	158:21 162:19	83:17 85:22 87:9	204:15
170:23	106:24 170:3	163:16 170:16,24	91:12 92:5,10	high-level 59:10
green 46:12,16	183:5,7 189:20	171:11 173:22	93:16 98:21	high-levels 104:3
grievance 81:12	190:10 194:14	175:22 179:11	100:8 106:24,25	higher 15:17 42:25
81:20	202:21 203:19	184:14,15 185:5	107:1,1 108:6	125:10 153:10
ground 148:25	204:22 210:10	185:15 187:22	113:6 115:9	higher-level 51:14
169:19 197:7	213:25	188:20,22,25	158:25 164:13,15	highest 13:9 41:21
198:4	happens 19:2	189:2,3,8,8,14,16	165:2 196:14	43:2 108:20
group 38:14 44:14	58:20 64:24	189:25 190:11	206:25 209:25	highlighting 208:9
47:10 50:9 52:7	142:24	191:3,9 193:16	210:14 213:10	highly 108:23
61:7,10 62:2	happily 25:1	199:3,8,13	hearing 65:4	168:5 172:5
136:6	happy 207:5	200:15,15,16	heart 63:25 64:3	184:6
groups 89:15,16	hard 52:14 67:10	201:4,6 203:20	66:4	highly-charged
grow 153:15	109:17 138:10	204:25 210:3	Heathrow 180:24	206:13
GSL 13:7,8	140:3 174:19	healthcare 4:3,22	181:4,6 198:14	Hindpal 86:4
guards 122:14	178:8,19 179:6	17:24 18:1,7,16	heavily 44:15	hindsight 76:2
guess 124:16	179:17	18:19 19:1 20:21	heavy 26:5	historic 54:14,14
165:25	Hard's 178:23	21:4,18,18 24:3	held 80:11 83:19	57:16
<b>guidance</b> 130:23	harm 16:19 17:23	24:22 26:17	86:15,25 87:21	historically 58:13
166:9 174:4	107:23 123:24	90:22 91:4,25	94:6,10 99:22,25	histories 130:25
guns 208:3	160:2 179:15	114:19 117:22	100:5,5 136:18	history 175:18
gymnasium 85:14	186:2 187:12,14	118:4,13 119:23	157:1,2	176:5 179:15
gymnasiums 85:14	195:24 198:22,24	134:25 135:3,7	hell 29:13	hitting 171:10
H	199:1,4,16 200:6	135:11 148:9	helmets 143:19	HMIP 3:5 7:24 8:5
half 30:19	200:10,20	159:7,10,24,25	help 18:12 38:7	8:10 86:4 151:11
half-hearted 74:11	harmed 176:6	160:6 164:17	40:4 93:15	151:12,15,18
halfway 16:15	harmful 184:1	177:2 181:23	109:23 119:2	HMPPS 130:13
34:21	Haughton 40:18	182:2 184:25	161:6 170:1	132:23 133:2
hallucinations	42:9 88:2 93:17	185:11,20 187:24	174:6 178:17	<b>hold</b> 84:1 94:3,17 94:25 97:24 98:4
188:25	129:10 head 40:16 55:5	189:23 190:2,6	helped 39:23 40:2	
hampered 197:9		191:21 196:23	55:13	holding 78:2 80:11
hand 53:15,15	80:23,24 164:16 188:11 204:6	200:11,12,14 206:1,7 207:25	<b>helpful</b> 3:13 156:7 162:25 206:23	83:18,25 <b>holistic</b> 171:12
handed 141:4,12	206:21	209:10 211:1,10	helpfully 9:2	Home 3:8,10 4:18
203:1	headed 107:20	211:19 212:2,5	Hewer 1:5,6,8,11	5:7,9 7:19,23 8:6
hands 62:22 78:2	heading 5:7	212:23 213:9	1:19 22:16 53:4	8:11,18,23,25
happen 71:7 90:4	116:11 123:25	healthcare's	62:25 65:4 72:15	9:22 10:4,6
95:25 101:3,7	health 5:1,2,25	205:14	79:17 80:8 82:6	13:18,20 14:17
114:1,3 134:12	43:22,24 44:9,16	healthy 41:10 53:3	82:21 83:9,15	14:19,22,23 15:3
182:9 196:11	44:18,21,24 47:7	53:4,8,12,21 54:5	86:17 138:14	15:4 16:1 19:13
205:1	47:12 48:17 49:3	55:10 59:3,17		20:4,14,19 23:23
happened 5:2 7:7	49:12,14,18	80:8	155:2,5 215:1 <b>Hewer's</b> 83:14	
23:1 27:18 31:11	61:24,25 62:1	hear 63:17	201:23	24:7,12 27:7,11 28:12,14,16 30:6
38:2 63:4,18	01.44,43 04.1	near 03.1/	201.23	20.12,14,10 30.0
50.2 05.1,10	<u>l</u>	<u> </u>		<u> </u>

32:3,20,21 33:13   horrified 62:24   hospital 64:1   147:23 151:19   169:4 179:11   impacted 28:13   impacts 95:15   impair 212:14   implement 33:25   implementation   177:16 178:21   177:19 176:5   implemented 4:25   implementing   174:11   implement 33:25   implementing   174:11   implement 33:25   implementing   177:16 178:21   177:17   177:16 178:21   177:17   177:16 178:21   177:17   177:16 178:21   177:17   177:16 178:21   177:17   177:17   177:16 178:21   177:17   177
33:17,18 34:23         hospital 64:1         147:23 151:19         169:4 179:11         impacted 28:13           35:2,19,25 36:3         16:15,21 24:24         153:2 154:9         identifying 174:11         impacts 95:15           36:19 37:24 39:4         16:15,21 24:24         156:23 157:1         ill-health 173:25         impair 212:14           44:11 49:8 56:8         173:24         159:4 164:17         188:19 190:8         implement 33:25           56:22 59:20 60:1         hospitalisations         168:2,8 175:10         ill-treatment         implement 33:25           160:3 90:14 91:1         18:7         177:16 178:21         175:19 176:5         91:7           91:9,25 92:21,24         hospitalised         186:13 187:24         130:24 131:5         implemented 4:25           101:4 102:7         host 100:10         200:7 202:6         167:4 184:2,7,24         7:23           104:9 105:3,6         hostage 132:22         203:16 204:22         185:6 188:18         implications 28:9           106:3,5,9,20,21         133:7,9,10         207:14 210:18         209:17         importance           106:23 109:21         hotel 35:16 36:25         HR 55:10         illnesses 208:24         160:14,20 161:5
35:2,19,25 36:3       hospitalisation       153:2 154:9       identifying 174:11       impacts 95:15         36:19 37:24 39:4       16:15,21 24:24       156:23 157:1       188:19 190:8       implement 33:25         44:11 49:8 56:8       173:24       hospitalisations       168:2,8 175:10       188:19 190:8       implement 33:25         56:22 59:20 60:1       hospitalisations       168:2,8 175:10       11-treatment       implement 33:25         19:9,25 92:21,24       hospitalised       186:13 187:24       175:19 176:5       91:7         96:7,21 97:6       115:19       189:20 194:8       130:24 131:5       implemented 4:25         101:4 102:7       host 100:10       200:7 202:6       167:4 184:2,7,24       7:23         104:9 105:3,6       hostage 132:22       203:16 204:22       185:6 188:18       implications 28:9         106:3,5,9,20,21       133:7,9,10       207:14 210:18       209:17       importance         106:23 109:21       hotel 35:16 36:25       HR 55:10       illnesses 208:24       160:14,20 161:5
36:19 37:24 39:4       16:15,21 24:24       156:23 157:1       ill-health 173:25       impair 212:14         44:11 49:8 56:8       173:24       159:4 164:17       188:19 190:8       implement 33:25         56:22 59:20 60:1       hospitalisations       168:2,8 175:10       115:19 176:5       ill-treatment       175:19 176:5       implementation         91:9,25 92:21,24       hospitalised       186:13 187:24       illness 43:16       implemented 4:25         96:7,21 97:6       115:19       189:20 194:8       130:24 131:5       implementing         101:4 102:7       host 100:10       200:7 202:6       167:4 184:2,7,24       7:23         104:9 105:3,6       hostage 132:22       203:16 204:22       185:6 188:18       implications 28:9         106:3,5,9,20,21       133:7,9,10       207:14 210:18       209:17       importance         106:23 109:21       hotel 35:16 36:25       HR 55:10       illnesses 208:24       160:14,20 161:5
44:11 49:8 56:8       173:24       159:4 164:17       188:19 190:8       implement 33:25         56:22 59:20 60:1       hospitalisations       168:2,8 175:10       175:19 176:5       implement 33:25         60:3 90:14 91:1       18:7       177:16 178:21       175:19 176:5       91:7         91:9,25 92:21,24       hospitalised       186:13 187:24       illness 43:16       implemented 4:25         96:7,21 97:6       115:19       189:20 194:8       130:24 131:5       implementing         101:4 102:7       host 100:10       200:7 202:6       167:4 184:2,7,24       7:23         104:9 105:3,6       hostage 132:22       203:16 204:22       185:6 188:18       implications 28:9         106:3,5,9,20,21       133:7,9,10       207:14 210:18       209:17       importance         106:23 109:21       hotel 35:16 36:25       HR 55:10       illnesses 208:24       160:14,20 161:5
56:22 59:20 60:1         hospitalisations         168:2,8 175:10         ill-treatment         implementation           60:3 90:14 91:1         18:7         177:16 178:21         175:19 176:5         91:7           91:9,25 92:21,24         hospitalised         186:13 187:24         illness 43:16         implemented 4:25           96:7,21 97:6         115:19         189:20 194:8         130:24 131:5         implementing           101:4 102:7         host 100:10         200:7 202:6         167:4 184:2,7,24         7:23           104:9 105:3,6         hostage 132:22         203:16 204:22         185:6 188:18         implications 28:9           106:3,5,9,20,21         133:7,9,10         207:14 210:18         209:17         importance           106:23 109:21         hotel 35:16 36:25         HR 55:10         illnesses 208:24         160:14,20 161:5
60:3 90:14 91:1 91:9,25 92:21,24 96:7,21 97:6 101:4 102:7 106:3,5,9,20,21 106:23 109:21       18:7 177:16 178:21 175:19 176:5 implemented 4:25 implementing 186:13 187:24 189:20 194:8 189:20 194:8 130:24 131:5 implementing 167:4 184:2,7,24 185:6 188:18 209:17 implemented 4:25 implementing 7:23 implementing 187:4 1
91:9,25 92:21,24 96:7,21 97:6 101:4 102:7 104:9 105:3,6 106:3,5,9,20,21 106:23 109:21         hospitalised 186:13 187:24 189:20 194:8 130:24 131:5 implemented 4:25 implementing 130:24 131:5 implementing 130:24 130:24 131:5 implementing 130:24 130:
96:7,21 97:6         115:19         189:20 194:8         130:24 131:5         implementing           101:4 102:7         host 100:10         200:7 202:6         167:4 184:2,7,24         7:23           104:9 105:3,6         hostage 132:22         203:16 204:22         185:6 188:18         implications 28:9           106:3,5,9,20,21         133:7,9,10         207:14 210:18         209:17         importance           106:23 109:21         hotel 35:16 36:25         HR 55:10         illnesses 208:24         160:14,20 161:5
101:4 102:7         host 100:10         200:7 202:6         167:4 184:2,7,24         7:23           104:9 105:3,6         hostage 132:22         203:16 204:22         185:6 188:18         implications 28:9           106:3,5,9,20,21         106:23 109:21         hotel 35:16 36:25         HR 55:10         illnesses 208:24         160:14,20 161:5
104:9 105:3,6       hostage 132:22       203:16 204:22       185:6 188:18       implications 28:9         106:3,5,9,20,21       133:7,9,10       207:14 210:18       209:17       importance         106:23 109:21       hotel 35:16 36:25       HR 55:10       illnesses 208:24       160:14,20 161:5
106:3,5,9,20,21         133:7,9,10         207:14 210:18         209:17         importance           106:23 109:21         hotel 35:16 36:25         HR 55:10         illnesses 208:24         160:14,20 161:5
106:23 109:21   hotel 35:16 36:25   HR 55:10   illnesses 208:24   160:14,20 161:5
110:3,8,12,13,15   38:10,11,15,20   huge 84:16 183:8   imagine 202:10   161:21 171:17
1
110:17,19,22,25   38:24   197:14   <b>IMB</b> 56:12,20   191:16
111:6,20 112:14   hotels 35:5 37:1   human 87:5   91:24 98:21   important 28:9
112:17,18,19,23   38:11   humane 87:1   102:20 104:21   61:17 89:11
113:21,23 114:12   hour-long 192:1   105:18 154:17   106:18 110:3,8   159:25 161:9
115:11 116:6   hourly 22:7   humanely 104:20   115:10 116:9   162:11 169:4,12
117:4,5,13,15,23   108:17   104:22   122:6 125:4   184:22
118:20,21 119:8   hours 22:8 49:13   Huntercombe   148:21 149:13   importantly 54:4
121:16 125:21
130:14,16,19
134:24 140:10,21   140:1,2,5,9,11   hurting 111:13   IMB's 107:7 153:5   23:13 146:19,20
141:6 148:10,12   142:24 160:13   123:4   <b>IMB000202</b>   <b>improve</b> 31:7
149:1,21,23
151:10,24 154:2   168:17   hypothetical 18:13   immediate 173:2   33:21,25 205:4
154:23 159:19   <b>House</b> 2:1,2,15,20   19:4,9 21:7 22:6   199:23 200:5,6   <b>improved</b> 33:1
160:2 162:7   6:24 7:2,9 8:15   23:24 24:17   202:11   41:1 167:7
167:7 169:5,14   10:2 12:5 13:7   hypothetically   immediately 96:21   improvement 8:3
171:18 172:19,24   35:7,8 38:14,18   22:12,15   165:20 183:14   150:20
173:4 176:8   45:15 49:13,18     199:17   improving 120:8
177:6,23 183:1 51:21 52:13 63:3 Immensely 121:3 120:11
185:1 186:17,23   63:18,22 68:23   Ian 111:4 131:16   immigration 2:10   inaccurate 79:5
190:24 191:16 71:13 72:25   idea 113:7 183:7 6:7,16 35:5   inadequate 178:11
192:21 193:18
194:6 208:2 87:15,22,22 88:1   ideal 140:5   115:10 161:4   inappropriate
homophobic 88:3,3 92:6,12   ideation 103:14   170:6,20 171:24   62:15 82:16,17
146:22     93:22 94:3,25     104:3 176:2     175:14 180:3,24     86:8 136:8 192:4
honest 27:25 41:8   95:5 100:10   193:15 195:14   187:5 191:23   192:4 193:6
67:22 76:21,25   101:1 103:7,24   identification   193:22 206:6   208:13
77:20 78:6 80:10   104:4,23 105:1   173:8 174:8,11   211:6 212:10,22   inaudible 7:19
97:11 113:5   105:12 106:9   176:7   <b>imminent</b> 65:5   60:2 149:11
125:22 189:22   110:13 113:8   <b>identified</b> 3:23   132:19   <b>incentive</b> 33:9
hope 62:10 63:6
65:3,3 75:6 78:5   120:8 122:1,7   161:22 167:4   48:16,18,22   204:15
152:24 123:22 126:2 184:24 185:6 49:20,22 112:17 <b>incident</b> 17:16
hopefully 203:13   129:7,21 132:15   identify 27:10 45:5   178:12 179:12   19:12,20 21:14
hopeless 187:25   134:10 137:3,20   54:3 90:23 134:3   180:10,17 183:2   30:18,23 31:11
160:1 161:11
L

				Page 230
	l	1	l	l
31:11 50:20	increasing 120:9	214:3	143:4 150:4	internal 130:4
70:12 72:10	178:17	informed 9:25	155:23 156:12	150:6
74:25 76:11	incredibly 106:12	139:2 162:16	158:5,7 160:10	interpretation
78:18,21 131:21	increment 42:2	189:23	162:24 164:13,15	170:9
137:12,15,24,25	incur 32:17	informing 161:25	193:1 196:14	interrupt 22:16
138:4,9 140:9	indefinitely 138:2	190:2	197:14,18,25	intervened 190:21
143:21 152:6	138:10	inherent 211:8	204:10 207:11	intervention 17:24
incidents 16:19	independent 3:6	inherited 84:6	209:25 214:2,9	18:1,8,17 19:1
17:15 25:5,5,9,18	23:21 130:6,19	175:8	214:21	54:4
31:19,22 56:21	208:25 209:7,13	inhuman 105:14	inquiry's 76:11	interviewed 55:20
80:14 107:21	209:16,19 210:17	inhumane 105:2	ins 9:19 82:19	introduce 27:13
127:15,16 129:6	211:1,24 212:13	105:22,24,25	insofar 116:2	introduced 32:11
132:17 133:13	independently	106:1 115:23	inspection 3:5,6	32:18 41:20 42:4
134:2,9,11,13	149:9	153:6	151:13	44:7
136:6 137:16	indicate 28:18	initial 15:2 44:5	inspections 5:9	introducing 42:7
148:19 194:16	193:9 195:19	47:6,6 75:25	instance 54:14	introduction
205:20 206:8	indicates 195:22	131:2 134:5	instances 53:24,25	197:22 209:3
include 23:10	indication 155:25	165:9,17 168:16	54:7,11	investigate 25:24
25:11 39:16	indicators 9:11	168:24	institute 95:2	33:24 53:24 55:5
46:22 55:12,17	13:24 15:20	initially 35:20	<b>institution</b> 94:9,15	investigated 19:15
79:2 88:11 90:18	167:3 174:15	38:11	instructing 183:13	26:10,15 62:18
133:25 146:14	individual 98:20	initiation 15:11	instruction 200:23	63:19 148:4
161:5	113:25 143:3	initiatives 84:23	201:2,3,11,16	investigates
included 3:24	192:16 211:15	injured 19:9 23:15	202:12	122:20 138:18
115:14 136:4	individual's 82:9	135:13 144:16	instructions	150:2
146:19 152:21	individually 98:9	injuries 19:12 24:22 26:17	182:24 203:4	investigating
includes 2:7 57:18	individuals 51:22		instructor 129:20	53:13 73:1 149:5
including 16:19	51:25 79:18 80:9 119:12	injuriously 186:1	142:14	investigation 22:1
21:24 30:14	-	injury 16:18,20	insufficient 5:15	22:2 23:19,21,21
43:18 46:3,25 47:5 129:10	induction 36:13 103:14 160:14	17:23,25 18:4,15 19:10,25 20:25	<b>intelligence</b> 145:8 145:9,11	53:9,11,16 54:19 54:23 55:11
130:6 146:23	168:12	21:19 22:3 23:13	intend 73:6 79:14	56:14 57:5,9,10
150:0 140:23	influenced 38:1	26:1 135:5,9	129:4 164:1	141:24 142:1,4
162:2 173:4	influencing 47:24	innovation 11:18	intended 161:10	148:17 150:24
182:23 200:15	influx 101:4,8	28:4	174:3,14	investigations
incorporated 23:4	inform 113:22,23	innovative 84:23	intent 212:16	56:21 146:12,22
incorporates 23:8	114:6 169:5,13	input 21:4	intent 212.10	150:6,8
incorrect 139:3	169:14 171:6	INQ000186 3:15	125:1 161:1	investigative 55:16
141:4,12	informal 88:15,25	inquiries 65:13	intentions 24:5	investigator 55:3
increase 11:19	89:10 162:22	inquiry 1:15,21,24	inter-personal	investigator 33.3
42:1 87:19	informally 71:1	6:22 17:6 40:19	131:7	84:22
103:13 117:25	information 21:16	43:14 48:5,13	interactions 88:15	invited 112:25
154:14 176:1,20	21:23 22:5 32:1	49:9 50:13 53:18	interest 27:23	involved 20:21
176:24	45:6 59:12 113:2	62:21 63:21	28:10 82:9 85:12	21:24 26:18
increased 11:7	115:25 116:4	69:11 73:3 76:9	85:13	28:11 36:8 47:2
41:15 44:16	140:16,17 147:16	79:20 80:2,5	interested 6:22	47:9 58:13,14,15
103:15 120:13	148:14 150:20	81:1,4,13 83:2	interesting 174:18	59:7 64:7 72:12
122:22 125:9,17	151:5 161:5	128:13,23 129:18	188:16	73:1,4,18 121:1
125:21	162:11 188:4	137:9 140:19	interests 192:16	124:8 129:24
	l		<u> </u>	l

				Page 231
146:17 153:1	ITC 43:6,7,10	37:16 46:22,25	101:2,14,17,18	language-wise
171:11 189:23	141:18	60:19,22,22	101:20,21 126:10	69:13
193:22	ITCs 43:7	102:10,19 120:11	131:15 136:6	large 116:14
involvement 58:18	110843.7	125:25 185:24	140:12 154:25	largely 47:8
involving 190:1	J	kill 21:8	194:25	173:12 182:5
Iranian 102:13	January 53:6	killed 82:1	known 187:21	191:20
Iraqi 102:13	147:17 186:5	kind 62:7 86:13	knows 117:15	larger 97:13,15
IRC 2:11,18 41:22	194:10 195:9	89:12 113:10	KP10 17:6	lastly 34:2
41:25 45:1	job 51:8 70:21	163:11 192:10	KP11 17:23	late 100:7,9 103:2
103:21 159:6,15	94:2 105:8	193:23 212:5	<b>KP6</b> 16:14,22	142:9
159:16,24 208:23	106:10,12 109:5	kinds 88:17	KP9 16:24	latest 24:20
IRCs 2:1,14 51:21	154:16 171:3	kit 145:14	<b>KPI</b> 19:11 20:2	laudable 203:12
87:21 101:17	185:17 200:11	knew 45:14 106:23	23:16 24:19 25:8	laughing 66:17
106:6 126:18,20	join 73:13 126:5	know 7:6 15:9	26:16,22 27:1	Lavis 45:19 60:25
126:21 139:1	joined 3:1 34:10	16:5 17:6 22:6	33:20 34:8 35:14	law 212:12
159:2,3,21	joining 180:25	22:25 25:1 40:15	36:2 39:13 45:22	lawful 126:13
irrespective 135:6	joint 36:4 92:1	41:19 43:8 56:3	53:21 55:14 60:7	143:25
issue 7:23 19:4	judgments 103:21	56:4 67:23 76:2	60:9,13	lay 106:8,19
20:6 27:18 33:25	<b>July</b> 6:11,11 34:23	83:4 93:22 97:8	KPI1 15:23	layman's 108:7
37:22 39:14	34:25,25 35:1,3	97:17 100:2	<b>KPI10</b> 17:9 23:16	lead 19:19 119:5
40:21 71:7 87:9	37:13 39:14	101:7 102:13	<b>KPI11</b> 23:17 24:21	161:10,16 182:17
93:17 112:8	100:9 101:10	106:25 107:1	27:17	198:6 201:6
117:6 124:20	103:2	110:12 112:23	KPI12 36:8	leadership 61:3
139:1 141:3,12	<b>jump</b> 107:13,17	114:18,19 116:18	<b>KPI15</b> 45:23 59:16	62:3 69:12 78:6
142:6 144:18	June 6:9 37:3,7,8	121:14 124:9,15	60:8	80:20 158:19
160:17 163:11	37:13 38:4 39:14	129:15 134:8	<b>KPI25</b> 23:11 29:20	leads 121:19
165:12 182:6	101:9	139:6 145:7	<b>KPIs</b> 13:25 18:6	learn 67:16 79:21
183:7 198:1,2	Justice 29:2	147:10 148:11	27:3,18 29:20	learned 7:13
200:4 203:2,11	158:22 179:3	156:14 161:7	30:14 37:9,20	learning 7:6,14,17
209:7 212:17	187:18 189:23	163:21 166:21		60:14 66:21
214:7	190:6 209:6	167:23 168:13	L	162:23
issued 53:6	justification	170:18 171:25	L 141:1	leave 10:19 74:9
issues 1:23 4:16,22	124:24	172:1,21,22,22	label 185:10	74:15 102:23
5:13,18 6:23	justify 108:14	173:20 175:24	labour 40:22	139:20
29:6 41:2,4	K	182:18,21 183:21	lack 43:15 79:20	leavers 42:17 43:9
43:21 44:24		186:19 187:8,8	82:8 87:11 88:15	58:6
49:12,14 51:16	Kate 3:7	188:4,14 189:22	169:20,24 179:14	<b>leaving</b> 24:17 58:6
54:14 57:1,15	keen 166:21	190:17,21 194:6	180:13 183:2	115:8
58:18,19 60:5,15	167:24 180:4	198:21 199:9	190:11,11 195:9	led 24:6 45:18
73:1 98:19 107:7	<b>keep</b> 22:20 54:12 58:15 106:15	201:19,21,23	208:25 209:7,10	50:22 88:9
110:9 116:12,12	38:13 106:13 119:17 126:9	202:3 203:3,17	209:16,17 211:2	186:11
118:12 134:3		203:22 204:3,23	laid 26:3	Leeds 158:16
140:13 141:19,21	137:20,23 171:10 176:22	206:21 207:20	Lake 64:21,25	left 70:3 79:3
142:2 148:8	keeping 58:23	209:20 210:19	<b>Lampard</b> 3:7 7:17	100:18
149:4 151:9	84:20 102:15	212:1 213:5	9:25	legacy 8:11
152:15 153:1	kept 74:24 106:21	Knowing 67:18	language 62:9	legal 80:7 103:15
181:13 197:15	107:3 119:14	knowingly 144:14	68:3,17,21,24,25	174:6 178:16
210:3 211:25	key 1:23 5:8 9:2,10	knowledge 39:11	69:3 70:9 82:17	212:14
issuing 203:4	13:24 15:20	76:5 100:24	104:18 146:19	legitimate 149:17
	13.2113.20		147:1	

				Page 232
	1	1	1	1
legs 115:19	limited 84:18	long 42:23 51:11	49:4 51:24 60:24	63:13 64:11
length 37:22 52:17	177:9 181:3	83:25 101:7	61:1,2 85:3 88:3	115:18
lengths 85:7	197:10	127:23 137:6,20	102:18 104:11	man's 23:25
lessons 5:8,9 79:21	line 15:15,18 28:2	164:22,23 165:4	110:3 114:6	manage 35:7
let's 18:13 21:7	107:11,16 119:13	170:13,15 191:5	131:6 147:23	38:10 93:25
22:5 24:2 43:22	142:13 158:11	191:11 197:3,5	172:5 182:9	102:18 117:2,18
115:7	183:16 190:19	longer 11:9 37:23	183:21 192:10,11	191:14 200:14
letter 114:7 115:9	linked 45:22,23	42:1 52:21 81:3	202:25	managed 8:2
115:21 122:6	175:17	95:11,18 140:19	lots 29:8 59:11	117:3,7,9 120:16
207:2,2	list 58:6 118:2	163:10 165:21	60:17 84:11 88:8	120:16,17 134:10
<b>letters</b> 207:9 208:2	174:4 176:16	182:11	102:11 109:12	184:25 191:4,9
level 14:14 16:3,6	listed 14:6 55:9	longest 83:20	141:14	198:9 208:3
16:12,23 22:7	listen 164:17	look 8:4,10 18:20	Loughton 43:19	management 4:9
26:6 33:19 42:23	listened 178:14	19:23 20:5 21:9	55:3 64:2 65:9	5:16 73:8,13
44:10 71:20	listening 65:22	21:12,17 24:11	67:12,18 68:3,7	78:3 88:16
87:19 108:20	163:4	27:13 52:6 58:17	68:11 69:7 70:11	101:20 131:22
118:5 119:21	lists 59:5,6	61:24 79:3 88:9	71:22 72:19,24	132:1 139:1
123:18 136:10	literally 181:4	93:22,23 95:3	love 129:2	158:19 182:23
147:25 148:2	literature 183:24	102:23 108:7	lovely 202:24	183:4 187:2
188:4,14 193:2	litigation 190:23	119:18 134:9,13	low 42:23 93:5	198:2 205:8,13
206:1 207:23	208:21	137:9,15 148:5	121:7 147:4,25	206:1
levels 5:25 11:19	little 5:18 6:10	151:16 158:22	148:2 153:7	manager 19:19
11:20 36:11	43:10 52:12	160:8 172:16,25	168:3 187:6	20:13 55:2,7
39:21,23 46:9	70:22 84:6,14	174:19 178:4,25	202:7	106:6 110:21
98:5 103:13	85:4 89:3 101:2	181:14 183:22	lower 15:14	111:4 112:19
109:21 117:3,4	131:5 134:7	185:16,20 187:16	luxury 191:25	142:5 151:3
119:18 120:6,10	154:21 161:14	200:10 205:13		198:6 210:22
120:14 125:10	194:2 197:9	206:17 210:20	M	managers 27:7
147:4 153:9,14	211:13	looked 8:21 22:5	<b>M</b> 143:8	29:15 31:25
175:15	live 65:13 86:4	24:7 26:11 51:10	Maconochie	46:14,15 60:4
Lewis 147:15,18	128:20,24 179:6	52:1 74:19 79:2	131:16	61:5 67:4 71:19
LIB000176 123:5	lives 112:17	143:4 157:9	main 27:16 88:24	89:20 121:2
Liberty 122:20	load 47:23 48:2	178:8,19 187:19	89:3,5 103:21	142:14 152:21
138:18	local 35:24 133:24	looking 21:23	123:11	manages 150:8,9
lie 76:18 77:12	locally 130:5	23:24 26:1,2	maintain 31:24	managing 2:7
105:23	located 35:5 157:6	27:3,13 51:13	41:12 54:5 183:3	38:21 48:9,10
lied 76:8,24	location 84:25	62:3 74:16 85:8	maintaining 48:4	123:13,16 131:7
lies 82:7	86:16 89:2	111:10 136:15,20	211:1	136:21 184:7
life 48:11 205:2	157:11	148:6 153:4	maintenance 13:3	mandated 7:11
ligature 18:15	locations 52:9	170:19 181:1	majority 69:5	11:20 35:17
68:5 70:13 78:19	locked 10:12,15	195:4 203:9	97:17 99:10	Mandated-wise
78:25	31:4	looks 12:14 17:24	156:16 175:23,24	40:8
<b>light</b> 23:25 45:11	log 30:14 54:12,12	46:10 54:23	179:8 194:3	mandatory 10:16
194:13,19 195:10	55:10 58:4,4	65:18 86:6	maker 113:10	29:14 128:10
likelihood 187:12	59:5 60:7,9	177:17 178:4	making 33:10	144:3
187:14	116:17 117:1,1	losing 27:20	105:21 109:15	manner 119:23
likewise 8:3 28:18	117:10,17,18	lost 41:17 163:5	147:13 167:9	146:18
limit 159:21	118:3 148:14	194:2	170:25 181:23	manual 131:25
213:11	150:20	lot 29:13 31:2 41:7	199:23	143:7,9,15 145:2
		3.22.12.01.1	man 18:14 22:6	
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				Page 255
<b>March</b> 1:16 2:25	mediating 102:16	43:16,22,24 44:8	36:1 101:16	mitigate 32:25
38:6 65:9 73:17	medical 64:6	44:15,18,21,24	119:2 151:6	200:20
197:4,18	131:4,4,10,13,18	48:16,22 49:3,12	methods 55:16	mitigated 27:20
margin 14:8 15:8	131:20 158:18,21	49:14,18,24	metres 89:6 155:9	30:11,19 60:6
Mark 20:18	162:1 164:24	50:18 86:12,13	Michelle 80:22	mitigating 24:15
market 40:22	167:7 179:3	86:14,18 91:3	microphone	55:22 200:9
marks 13:9,13	182:17 187:18	93:18 94:5,8,13	171:10	mitigation 24:12
Mary 98:21	189:23 190:6,13	95:2 97:21 98:23	middle 41:19 66:3	27:3,13,15 30:9
materials 43:13	198:6 207:4,5	109:13 116:15,20		32:6,8,17 33:22
maternity 127:23	208:9 209:2,6	130:24 131:5	mightn't 58:2	33:24 34:17,20
matter 22:2 29:9	211:4	135:12 162:1	million 28:21	60:10 124:21,23
73:8 90:12	<b>Medicine</b> 158:15	165:1,8 166:10	mind 22:17 45:16	mitigations 30:15
105:25 125:25	174:6 178:17	167:3 170:16,24	75:16,18,20	mixture 114:8
142:12 183:5	medium 114:8	171:10 173:25	108:14 209:24	MMPR 136:21
200:22	meet 18:22,24 19:5	175:22 179:11	minimising 136:21	mocking 62:9
matters 23:3 48:18	35:17 36:5 89:19	184:1,7,14,15,24	minimum 12:8	model 7:12,16,19
151:11,20 152:13	184:8	185:5,6 187:22	40:9,9	35:18 131:24
MDA 208:22	meeting 19:16	188:18,19,20,21	minister 106:25	136:20,23 139:25
MDT 135:15	20:9,11,21,22,23	188:25 189:2,3,5	115:10,24	models 170:19
mean 18:20 25:21	27:6 42:13 60:18	189:7,8,14,16,24	Ministry 29:2	Molyneux 98:21
28:1,14 29:6	87:24 91:24,25	190:3,7,11 191:3	minor 14:9,20	106:18 109:20
32:15 34:25	92:1,2 110:16	191:9 193:16	30:3,6	110:11 113:6
35:13 43:5 47:3	115:6 118:4,6	199:3,8,13	minutes 78:20	115:9,23 148:21
50:20 52:5 56:20	125:22 135:15	200:15,16 201:4	110:18 138:13,24	149:13
67:10 69:14 84:4	136:13,14,17,25	201:5 203:20	164:22,23 165:4	moment 3:16
91:13 93:8 94:4	164:6 171:16	204:25 208:19,24	165:11 166:17	92:12 99:8 114:1
96:9 98:12 102:4	185:23 198:5	209:10,11,17	170:13	130:8,9 135:22
105:16,24 106:25	meetings 19:14,17	210:2,3,6,8,15	misapplication	144:21 145:12,15
109:12 110:1,15	21:11 87:17	mentally 93:23	179:9	150:14 156:15
123:13 124:9,23	91:22 93:19,20	199:7	misconduct 17:4	159:13 163:13
131:1 135:14	110:6,7,15,17,18	mention 10:10	53:25 54:1,7	168:2,20 180:6
138:4 140:8	110:19 111:1	11:19 78:18,21	57:15,23	200:8 202:7
142:20 144:7,11	125:23 129:1	93:19 100:7	misinterpretation	203:22 211:9,21
154:20 174:18	137:11	210:25	66:22	213:25
194:16 200:20	meets 135:18	mentioned 5:22	missed 78:25	<b>Monday</b> 214:17,21
meaning 15:13	171:1	7:21 11:7 12:13	139:15 214:8	monitor 28:14
32:8 52:15 74:20	member 17:1	13:23 20:8 29:19	missing 78:24	54:2,11 58:25
means 1:18,19	80:22 81:7 82:21	30:8 31:10 44:20	mistake 74:20	59:4,13 164:2
16:5 27:18 33:3	88:1 89:24	52:22 59:16	75:4,14,18 76:20	203:25
91:1 110:12	100:11 146:25	65:17 78:24	77:8	monitored 60:6
158:10,22 209:8	150:22,25 158:16	79:24 80:1 83:20	mistakes 67:17	monitoring 26:8
meant 5:15 94:4	members 12:21	102:25 106:8	76:1,3 78:3	26:22 29:1 32:2
165:18	40:6 43:18 50:16	107:14 122:10	mistreatment	35:14 60:14
measure 164:4,7	89:18 150:21	129:11 132:13	146:13 148:19	152:15 163:15
measures 4:9 53:3	155:21,24,25	179:12 198:15	misunderstanding	176:22
mechanism 26:14	men 2:21 49:11	199:9,13 200:12	186:11	month 24:2,5 25:6
161:9 185:24	115:14,16 156:23	mentions 81:22	misunderstood	42:17 108:4
mechanisms 50:16	156:25	mentoring 36:13	186:8	124:18 125:6
53:19 72:22	mental 4:3 5:1,25	met 4:5,10 10:8	misuse 127:17	137:12 141:4
	I	ļ	I .	I .

				Page 234
	1		l	l
197:24	Munroe 83:1	176:15,18 181:14	81:15,18 82:3,14	73:17 84:23
<b>monthly</b> 14:2,8	Murrell 110:24	182:9 183:4,6,10	<b>NHS</b> 118:17 177:6	86:11 89:15
15:7 19:17 89:19		185:16,21 196:5	177:23 203:24	92:25 94:6,9
110:5,16,19	N 120 17 142 0	196:20 197:15	204:3,5	102:14 104:16
118:4 135:18	N 129:17 143:8	205:20 206:19	nice 49:14 214:11	107:12,24 114:23
137:11	214:25	207:4	<b>night</b> 40:10,15	115:14,15,16
months 25:4,6	naive 48:17	needed 8:17 45:11	nine 146:11	128:14 132:1,14
42:16,24 58:9	name 1:10 57:18	54:5 141:21	no' 74:13,21	133:5,6 143:1
94:7 103:24	131:16 158:4	166:19 182:4	nod 74:17	148:8,8 149:3
105:4 107:25	214:8,9	200:5,6 211:4	<b>nodding</b> 6:3 41:5	153:20,20,24
114:4 126:8	names 124:6	needing 172:5	nods 6:2	156:9 168:5
128:10 138:25	NAO 3:13 5:4,22	needs 4:4,10 5:25	Non-operational	169:23 172:2
141:23 146:11	6:9,18 7:17,22	19:5,6 90:23	46:15	173:22 176:14
148:17 153:16	national 126:17	93:6,18 94:23	normal 86:15	182:14 183:10
Moore 1:4,7,8	158:21 207:15	103:10,15 143:5	191:24	194:13 197:10,11
22:23 83:6,8,13	nationalities 103:9	149:1 153:24	normally 98:12	199:10
83:14 138:16	nationality 57:19 nature 26:22	163:22 170:10,24	notably 103:12	numbers 7:15
155:4,8,20	50:24 56:25 67:3	171:1,7,13,16	note 45:22 57:14	35:16,17,22
156:22 157:16	93:11 103:6	173:11 185:15,23	117:13 124:4	42:14 86:12
215:2		196:11 197:1	141:1 143:8	92:16 93:4
morning 1:3,4,8,9	109:18,24 136:14 138:6 147:3	208:10	noted 109:20	100:25 107:2,2,3
19:14,14 87:24	207:5	negative 32:5	139:25 141:20	108:12 116:14
110:7 115:5	near 35:5 38:11	negotiated 42:5	149:13 153:12	137:18 168:2,3
157:7,8,15	nearly 25:17 37:12	negotiation 36:7	notes 3:19 4:19 5:7	175:9 176:20
201:23	necessarily 30:24	131:25 132:13	5:11 24:3,3	187:6 196:9
morning's 115:6	119:4 142:10	133:18,22	48:16 51:16	197:8 202:6,6
168:10	161:17 170:1	negotiations	107:7 122:20	nurses 44:18
motivated 51:22	188:17	133:12,14	137:11 140:3	173:10,15 194:23
<b>Motivating</b> 47:24	necessary 28:9	negotiator 133:7,9	notice 36:21 154:5	206:12
move 15:5 16:12	123:1 129:23	negotiators 132:16	noticed 50:5 78:20	nursing 171:11
29:19 47:22	143:22 202:13	132:22	noticing 27:18	173:12 206:11
61:11 62:22	212:9	neither 153:1	notified 101:9	0
74:10 100:16	necessity 96:14	nervous 64:8	notify 160:2	O 143:8
102:8,18 173:5	neck 18:14 62:22	never 24:8 49:23	171:17	obligation 16:17
182:5	68:6 70:14 78:19	70:12 76:9	notifying 191:16	18:3,5,9,24 25:10
moved 35:15 61:4	need 11:15 15:9	111:19	notionally 87:16	90:16
73:19 84:23	18:16 20:25	nevertheless 28:8	notwithstanding 197:11	obligations 17:10
106:5 moved' 82:6	25:24 30:15	new 8:9,15 21:23	November 46:4	25:11 42:13
moved 82:6 movement 10:22	36:16 42:20	27:14 32:11,17 34:12,13,14,15		obliged 90:20
52:8,9 85:2,3	51:24 57:13	41:16,20 42:4,5,7	123:7,18 124:18 140:25 141:4	observations 22:8
moving 62:4 80:18	58:22 60:15	41:16,20 42:4,3,7	189:12,24	22:11,13,13,25
82:2 88:23	61:19 71:20 74:1	43:1,3,6,7,12	number 3:22 4:19	70:18 71:2 130:6
multidisciplinary	75:10 76:17	128:2,3 132:2,9	4:20 8:16 17:19	130:7,17
91:23 92:2 93:20	82:19 94:1	141:14,15,15,16	30:15 36:8 38:1	observed 100:1,3
135:15 171:4,9	117:10 119:10	153:9 177:9	38:17 40:2 41:18	157:3
multiple 25:22,23	128:7 139:13	194:18 197:5	47:9 49:1,2,11	<b>Observer</b> 122:9,13
43:18 51:17	141:2,14 143:7	207:16	51:25 52:7,10	122:20 138:20
172:14	150:23 158:10	Newland 54:24	58:14 63:21	obtained 122:19
1/2.17	161:22 170:7	11CWIANU JT.27	JU.17 UJ.21	obtaining 168:13
	101.22 170.7		<u> </u>	

				Page 235
-h 0.21 (1.10	- <b>cc</b> 40 - 5	200.2 212.2	105.2 4 14	0152-(-0.11
obvious 8:21 61:18	offers 49:5	208:2 212:3	185:3,4,14	Oscar 152:6,9,11
143:20	office 3:8,10 5:7,9	Office's 4:18	opened 194:18	ourself 89:13
obviously 5:20	7:19,23 8:6,11,18	officer 52:8,16	195:20	outbreaks 114:5
6:22 7:11,18	8:23,25 9:22	57:7 114:17	opening 40:23	197:10
19:23 26:20 29:6	10:4,6 13:18,20	123:1 146:14,23	84:9	outcome 18:6 33:3
32:2 36:5 39:2	14:17,19,22,23	officers 51:19 52:1	openness 27:8	outs 9:19 82:19
43:24 45:9,11	15:3,4 16:1	52:5 63:11	28:16	outset 169:4
49:5 53:17 56:10	19:13 20:4,14,19	107:23 126:1,15	operate 158:24	outside 27:15 32:9
57:19 61:23	23:23 24:7,12	127:15 138:23	159:12 184:23	35:9 191:24
62:25 63:6 64:4	27:7,11 28:12,14	209:9	operated 54:13	overall 40:3
65:3 66:22 67:1	28:16,22 30:6	offices 88:22,23	operates 159:15	overleaf 55:16
67:5,10,11 72:17	32:3,20,21 33:13	official 142:4,10	operating 29:22	104:20 107:19
74:16,19 75:6	33:17,18 34:23	officially 27:19	29:23 36:24 37:1	overloaded'
76:25 84:5,18	35:2,19,25 36:3	okay 22:19,22	90:21	106:23
89:20 91:9,12	36:19 37:24 39:4	31:17 70:1,4	operation 31:8	overly 147:6
92:21 94:20 97:8	44:11 49:8 56:8	110:25 115:7	32:24 124:22	overnight 12:6
99:12,13 102:10	56:22 59:20 60:1	129:19 186:24	129:1 164:14	45:10 108:17
104:9 107:13	60:3 82:2 88:2,2	on-site 149:21	operational 5:15	overseeing 91:7
108:1,23 111:8	89:5,8 90:14	once 24:15 150:18	9:23 10:5 11:8	oversight 146:9
114:4,14 118:5	91:1,10,25 92:21	172:25 176:20	11:14 13:9 27:5	158:23 177:20
120:21 124:6	92:24 96:7,21	one-day 131:3	31:8 39:21 40:10	overview 9:16,20
129:6 142:6,11	97:6 101:4 102:7	one-off 178:6	43:17 61:5 91:17	54:19
152:25 153:7	104:9 105:3,6	ones 16:13,23	110:7,16	overwhelmed
156:9,20 157:8	106:3,5,9,20,21	48:13 108:25	operations 20:9	118:1
168:4 169:1	106:23 109:21	113:21	55:5 88:6 134:22	overwhelming
189:10 213:21	110:3,8,12,13,15	ongoing 8:9 57:15	135:24 136:1	171:24
occasions 49:11	110:17,19,22,25	57:21 172:11	<b>opinion</b> 174:11	P
90:9 123:19	111:6,20 112:14	196:2 203:25	178:18	pace 22:17
143:2,12 208:22	112:17,18,19,23	online 65:14	opinions 47:10	pack 135:8
occupancy 12:10	113:21,23 114:12	onsite 19:15 32:3	opportunity 79:11	<del>-</del>
153:14	115:11 116:6	50:22	79:12 161:11	package-wise 133:19
occupied 155:11	117:4,5,13,15,23	onus 59:23	168:23 169:16	
occur 209:8	118:20,21 119:8	onwards 101:6	180:23 181:12	packages 44:10
occurred 129:7	121:16 125:21	Oozeerally 165:7	opposite 75:21	<b>page</b> 2:5 3:17 4:15 9:18 11:22 12:14
154:11	130:14,16,19	166:25 168:14	option 74:7	14:4 15:22 32:6
occurrence 16:18	134:24 140:10,21	176:13 178:20	oral 148:21	
17:5 18:4	141:6 148:10,12	180:10 181:15	orange 107:16	34:4,5,6 46:10,13
occurs 31:23 50:21	149:1,21,23	182:16 183:19	order 94:1 95:15	47:22,22 53:5,6
October 24:20	151:10,24 154:2	197:17 198:3,8	96:5 159:17	54:18 55:21,25 81:23 102:23
115:11 138:25	154:23 155:8,10	201:12 202:12	169:13,13 172:6	103:20 104:20
odd 199:9	159:19 160:2	207:1 208:16	175:11 182:9	
offence 18:20	162:7 167:7	211:12	183:3 191:17	107:9,9,19 112:8 116:8 117:21
offences 28:24	169:5,14 171:18	Oozeerally's	203:11 207:6	123:9,25 138:17
98:6	172:19,24 173:4	165:14 179:18	212:18,19 213:1	140:24 141:19
offer 35:4 51:23	176:8 177:6,23	193:3	213:4,9	146:10 187:21
85:6	183:1 185:1	open 1:16 3:17	orders 113:22	
offered 46:7	186:17,23 190:24	25:2 27:25 53:3	origin 53:11	paid 41:2,22 88:25 89:9
141:17 177:7	191:16 192:21	66:20 78:6 80:10	original 13:6,11	painted 190:19
offering 35:11	193:18 194:6	84:10,20 172:7	83:17	painted 190.19 panel 82:6
				panci 02.0

				Page 236
	1	1	1	1
<b>Panorama</b> 45:9,12	130:14 131:6,8	pass 45:6 192:8	118:24 121:18,19	period 8:24 10:19
45:15 59:1 60:16	131:19 132:10	passed 148:7	123:4,14 124:7	11:1,2 34:8,14,16
62:8 63:23 72:4	133:17 134:5	pathway 51:7	125:6,16 126:23	41:15 42:6 43:11
129:16	135:4,8 140:10	180:21 197:22	127:4,22 128:2	54:1,8 63:22
paper 169:25	142:21,24 147:11	198:20 202:20	129:24 130:1	73:10 78:12
paperwork 138:16	171:4 180:9	pattern 58:12	132:11 136:23	80:23 83:19 84:1
140:4,23 141:3,4	192:5,7,14,18,20	patterns 54:3	138:19 140:13	87:10 96:1 97:4
141:12,21 142:9	192:23 193:4,16	58:19	143:24 145:14	97:15 104:4,11
142:9,22	195:5,12 196:14	pay 41:2 42:8	146:2,13 149:4	109:2 120:25
paragraph 2:4,17	196:21 202:13,13	payroll 12:18	153:20,24 156:11	121:1 123:8
3:17,22 4:15	202:20 205:23	42:20	157:3 160:3	129:8 140:7
5:14 9:18,21	partially 17:1	<b>PDA</b> 38:18	161:7 162:7	153:11 155:11,22
10:10 11:22	147:2,21	<b>PDC</b> 47:3 61:2	163:6 167:12,15	166:12 178:9
12:14 13:14 14:5	particular 5:13	peaks 42:16	167:17 168:5	189:12,14 194:14
15:5 23:7 32:7	11:2,8 25:23	peculiar 180:7	169:8 170:20,22	194:17 195:8,21
34:5,6,22 36:7	32:23 33:20	206:10	171:20,22,25	196:1
45:10,17 59:19	39:24 44:24 52:7	peer 130:6	172:6,16 173:13	periods 10:17
74:1 78:23 81:1	52:8,20 56:18	penalties 9:12	173:24,25,25	permanent 88:1
81:24 84:16	72:6 90:7 93:17	15:13 16:22 34:9	174:1,22 176:4	permitting 137:14
86:23 87:13,20	99:1 102:10,18	34:17 39:13,15	178:5 180:1	perplexed 89:4
95:10 103:19	133:18 137:15	149:16,19	181:19 182:8,13	person 16:20 19:9
112:10 116:10	152:3 153:24	penalty 13:25 14:2	185:9,13,16,20	21:8,25 25:17
138:16 141:19,22	158:13 164:15	15:14,18 16:14	185:23 187:9	46:19 55:13
146:10 148:16	178:11 180:8	16:24 17:7 23:1	188:16 192:12	73:19 81:5 83:21
151:8 153:12	182:16 184:14	30:12,20 32:17	193:1,7,10 195:4	98:10 110:25
160:11,17 168:11	202:25	33:6 37:10 59:16	196:16,22 199:2	113:9 129:16
173:7 175:3	particularly 18:23	pending 146:25	199:10 200:7,10	130:19 143:23
176:25 177:4,8	43:16 45:3 46:24	penultimate	200:14 201:18,24	161:12 167:4
195:18 210:24	50:12 51:11,22	123:17	203:15 204:19	187:21 207:19,20
paragraphs 92:23	71:19 72:9 89:17	<b>people</b> 12:17 19:10	207:15 208:24	208:5 209:12,14
part 7:3,4 14:22	97:23 101:23	21:24 25:22	209:8 211:3,19	210:7 212:8
15:2 16:6 18:23	104:6,12 109:3	30:23 31:19,21	212:1 214:1	person-centred
19:7 20:5,22	109:12,15 131:1	38:23 40:15,24	people's 49:24	171:2
22:1 26:8,13	133:7 145:13	42:20 47:1 51:23	128:8 188:21	personal 51:19
28:21 31:24	147:4 148:2	58:9,13 65:4,22	208:9	52:1,4,5,15
32:15,23 36:6,9	165:2 168:1	72:12 79:24 80:1	percentage 14:7	170:21
37:22 41:11 42:8	169:3 174:7	83:19 84:1 85:13	15:7 38:8 42:3	personally 7:1
44:4,4,9,12,14	193:22 211:14,15	85:17 86:12,14	47:19 97:13,15	150:7
47:3 56:14,21	partly 186:22	86:17 92:17	127:22 131:3	personnel 112:14
59:2,2,15 60:25	partner 177:9	93:23,23 94:3,17	149:21,22	persons 55:19 90:7
61:2,23 77:17,19	partnership 45:20	97:24 98:22 99:5	percentages 14:17	perspective 6:14
79:15 80:5,16,16	212:25	99:10,25 100:13	14:19 42:3	8:2,11 27:11
84:22 85:10,18	partnerships	101:15 105:9	perception 143:5	28:2,15 30:10
85:19,20 88:7,9	173:5	106:14,21 107:1	149:6	34:12 37:24
89:5,18 91:19	parts 10:22 170:6	107:12 108:3,6	<b>perform</b> 123:14	41:10 51:14 52:4
92:20 93:7 102:4	194:1 195:5	108:19 111:1,12	performance 8:3	52:16 80:6 85:9
102:17,21 111:21	party 8:4	111:13,18 112:1	9:11 13:24 14:6	91:10 92:14
117:19 120:23	Paschali 62:22	114:23 115:15,17	14:9 15:20 16:3	104:10 105:8,25
123:14,15 127:3	64:10 72:10	117:1,6 118:3,19	16:6 19:11	106:1 111:21
, = ==3		)- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				Page 237
117:3 119:22,23	planned 43:7	172:3,4 181:24	184:8 196:10,23	208:17
122:18 151:7	63:12,23 65:23	189:4 198:13,25	possibly 19:18	pre-agreed 163:22
152:1 162:25	67:9 124:8 127:1	210:7	42:17 105:19,21	pre-authorisation
pertain 87:15	127:6,6 128:4	pointed 78:21	161:12 182:3	96:10 97:1
pervasive 61:16	143:2,5 144:4,9	192:1 198:13	post 40:23 50:12	pre-authorised
pharmacy 212:3	144:24 145:18	points 9:12 13:25	131:22 132:11	97:10,14
phase 92:5	planning 66:10	168:21 172:14	Post-Covid 85:3	pre-departure 2:2
phrase 200:3	170:25 198:19	190:16,20 205:17	potential 26:25	29:23 35:8 38:19
physical 62:15,20	<b>plans</b> 150:20	<b>police</b> 174:10	134:3 185:5	154:10
84:17 91:3	210:17	policies 26:3,4	210:25	pre-emptively
136:21 162:1	plaster 200:4	34:15 60:17	potentially 22:24	95:11,19,22
164:25 165:8	<b>play</b> 92:20 93:7	141:15	24:15 25:14	151:22
166:10 170:16,24	211:24	<b>policy</b> 23:10 25:12	27:20 51:8 62:20	pre-existing 167:3
173:22	<b>please</b> 1:10 3:15	26:2 30:19 53:8	94:25 113:8	pre-loaded 131:14
pick 8:12 169:12	3:17 14:3 34:3	53:23 56:24 91:9	135:12 171:19	precipitate 175:21
picked 54:9,10	47:22 53:4	91:10 121:15,19	199:7	175:25
76:3,4 137:14	102:22,24 112:7	128:9 144:21,22	poured 115:18	precisely 178:18
picking 76:19	115:8 116:8	153:17 167:10	Povey-Meier	predicters 153:14
picture 171:12	123:5,9 158:2,5,9	173:20 174:15,20	43:19	predominantly 2:6
172:4	158:14 187:17	197:1 199:23	power 159:18	38:13
piece 60:19 62:23	202:5 204:11	203:1 207:17	powerless 188:21	prefer 211:18
169:25	214:9,10	208:20	powers 86:25	prepared 64:6
<b>piloted</b> 206:16,17	plus 28:21 44:14	political 106:14	<b>PPE</b> 143:3,6,13,20	147:7,8,9
place 8:23 33:4	60:14 104:18	pool 41:11 85:22	143:21 144:3,16	prescribe 28:7
36:24 40:24	<b>pm</b> 10:13 157:19	86:2	144:21 145:1,16	prescribed 11:20
43:12 45:18	157:21 214:20	poor 61:18 66:20	146:6	presence 112:16
48:25 49:14	point 4:17 6:13	182:25 191:5,11	<b>PPG</b> 44:13 90:12	112:19,21 113:24
50:18 76:21	29:10 41:13	population 47:14	92:24 157:17	present 72:14
87:16 90:17,21	42:11,14 43:3	86:9 90:6 100:10	158:20 159:1	97:21 112:24
90:25 95:3,21	47:14 49:18	103:3,9 105:3,14	162:18 164:1,11	113:7 123:14
96:15 102:3	50:23 51:3 52:9	108:2 115:3	172:23 182:23	168:9 170:11
103:25 104:5	66:23,24 67:11	121:8 147:5	187:23 194:11	presentation 123:6
105:12 133:6	67:12,20 69:9,14	153:7,13,18	195:6 198:2,19	131:4
136:14 167:2,5	70:13 77:8,10	154:11	199:16,17 205:13	presented 127:16
167:12 182:15	78:22 80:24	population's 93:6	205:25 207:8	presenting 204:20
183:12,15 198:11	82:20,24 88:5	pose 87:4,6	210:17 212:19	presents 131:16
198:18 199:23	90:9 92:16 97:14	position 160:16	PPG000172 158:8	165:13
200:3 207:16	97:19 101:11	206:13 211:18,21	PPG000173 158:8	pressed 72:9
211:9	102:25 103:5	positive 29:12 32:4	practical 87:18	pressure 51:25
placed 92:13,22,24	111:3,16,19	45:17 46:1,1	212:17	pressures 120:15
99:5,14 105:7	112:4 118:9,12	47:4 60:20	practice 13:22	167:11
107:24 117:6	120:18,20 121:2	152:20	44:13 134:2	pressurised 41:3
120:15 154:23	120:10,20 121.2	possibility 52:11	144:5,6,8 170:5,8	presumably 18:19
212:13	126:21 127:24	113:17	175:9 181:2,10	63:14 143:24
places 79:22	128:1 133:20	possible 23:19	182:7,12 183:12	presume 40:16
plan 6:14 8:4	140:17 146:18	84:21 85:20	184:8 191:5,11	81:14 91:1 94:4
33:25 46:3	149:12 154:25	86:16 104:7	191:24 193:5	pretty 183:19
145:20 160:19	156:3,5,8,12	105:16,18 109:19	191:24 193:3	188:5
170:2 210:21	<i>' ' '</i>	162:2 165:7	205:21 207:8	
1/0.2 210.21	163:17,25 169:13	102.2 103./	203.21 207.0	prevalence 176:4
	l		l	l

				Page 238
prevalent 170:6	138:12,13 154:22	products 46:7	proportionate	psychiatrist 94:20
prevent 104:14	problem 106:20	professional 2:5	123:2	94:22 189:9
107:23 123:2,4	106:22 124:19	23:20	proposal 46:2,4	200:16
123:23,24 200:6	135:13 192:20	professionalising	proposals 83:17	psychiatrists
205:1	196:8,19	51:9	protect 144:14	44:19
prevented 22:11	problems 3:22	professionalism	145:1 146:3	psychologists
prevention 124:19	4:18 86:13,13	50:8	protections 92:17	44:19
previous 7:24 8:10	88:18 97:22	professionals	protections 32.17	PTSD 43:16 45:2,3
8:12 27:5 33:16	98:24 184:14	43:25 190:14	provide 11:11,15	175:15,17 176:4
41:18 48:8 91:12	210:25 212:20	196:24	11:18 34:24 35:3	176:11 190:8
101:17 116:12	procedural 89:17	Professor 48:6	36:16 111:17	publicly 29:2
previously 20:18	procedure 26:2	50:1 51:4,16	159:25,25 177:9	published 6:9
48:11 59:21	32:24 97:7	86:22 88:13	191:19,20 204:10	48:10 122:12
72:12 139:14,17	151:25	183:24 184:3	212:18 213:4	pull 164:7
176:11 177:5	procedures 26:3	profile 125:14	214:2	pun 104.7 punishment
205:18	27:14 34:15	profit 14:8 15:8	provided 4:1 8:24	184:17
price 13:16	60:18 90:18,24	16:7 27:20	25:2,11 30:14	pure 87:6
pride 28:3 89:13	91:14 141:15	profits 15:14,17	31:16 43:12	purpose 31:7
primarily 4:22	196:21	28:25	54:16,17 57:11	33:11 53:8 126:9
90:12 159:16	procedures' 90:17	programme 43:12	65:12 81:13,23	160:20 163:4
178:20	process 4:23 7:3	45:18 50:5 51:5	159:6 177:5,13	166:6 169:21
primary 3:13	13:5 26:16 27:2	62:5 80:17 103:7	177:23 184:15,25	purposes 100:1
159:25 175:5	29:5 30:9 33:20	103:23 105:2	provider 28:2	pushback 208:1
principle 27:22	33:21 54:2 55:11	107:25 122:22	90:22 118:5	pushed 81:3
129:23	61:11 91:14	196:12	132:5 133:3	put 7:18 14:18
prior 47:7 60:23	96:16 97:1	programmes 49:6	181:23 206:10	27:11 31:14
76:4 101:19	103:14 117:22	progress 60:17	207:25	51:24 56:16 57:7
159:2,9 167:7,21	119:19,20,25	61:24	provides 12:3,21	62:4,23 82:13
169:6	123:13 132:4	project 124:21	53:23 59:16 74:4	85:9,11 86:1
priorities 154:3	148:23 149:8	projected 15:11,14	136:5	90:2,17,21 96:14
212:7	150:14 152:18	15:17	providing 171:15	102:2 103:10
prison 86:7,7,24	163:5,6,8,16	promote 53:3	207:8 211:19	106:4 115:20
130:13 132:5	164:2 167:11	promoted 73:9	212:23	145:1 182:14
139:25 143:10,15	168:13,21 172:15	152:20	provision 11:12	192:12 193:16
159:8,16 171:24	172:16 173:1	promotion 73:13	90:15 94:14	199:12,24 202:14
207:15 212:23	176:19 177:10,12	<b>prompt</b> 176:7	159:10 175:3,5,7	206:12 207:16
prison-like 86:19	179:1 181:8	prompted 189:15	175:12 209:13	putting 183:15
prisoner 143:14	192:7 195:3	190:3	211:2,10	200:2
143:16 145:3	198:19 199:22	prompting 46:18	provisions 4:24	puzzling 195:10
prisoners 143:14	211:20	promptly 160:4	24:1 37:16 50:7	
<b>prisons</b> 2:7 159:10	processes 20:1	185:1	96:24 111:24,25	QQ
159:13	32:12 33:15	proper 70:17	provocative	qualifications
proactive 31:1	36:11 60:13	144:16	146:17	158:14
probably 1:13	119:24 120:1	properly 4:5 25:19	provoke 146:18	<b>quality</b> 3:25 13:13
38:5 41:7 42:15	121:11,13 124:12	60:14 93:25	<b>PSO</b> 143:11	13:16 48:11
44:13 56:15	192:10 193:7	119:5 136:8	<b>PSU</b> 147:23 150:5	130:4 142:15,18
66:18 67:19	produce 180:1	162:16 170:1	150:16,17 151:7	142:19 149:20
101:2,9 112:2	182:10	proportion 88:23	psychiatric 191:5	163:15,24 164:2
131:14 136:20	<b>product</b> 19:2,3	175:13	191:11	164:3,6,9 177:1
				177:20 178:7,23
	1	1	·	·

				Page 239
		1	1	
179:5 181:14,20	raise 5:11 109:24	170:3	209:10	refer 1:13 12:14
182:25 203:6	125:20 140:13	reads 15:6 18:2	recognition 179:14	44:17 45:6 50:21
206:11	160:17 190:7	ready 104:10	recommend	93:12 94:20
quarterly 110:17	210:22	real 80:9 134:1,9	150:17	102:20 138:17
<b>question</b> 67:13,21	raised 5:12,24	134:13 154:8	recommendation	200:24
82:13 88:13,16	29:7 82:22	211:25	132:1,14 134:7	reference 1:18
89:2,9 92:22	103:12 110:11,14	real-incident-ba	142:13 182:1	57:14 87:24
109:7 121:4	111:5 113:17,18	134:4	recommendations	138:21 141:1
154:22 156:4,22	138:7 148:21	really 31:20 61:18	5:17 7:24 8:4,5	144:23 153:12
156:25 173:19	151:9,12 165:18	73:3 76:14 90:10	8:17 48:5,14	referral 91:4
177:15 181:18	165:21 190:13	107:12 109:6	51:15 55:23	referred 23:20
213:17,20,24	208:15,16	111:13 149:1	113:19 128:14,17	80:14 93:18 94:8
214:11	raises 122:7	164:8 165:11	128:18 129:11	94:19 122:9
questioned 77:4	raising 4:23 68:19	185:12 197:5,7	137:10 150:19	125:23 138:24
112:11,13	111:10,12 138:8	197:15 201:9	151:6 204:9	140:25 207:1
questioning 62:2	172:24 205:15	213:18	recommended	referring 66:7
67:20 68:16	206:2,18	reason 23:3,14	51:4 131:21	refers 5:13 17:23
questions 91:16	ramp 120:23	35:18 36:18 42:7	203:23	143:14
113:13 155:2,3,5	168:2 175:9	125:2,3 128:24	recommends	reflect 93:5
155:7,20 156:23	ramp-up 41:14	165:5 199:15	130:4 133:12,24	reflected 5:8,9
157:13 158:13	ran 129:9	207:20	136:3 142:13	73:3 125:13
213:14,16 215:3	random 137:14	reasonable 207:6	reconcile 195:13	reflecting 123:21
215:6	142:15	reasons 8:22 43:22	record 27:23 54:2	reflection 79:20
quick-fix 163:11	range 11:12,12	58:6 64:9 81:20	58:11,16,23	reform 29:3
quickly 4:13 98:23	85:9,11 163:21	81:21 137:1	120:25	152:16,17,19
137:19 159:7	ranks 81:4,10	161:6 169:23	recorded 11:21	refractory 99:11
176:23 182:4	rapport 143:20	178:2,15 188:17	30:18 60:7,9	refresh 43:8
196:25	172:6	189:19 199:10	163:19	refreshed 132:9
<b>quieter</b> 98:15,17	rarely 98:3	recall 11:14 82:6	recording 17:14	refresher 44:6,6
quietly 74:12	rate 14:11 149:3	82:11 115:25	64:4 178:12	126:7,8 127:25
quite 26:5 37:15	160:17	116:21 184:20	records 24:7 55:18	128:1 131:3,17
41:15,24 57:1	ratings 46:12	recalled 77:17	163:20 164:8	133:16,19 178:6
61:1 77:19 90:5	rationale 76:15	receive 5:1 150:7	recruit 40:22	refreshers 130:12
90:5 94:10	137:1 213:22	150:11 154:4	42:12	refreshing 132:11
101:12 104:16	reached 174:5	received 5:4 12:12	recruitment 36:11	refusal 67:16
109:16 121:7,17	178:16 198:8	29:17 68:23	41:4,10	115:17 162:14
137:16 164:3	reaches 141:5	126:15 137:20	recruits 41:11	189:13,15,18,19
166:8 168:3	reactive 127:9	147:16,19 152:21	recurring 124:18	refuse 112:1
173:19 174:18,19	read 4:17 15:6	receiving 13:9	red 46:12	161:20
176:12 182:9	48:6,13 50:2	115:25 206:22	redacted 124:7	refused 66:5 67:7
185:7 192:11	51:4 65:19 73:20	reception 161:3	redecoration	112:3
197:5,11 208:12	73:25 108:1	162:19 163:16,19	84:11,21	refute 82:12
quotation 69:17	109:20 116:22,24	163:23 168:22	reduce 10:11 48:1	regard 172:24
quoted 67:1	122:16 124:17	173:11	167:10 200:10,14	regarding 42:13
quoting 66:14	128:11,16 129:11	recognise 45:9	reduced 4:19	58:18 136:20
	164:19,20 166:8	82:14	153:13	regardless 29:24
R	174:18 178:14	recognised 133:3	reducing 33:16	53:10
racist 146:22	184:19 196:13	206:5 209:12	reduction 5:14	regime 87:1,5
147:1	reading 68:17 75:2	recognising	7:15	regimes 85:5
radical 84:15				
L	1	1	1	1

				Page 240
Ţ				l
region 182:18	58:11 63:22	reoccurrence 33:1	86:11 147:13	18:8 36:5 192:22
regional 149:23	73:10 78:12	repeat 43:15	177:24 185:7	193:18
182:17 198:6,6	80:23 83:19	repeated 177:25	reporting 5:13	requirements
210:22	87:10 96:1 97:3	repeatedly 87:10	17:14 24:14	29:21 36:6,15
Registered 44:18	97:15 129:8	repeating 74:24	27:17,19 31:6,19	39:17 60:18
regular 22:10,24	150:1 152:2	replace 43:9	185:24 188:24	119:2 163:2
141:6 178:6	153:10 155:11,22	reply 67:14	189:1	166:19
182:17 210:10	178:9 194:17	replying 82:6	reports 2:23 3:12	requires 17:25
regularly 134:1	211:5	report 3:14,18,23	5:21 7:24 10:1,2	61:13 132:19
reiterate 162:18	relied 183:1	5:17,22 6:9,12,18	48:7,8,8,10 92:25	164:25 187:12
213:18	relief 34:8 35:18	6:18 7:17,18,18	93:4,11 128:12	requiring 16:20
relate 22:14 53:20	36:4 39:3	7:22 19:20 21:14	128:16 138:24	24:22,23 167:17
148:8	relies 78:1	21:19 24:6 27:23	139:4,7,24 140:1	173:3
related 10:1 17:8	religious 13:2	30:17,23,23,24	140:9 141:20	requisite 140:4
28:25 46:24 57:1	relocate 204:19	31:5,10,12,13,21	142:16 174:13	reread 66:2
73:18 103:23	relocating 88:21	32:1,4 34:18	177:21 178:7,9	rerolled 159:7
113:14 137:24,24	rely 51:21 76:19	50:2 51:6,16	178:19,24 179:5	rerun 154:15
188:17	relying 137:17	52:21 63:8 70:17	179:8,20 180:8	reserving 138:23
relates 36:8 57:14	remain 79:18	70:20,25 73:21	180:18 181:5,14	resident 25:23
relating 17:13	156:14,16 170:22	73:25 74:2 76:12	182:25 183:18	47:13 52:20
43:16 67:23	185:2 186:12	78:18,22,24	186:21 190:25	138:7 147:2
105:1 141:24	211:11	86:23 88:14	194:3,3,7,11	residential 40:6
146:12 148:18	remainder 43:8	96:20,21 102:20	195:10,15 196:1	residents 3:20 4:1
190:19	remained 123:18	103:2 107:7	197:19,21,23	4:4,10,11 6:1
relation 7:22 8:9	remaining 156:4	108:11 113:2	198:22 202:7	47:5,9 52:5,7,10
8:14 55:14 62:8	199:4	115:8,13 116:8,9	represent 184:17	52:15 69:4 71:20
65:5,23 66:9	remains 73:14	116:12,22,24 122:6 129:11	representation	84:25 87:22
87:10 126:19	remedied 88:21		47:16,19	89:14,18 91:15
171:15 175:2 179:5 189:14	remedies 212:15 remember 71:1	139:13 140:25 141:2 143:2	representations 209:1	91:22 93:9,14 94:6,9,11 98:6
194:6 202:14	82:4 122:16			100:3 102:11
204:13 205:16	204:5 205:24	147:9,17 148:19 150:16,18,19	representative 114:15 135:11	104:7,12,15,16
204:13 203:10	remembered	157:9 161:11	136:3	104.7,12,13,16
210:2	139:16	162:3 165:19,20	request 35:2,19	113:14 121:14
relationship	remembering	162.3 163.19,20	36:4 112:19	146:15 151:9
161:15 211:17	163:7	168:13 178:14	requested 34:23	160:12
relationships 52:6	removal 63:23	179:10 181:21	35:4,20	residents' 4:6 19:6
52:15 205:4	95:9 113:22	182:1,20 184:3	requesting 144:8	resignation 81:21
relatively 42:23	115:15,18 123:15	184:18,19 186:5	require 18:16 21:4	82:20
180:14	160:5 161:4	186:9 188:1,12	31:1 186:2	resigned 146:19
Relax 64:11	170:6,21 171:24	194:21 195:8	187:11 192:21	resilience 50:8
release 119:1,5,6	180:3,24 187:5	201:13,15 202:2	required 11:8	resolution 131:8
121:23 122:2	191:23 193:22	202:5,17,18	19:24 22:2 36:11	132:16 133:17
released 118:19	206:6 207:7	203:7,7,23 204:8	55:24 95:14	resolved 116:13
190:23	212:22	204:14	134:25 135:3	resort 95:14 205:5
relet 7:16	remove 33:9	reported 19:13	138:2 165:9	205:14
relevance 93:3	106:14	24:15 26:11	171:18 202:10	resorting 132:18
relevant 8:24	removed 94:15	30:11 31:23	213:1	resource 26:7
21:16 43:11	95:6 143:21	34:19 48:12	requirement 12:8	120:19
			1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	
	ı	I	<u> </u>	ı

				Page 241
resources 7:12,12	150:23 166:2	79:22 83:23	robust 199:22	103:16 117:21,22
26:12 119:13,16	168:16 199:14	95:12 99:18	robustly 148:4	117:25 118:18
166:18 167:25	201:8	101:6 106:7	role 1:25 91:17,20	119:3 122:25
170:12,18 172:19	resulted 123:19	126:17 129:22	93:8 102:4	151:21,25 160:12
172:23 173:3	146:15	138:23 139:4,12	104:14 105:16	160:15,18,20
176:19 211:2	resulting 15:24	139:12 140:16	121:17 127:2	161:5,9,11,16,17
respect 3:21 17:3	results 16:18 18:4	143:12 147:14,14	132:10 152:3	161:21 162:2
29:13,15 39:5	resumed 126:22	159:3,11,12,19	158:20 159:24	163:5,5 164:24
79:6 80:13 91:13	retained 57:23	159:20 160:5,15	176:25 181:22	165:19,23 166:7
91:16 101:5	58:4 138:1,10,11	160:21 161:2,25	185:19 192:14	166:9,19 167:11
154:20,23 185:25	retention 41:4	171:20 175:15	205:15 206:14	167:17 168:13,18
211:4	retraining 58:22	177:2 185:21	211:10,24	168:20 169:3,5
respectful 112:16	return 83:7 157:16	193:19 197:13	roles 13:3 41:3,18	169:13,21 170:11
respond 176:23	returning 115:20	199:24 207:25	160:6 206:7	170:11 171:7
205:8 206:4	152:12	210:4 212:8,12	roll 10:16	172:10,20 173:14
responding 79:1	revalidate 130:17	212:14	rolled 162:20	174:13,17,21
response 57:6	revalidation	rightly 192:1	206:20	175:2,4,6 176:15
75:25 107:21	130:13	rights 161:7	rolling 61:6,10	176:16,19 177:5
111:7 121:5	review 5:4 20:1,9	Riley 214:18	124:22	177:10,11,14,21
147:16 148:4,15	21:15 26:5 27:6	Ring 68:9,14	room 65:17 70:3	178:7,8,22 179:5
149:20 156:25	42:8 46:11 75:7	rise 13:25 17:21	70:23 74:9,12	179:24 180:21
responses 3:9	80:4 81:24 98:1	18:1 23:1 30:12	77:9 78:16 85:14	181:5,21 183:11
149:13,16,18,22	135:1,1,11,15,17	37:10 41:20 42:3	99:15 212:1	184:23 185:24
149:25 150:1	137:1 142:24	42:5 45:23 49:20	rooms 10:12,15,20	186:5,9,11,13,21
responsibilities	149:2 171:19	49:21,21 58:2	212:3,4	187:11 188:1,12
206:8,20	183:25 184:6,12	90:16 94:22	root 29:10 32:23	190:12,25 191:22
responsibility	185:25 190:24	122:25 153:18	152:19	192:5,5,21,23
28:23 91:8	191:6,17 192:21	rises 42:16 120:17	roots 118:18	193:10,17,23
105:10,23 106:8	193:18 198:5,18	rising 124:24	rota 132:17,24,25	194:3,4,6,7,11,21
106:18 144:13	200:2 203:25	risk 19:16,22 20:23 22:7 25:12	rota'd 39:3	194:21,24 195:3
146:3,5 185:18	213:23 reviewed 19:18		rough 38:7	195:10,15 196:1
186:17,19,23 187:2 206:15	25:25 26:1 92:19	90:18 91:7,20,22	roughly 97:8 178:10	196:18 197:19,21
207:24	92:19 96:22	92:3,12 96:13 115:15 116:10,11	round 88:7	197:22,23 198:7 198:19,21 200:18
responsible 29:15	134:1 136:7	116:17 117:1,2	round 88.7 round-the-clock	200:25 201:1,8,9
144:12 187:4	137:12 160:4	118:18 119:3	108:20	200:23 201:1,8,9
rest 97:7	162:8 175:10	127:16,18,24	route 171:19 203:9	201:13,13 202:2
restrain 74:10	176:9	132:19 144:15,20	routine 137:16	203:21 213:23
restraint 17:17	reviewing 7:3 43:3	145:13 154:15	210:1	rules 23:9 29:22
136:21	55:17 134:17	161:13 167:10	routinely 144:24	160:10 162:5,6
restraints 64:19	reviews 3:7,18	173:20 174:4,15	205:9 206:3	164:14 167:15,21
restrict 212:16	4:20 5:21 7:7	174:15,20 174:4,13	<b>Royal</b> 158:16,17	170:9 172:1
restricted 85:4	19:23,24 82:5	195:22,24 198:22	rule 5:13 24:2,5	183:22 193:4,20
restrictions 10:25	112:12,15,24	198:24 199:15	25:15 73:20	198:20 200:13
86:24 87:4	112.12,13,24	200:10,14,21	90:11 91:13,17	run 2:18
212:13	211:1	204:20 205:2,8	92:25 95:8,11,18	running 47:8
result 11:9 18:15	right 2:22 15:12	risks 111:8,13	95:21,22 96:6,11	75:16 124:22
23:13 25:9 37:9	28:6 31:17 44:12	204:24 208:10	96:15,17 97:5,21	runs 2:17
39:12 140:18	48:25 62:5 66:3	RNA 187:22	99:5,14,22	Rupert 29:8
37.12 170.10	TO.23 02.3 00.3	131 1/1 10/.22	77.5,17,22	rupert 27.0
			<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				Page 242
	190.5	ganaanings 162.22	45.0 56.17 62.7	60.4 71.10 72.7
<u>S</u>	189:5	screenings 163:23 scrutinised 136:8	45:9 56:17 62:7	60:4 71:19 73:7
saddest 82:5	saying 51:6 62:22		63:11 67:15	73:13,16 78:3
safe 48:3 102:15	63:13 65:22	scrutiny 17:14 28:11	72:25 78:8 83:18	79:16 82:21
103:21,24 104:5	75:13,14 82:4	_	97:5 124:18	88:16 89:20
104:6,6 105:12	207:19 208:5	seat 158:2	128:14 129:17	101:20 106:25
105:15,16,21	says 3:18,23 4:17	second 4:21 15:25	149:15 154:3	158:18 173:15
111:17 119:15,17	17:5 23:8 41:2	32:15 46:21	172:15 179:4,8	182:23 183:4
126:13 172:2	46:17,21 47:25	116:10 169:8	189:18	187:2 198:1
safeguard 106:22	50:7 51:5,20	187:20 205:23	segregated 185:4	205:12,25
162:6 172:11	53:7,23 55:12,25	secondary 50:4,10	segregation	sense 86:25 123:12
187:7 195:1	57:20 64:18,25	secondly 139:25	184:12	123:13 138:13
196:3	65:2 74:2 75:16	section 93:24,25	self 48:2	149:15 167:6,12
safeguarding	80:25 82:2,3	94:3,8,14,23	self-harm 15:24	169:9 197:14
19:19 26:8 44:8	88:14,24 98:24	sectioned 94:7,8	19:16,22 20:24	209:23
44:21 71:7 80:23	103:1 104:21,24	sections 94:18	25:4,18,23 98:19	sensible 167:1
163:8 172:16	110:11 112:21	sector 2:10 95:16	103:13 104:3,11	sent 24:6 115:10
196:21 204:4	116:10,11 123:9	secure 2:7,8 94:15	104:14 107:2,16	115:23,24 148:11
safeguards 48:25	123:17 124:9	158:23 171:23	107:21 110:2	separate 23:16
119:3 160:1,8	132:15 137:12	192:9 206:6	115:20 119:18,21	57:16 135:14
171:17 174:16	143:8,12,17	security 80:24	120:6,17,18	174:23 175:5
184:23 185:18	144:23 145:2	135:20 138:2,11	122:25 123:3,18	211:20
186:21 187:3	149:15 150:11	see 3:15,22 14:3,8	123:23 124:19	separately 73:7
190:10 191:16	183:14	16:8,14,24 17:8,9	125:10 154:12	118:16 135:14
199:5 200:18	scale 195:11	20:1,6 24:19	176:1 188:16,16	September 30:17
Safer 26:10 99:12	scenario-based	29:5 31:3,13	193:14 194:17	47:13 186:5
110:5	133:25 134:3,6	34:21 35:7 37:4	195:11 199:11	187:23 188:9,24
<b>Safety</b> 144:13	134:11	45:1 46:7,13	202:15 204:16,20	194:10 195:21
salary 41:20,23,24	scenarios 134:13	50:24 53:5,23	204:21 205:9,14	197:4
41:25 42:5,5,7	134:15	54:21 56:23,25	205:20 206:4	SER000023 45:25
sample 149:25	scene 74:8 131:22	57:2,4,5,9 58:12	self-harm/physi	SER000041 53:4
Sandra 164:16	131:23 132:3	60:2,12 63:17	16:20	SER000226 14:3
168:15 186:7	schedule 12:13	64:24 66:19	self-harmed 21:1	SER000451 1:18
192:3 194:18	17:12 18:21,22	67:18 69:23 70:1	22:9 50:17	34:3
197:20,24 198:3	19:7 23:5,8	70:4,18 77:19	188:10	SER000464 57:14
200:23 201:2	schemes 51:11	89:18,24 90:1,2	self-harming	<b>Serco</b> 1:25 2:6,14
204:18	Schleicher 187:18	104:13 107:12	109:22 115:18	2:17 3:7,9 4:25
Sarah 54:24 82:14	screaming 146:23	111:5 115:12	116:16 199:3	5:10 6:14,23
157:17,22,23	screen 1:14 3:14	123:21,25 128:20	self-harms 199:7	7:16 8:1,8,25
158:6 214:12	5:20 14:3 31:14	136:24 137:7,17	self-inflicted 17:25	9:16 12:16 20:7
215:4	34:3 45:25 56:16	140:12 144:23	18:15	28:3,20 29:2,11
sat 59:11 82:4	57:12 62:4	149:14 164:19	self-reporting 31:2	29:14 32:11,20
203:21	102:22,24 112:9	166:22 173:13	78:2	34:12,13,23 35:3
satisfactory	115:8 119:10	174:20,22,23	<b>SENAR</b> 130:11	41:1 46:8 47:7
177:18	screened 169:10	seeing 180:23	send 77:9 100:11	49:5 51:12 53:10
satisfied 60:13	169:11	seek 126:20	113:1 144:14	54:2 56:10 59:23
Saunders 155:10	screening 161:3	seekers 100:11,25	167:12	61:25 79:8 80:6
saw 7:21 45:11	162:19 163:16,19	101:18,23 122:13	sending 144:25	80:25 81:2,9
59:1 60:15 68:7	167:7,14,20	125:17	senior 27:6 44:18	82:23 87:19
73:13,20 79:22	169:6 173:12	seen 2:23 13:6	55:2,7 56:10	90:20,22 91:8,17
13.13,20 13.22		-		
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				Page 243
		1	1	1
92:20 93:3	set 2:4 11:24 13:18	shocked 82:8	simple 121:4 185:9	106:15 125:16
105:11 106:2,9	13:20 14:17,19	shop 85:25	202:11 209:22	smaller 15:18
107:1 109:21	15:1,3 16:1,4	short 10:17 13:10	212:17	<b>SMT</b> 12:21 46:8
110:11 112:19	26:15 29:21 30:5	42:15,19 73:24	<b>simply</b> 111:16	60:3 61:1 80:22
117:7,12 118:13	39:9 55:16 69:3	76:7 83:11,18	167:17 183:8	87:11,13,17 88:1
122:17 123:6	91:9 115:13	84:1,3 147:24	191:14 203:3	88:8,17,22 89:2
129:9 138:25	117:4 135:17	157:20	Singh 86:4	89:18,24 150:21
148:7,13 149:5	142:23 177:10	short-term 2:21	single 158:11	SMTs 31:25
149:20 151:8,23	187:21 195:18	shortages 4:20	171:13 172:9,10	snap 199:24
152:1,15 153:9	sets 115:12	40:20 42:9,11	206:13 210:7	snitch 72:1
155:22 156:1	setting 111:17	shorthand 193:23	sit 8:6 58:16	Soames 29:8
212:21 213:2,10	124:4	shortly 3:4 7:5	134:25 180:23	social 50:22,23
Serco's 5:14 27:23	settings 2:7 191:21	39:4 64:18	181:12	90:23 119:22
32:10 90:15	settlement 28:22	101:12 159:8	site 40:11 56:11	society 38:2 86:1
91:20 92:14	seven 54:7	show 1:13 10:7	110:22 163:3	soften 84:8,12
152:16	severe 14:10,21	22:10 24:4 30:16	180:21 197:12	sole 103:7
series 9:10 13:24	16:10 50:17	32:17 33:21	sites 12:20 46:20	<b>solution</b> 85:10,10
46:3 199:18	severity 14:14	79:20 147:7	87:14,21,23	163:11
204:9	16:13 173:23	showed 66:2 76:5	192:12 203:4	somebody 21:1
serious 14:10,21	sexist 146:23	showing 169:24	sitting 203:15	24:4 31:4,5
16:10,22 17:4,4	Shane 150:4	188:9	situated 38:11	58:15 94:15,23
17:21 18:2 28:22	shape 42:12 62:12	shown 45:15 63:23	situation 40:5	96:17 133:10
30:18,23 31:11	62:16 65:7 67:19	102:22 123:5	100:6 102:21	161:16 163:18
31:11,19 69:1,2	83:5 149:19	shows 14:5 62:13	114:22 120:5,16	165:12 166:13
76:14 79:6 86:13	share 8:7 21:16	64:5,12 74:8,17	143:17 144:25	168:23 169:25
98:23 107:21	23:23 28:17 32:4	107:23 147:17,19	153:5 154:19	176:11 189:17
111:13 132:17	87:25 91:15	side 13:12 20:4	168:19 206:14	208:11 210:11
133:13 175:18	117:13 150:21	sign 149:2	situations 32:9	somebody's
184:7,13 194:12	shared 6:7,18,20	signed 1:15 36:22	six 2:11 25:4,6	171:13 211:11
195:1,2 208:8,24	27:1 31:4 36:19	141:5	147:23	someone's 145:20
209:17	36:21 53:18 56:8	significant 9:23	skills 38:16 45:5	193:15
seriously 70:6 91:3	60:3 117:19	43:14 107:13,17	55:8 126:9 131:7	soon 40:25
185:19	118:6 122:17	175:14,22 194:24	131:25	SOP 53:5 57:15
seriousness 22:3	150:21,25 151:3	significantly 32:10 194:20	skin 197:6	sorry 6:3,5 15:22
67:15	sharing 6:16 181:2 182:12		skipping 11:22 Skitt 135:25 136:1	22:16,19 34:6
served 115:16 service 4:3 5:10	sharp 145:10	<b>signpost</b> 44:17 45:6 50:25 91:15		37:7 46:1 51:6 61:22 68:4
14:8 15:7 18:25	Sharp 143.10 Shaw 3:8 7:18	91:19 93:10	slavery 174:2	119:24 129:15
31:8 38:9 90:15	9:25 50:4 183:25		sleep 62:24	
110:21 130:13	184:6,12,18,19	signs 174:8 Simcock 157:22	sleeping 188:1,6 slide 123:21 124:6	133:2 139:12 171:10 191:8
	191:6		124:17 177:10	205:18 211:14
132:5 139:25 197:5,6 210:18	Shaw's 191:10	158:1,4 213:13 213:15,18,23	slightly 22:18 64:8	sort 21:12 34:21
services 2:8 3:25				
4:10 12:12 20:13	Shayne 83:1 sheer 82:8	214:6,13,17 215:5	112:8 207:18 211:7	38:8 46:11 54:21 61:13 85:23 95:5
20:16 34:24 35:2	shift 133:1 140:3	similar 9:9 18:8	slipped 75:18,20	158:22 165:8
36:16 46:7	140:14 172:18	119:11 154:11	slipped 73:18,20 slowing 22:17	197:8 210:7
149:24 175:5	207:18 208:5	similarities 212:22	small 51:25 100:14	sorts 75:7 85:7
213:4	shifted 103:3	Simon 110:24	101:24 102:12	sound 15:10 199:9
sessions 182:17	shit 62:23	111:3	101.24 102.12	sound 13.10 199.9 sounds 176:12
50510115 102.1/	SHIL 02.23	111.3	103.7 107.1	Sounds 1/0.12
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				Page 244
	1			1
source 3:13 4:16	spreadsheets 60:1	145:1 146:3,12	state 40:10 96:6	135:25
sources 55:9	stability 95:16	146:25 147:7,8,9	108:14 119:10,11	Steven 1:6,11
space 55:19 211:2	96:5	147:10 148:18	146:10,21 148:16	215:1
211:25 212:4,17	stable 52:10	149:5 150:6,8,9	151:8 165:8	stick 208:3
213:4,9	staff 3:20,21 4:5,7	150:22,25 151:9	189:5 190:4	sticking 200:3
spaces 213:2	4:19,20,25 5:2,4	151:23,24 155:21	214:9	stimulated 178:25
speak 63:9 70:25	5:14,16 7:15	155:24 156:1,4	stated 124:11	stop 32:12 37:1
71:12 79:25,25	12:16 17:2,15	160:14,19 161:6	207:2	74:11,20
81:5 102:14	21:17 29:15	161:19 162:5,19	statement 1:15,20	stopping 10:4
193:1	34:13,14 35:15	168:12 169:19	2:4 9:3,4 11:25	storage 137:19
speaking 21:24	36:12 38:14,15	170:10 171:11	32:7 33:23 34:3	138:10
63:12 81:25	38:17 39:18,23	173:8,10,11,12	37:4 52:22,23	straight 127:19
specific 107:7	40:2,6,10 41:1,12	186:9 191:14	53:2 55:13 67:5	straightforward
126:18 130:23	41:16,18 42:11	192:24 199:19	80:25 81:12,22	173:3 176:12
155:21,24 165:12	42:14,15,19	200:23 206:1,18	81:22 84:16 89:4	180:15 185:8
specifically 6:19	43:17,18 44:5,6,7	staff's 36:12 48:22	90:10 92:23	strategies 48:1
6:22 8:14,20	44:23 45:7,24	91:17	95:10 100:8	strategy 37:25
17:2 51:1 52:6	47:10,15,16 48:5	Staff-related	119:11 120:9	47:2 61:3 101:10
86:17 125:20	48:19,25 49:3,5	57:18	122:15 134:18	154:24,24 158:23
133:16 165:25	49:24 50:4,6,9,16	<b>staffing</b> 5:24 7:11	138:17 140:24	stress 103:11
183:22 184:11	51:1,3,3,23 53:5	7:12 11:19,20	141:8 152:16	string 58:1
specification 9:23	53:8,12,21 54:5	35:4,11,16 36:11	160:11 168:11	strongly 206:11
10:5 13:5 14:22	54:15 55:10 57:1	39:17,18,21	173:7 175:3	structural 155:13
15:4	59:3,17 61:7,9,10	40:19,20 41:15	177:1,5 186:6	Structurally-wise
specifications 4:22	62:2 63:6 67:4	42:9,13 44:16	187:20 195:19	84:6
5:10	68:19,24 69:5	120:9,14,24	209:20,24 210:24	struggles 108:11
specificity 97:9	72:19,21 73:1	153:9	statements 29:8	struggling 22:20
specified 11:3,10	74:11 81:6,8	stage 9:15 162:3	142:16,19 158:7	stuck 185:10
11:14	82:22 83:2 87:8	168:24 188:2,12	158:9,11	<b>studies</b> 187:19
specify 10:6	87:12 88:18	188:13 189:25	states 5:16 74:6	study 190:9
speedily 202:8	89:13,15,16 91:4	213:7	100:11 112:10	stuff 84:20 89:17
spend 49:13 52:5	91:13 93:24	stages 24:13	141:2	subheading 47:24
52:12 85:24,25	94:12 98:6	stakeholders	statistics 104:13	subject 90:24
87:23 88:3	101:20 102:9,14	46:23,25 47:5	114:23 148:7	164:5 209:5
spent 160:9 170:21	102:18 103:11	110:4 151:10	157:7 195:18	subjected 122:13
170:22	104:18 105:8	stand 74:8 165:5	status 116:15,20	125:6
spike 107:11 110:1	106:2,9 108:15	standard 53:24	124:9	submission 177:11
110:9	109:3,4,8,10,12	140:4 142:23	statutory 161:9	177:14
<b>spite</b> 107:3	109:13,14,16	165:6 177:21	174:4,16 185:24	submit 96:10,11
spoke 104:18	113:21,23 117:8	standards 9:24	192:22	140:9
spoken 72:12	120:22,22 121:1	10:6,7 11:3,9,14	stay 82:25	submitted 29:9
spontaneous 124:8	121:4,10 124:6	23:20 29:22,23	Stayed 80:24	56:1,4 62:13
127:2	127:21 128:4	start 1:4 15:21	Staying 39:18	81:13 135:8
sporadic 113:4	129:10 131:25	40:24 58:2 126:5	step 21:9 30:8	142:16
114:5	132:2 133:5	132:7,8 176:20	<b>Stephen</b> 3:8 50:4	subreview 183:24
spreadsheet 12:15	136:16,22 139:2	started 6:10,11	steps 87:18 109:23	subsequently
56:16 57:13,25	139:3,6,8,24	43:1,5,7 74:6,23	116:5 162:18	139:1
59:10,11 60:5	141:15,24 143:13	101:8 107:14	164:1 212:19	subsidiaries 28:23
80:8	144:8,11,14,25	starts 196:16	Steve 55:3 82:6	substantiated
	-, , ,,			
	ı	ı	ı	ı

				Page 245
160			4074545	
16:25,25 17:1	112:14 182:13,13	158:15	185:12,13,18	75:10 76:12
57:24 58:3,3	supervisions	surprise 165:3	197:4,5 198:18	77:12 87:18
147:2,20,21,25	104:17 194:14	184:21	198:25 203:2,18	92:11 114:18
148:1	supervisor 75:6	surprised 72:3	207:24	116:6 128:23
success 149:3	<b>support</b> 26:9 35:4	surrounding	taken 4:9 28:23	137:19 157:6
197:22	35:11,16,22	190:18	38:13 39:19	158:14 163:24
suffer 208:24	37:23 38:9 48:25	survey 47:6	67:24 70:6 78:22	182:8 185:10
suffering 49:12	49:4,5,7 50:14,24	surveyed 47:14	87:19 98:14 99:6	telling 22:23 82:7
sufficient 90:21	72:21 93:8,14	suspect 175:8	120:21 133:10	tells 69:20 124:7
140:2 170:12	103:15 104:14,17	sustained 182:10	143:6 162:18	164:8
175:7	105:17,20 109:5	swearing 146:14	180:10,24 181:5	template 163:21
suggest 36:2 83:6	109:10 113:24	147:10	187:24 188:20	temporary 36:17
149:1 157:16	121:13 140:8	sworn 1:6 157:23	198:1,2 200:9,20	36:18,20,23
187:6 199:15	151:16 206:18	215:1,4	takes 8:8,8 15:15	37:15 95:5
suggested 36:1	207:17 209:1,7	syllabus 131:8	15:18 136:14	<b>tempting</b> 196:7,10
97:4 152:25	support-wise	symptoms 174:8	151:8	ten 42:17 164:22
suggestion 51:17	50:21	188:9 189:2	talk 119:20 160:19	165:4,11 166:17
suggests 196:2	supported 35:21	synonymous 195:4	181:13 210:22	170:13
suicidal 24:5	94:11 119:12,21	system 32:21,24	talking 10:1 27:3	ten-minute 166:17
103:14 104:3	119:22	51:19 124:1	49:9 51:3 66:5	170:15 172:20
122:13 125:10	supporting 38:12	148:24 149:11,11	69:16,16 88:19	175:6
173:25 176:2	38:21 93:8 105:9	163:20,20 164:8	96:2 133:7,8	tendency 174:23
193:15	109:18 119:19	166:23 168:21	183:8,13	tender 13:19
<b>suicide</b> 19:16 25:5	121:18 123:16	181:23 192:17	talks 131:5,18	tennis 86:3
25:18 107:22	141:17 210:25	193:7,10 196:17	task 46:18 109:17	tension 211:8,14
193:14 195:11,14	supportive 50:24	206:9 209:21	172:15	212:6
195:23 202:16	87:1	211:9,22	taught 72:23,23	term 51:11 83:18
suitability 169:14	<b>suppose</b> 21:9 38:1	systematic 203:24	teach 72:22	105:24 126:24
suitable 143:13	64:19 66:23	systems 32:11,18	team 7:4 8:18	127:23 128:5
suite 213:6	104:15 105:7	103:11 192:13	17:17 19:15 20:5	182:11
suited 85:6	121:4,25 148:3		20:19 26:8,9,9,10	terms 9:16 16:13
<b>suites</b> 99:13	149:10	T	32:3 46:22 49:4	33:5 46:21,25
suits 138:14	supposed 5:1	tab 1:14 25:3	50:22 51:1 56:10	68:16,20 83:24
sulking 68:9	sure 6:21 49:10,17	57:16 58:8	56:11 64:3 65:19	85:21 87:18
sum 14:1	56:6 67:13,22	table 14:5 27:12	73:8,14 74:8,9,21	91:20 96:13
summarise 2:24	69:23 79:6 85:5	86:2 107:19,23	74:23 77:9 78:3	105:10 108:7
9:15 11:21	96:3 109:15	124:10,14	78:6 79:16 80:7	120:8 134:17
summarised 5:22	113:3 117:12	tackled 5:19	101:21 109:14	149:6 166:17
92:8 115:21	128:1 140:22	take 5:20 18:13	135:15 142:19	170:25 173:21
146:13	142:8 148:5	61:11 62:19 63:9	149:22,23,24	174:7,10 178:6
summarises 74:1	149:25 151:6	71:6 81:5 85:17	171:4,11 200:16	190:11
summary 3:18	157:11 162:9	85:20 98:13	teams 166:22	<b>Thames</b> 182:18
4:14 5:16 9:5	163:14 170:25	101:8 105:11	180:25 181:8	thank 1:3 22:20
12:21 103:17	175:11 177:19	109:23 112:1,3	198:15	24:17 39:19
164:20	182:21 185:21	116:5 125:25	technical 13:16	57:12 83:8,8,9,13
supervise 104:17	196:21 202:19	148:15 150:23	149:14 214:6	83:13 95:8 124:4
supervision	203:12 205:4	151:4,17 152:7	techniques 17:14	125:25 138:15
107:22,24 108:4	210:14,16 214:4	154:5 158:2	telephone 114:7	155:4,5,19
108:5,13 109:19	surgery 64:2	163:10 164:1	tell 49:9 56:3	156:21 157:12,13
		178:3 183:7		
	ı	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	1

				ŭ
			l	1
158:3,4,25	136:5,5,20 139:8	ticket 39:6 126:2	108:15 123:22	tough 40:24
159:14 204:13	140:2,12,19	126:24,25 127:4	169:1,2 176:23	tour 88:8
206:24 213:13,15	142:4 143:10	127:15 128:6	timescales 168:6	tours 88:10
214:5,11,13,13	147:7 148:24	ticking 163:7	timing 152:7	Townshend 73:17
214:14,15,19	149:10 150:12	ties 53:17 196:12	Tinsley 2:2,15	75:9,19
themes 3:23	154:22 156:8,10	Till 37:7	35:8 38:14,18	track 151:5
then?' 82:7	161:14 162:22,24	time 2:24 6:10,13	87:15,22,25 88:1	tracked 151:6
Theresa 187:18	163:3,9,17 164:4	6:20 10:12,17	137:3 147:19	tracks 57:15
thing 7:21 76:14	166:8,11 167:20	13:11,15 21:21	tiny 212:4	train 160:19 178:5
80:9 82:16	167:25 168:8	22:14 25:19	title 46:14	trained 4:6 38:15
100:22 111:23	169:20,23,24	29:10 39:10	today 1:24 42:4	49:3 61:8,9 91:5
133:18 152:12	170:3 171:3	42:11,14,24	79:17 114:24	93:24 94:1
164:3 180:15	172:13,14 173:11	46:12 47:5,10,15	197:24 203:16	109:13 132:16,21
183:14 197:2	174:22 175:9	49:19 50:23 52:4	today's 114:22	132:22 133:2
210:6	176:21 177:19	52:10,12,23	toilet 213:7	136:22
things 5:24 17:20	178:1 179:24	61:11 63:4 66:24	told 16:1 21:10	trainers 130:11,11
23:9 27:14 35:23	180:2,7,19,19	67:11,12,17,20	25:14 72:17	training 2:8 5:1,2
40:23 49:1 50:17	181:18 183:10,17	69:9,14,24,25	75:13 83:1 99:5	5:25 29:13,14,17
60:22 61:17 63:8	184:11 185:6,7	70:21 75:5,24	112:18 115:23	31:25 36:13 39:5
63:17 76:1 79:22	188:5 192:24	77:1,8,10 79:5,17	119:14 123:22	39:17,19 43:10
80:18,18 82:24	193:7,20,23	81:14 87:23,25	124:2 143:4	43:12,15,15 44:5
85:12 86:3 89:12	194:2 195:3	88:3 92:16 97:14	153:19 155:8	44:9,10,20,23
92:11 109:12	196:6,7,12,16	99:14,22 101:2	157:5	50:3,10 61:1,2,5
111:2 136:15	197:2 199:21	101:11 104:4,16	tolerate 62:11	75:5,10 76:18
147:9,11,12	200:1,9 201:3	105:11 106:5	tolerated 62:16	120:22 126:3,4
164:7 166:16,22	202:22,24 205:17	108:17 109:6,11	tone 69:3	126:16,22 127:21
172:2 182:7,9,12	206:5,9,16	112:4 114:6	tool 205:8	127:25 128:1,8
183:10,15 184:21	207:24 208:9	116:2,18 118:9	top 34:6 40:16	129:12,25 130:3
192:11 213:1 think 2:21 6:9 7:13	209:18,22 211:7 211:12 212:6,16	118:12 120:18,20	46:14 47:23 123:9 129:25	130:5,7,15,17,22
16:8 24:20 26:16	213:19,23	120:20 121:2,7 122:16 126:21	204:5 206:21	131:2,2,22,25
	thinking 86:17	122.16 126.21 129:7 133:20	topic 39:18 146:8	132:4,13 133:3,6 133:8,9,16,22,24
37:19,22 38:5	192:15 208:5	137:14 140:3,7	topics 158:13	133:25 134:4,6
*	third 8:4 102:25	140:17 141:5	163:21	141:10,14,17,22
48:9 49:12 50:12	123:25	140.17 141.5	torture 4:11 43:17	152:21 160:23
	thirdly 4:24	155:1,17 156:3,5	90:24 91:2 93:11	161:1,3,22
	thought 113:6	156:8,13 159:21	130:25 165:17	162:20 170:2
62:12 66:1,12,14	210:14	160:9 164:24	167:3 174:1,9	173:8,10,14,15
· / / /	threats 107:22	165:20,22 170:21	175:18 176:5	174:3,7,14 177:5
69:2,2,5,7,9 71:4	144:11 195:11	170:22 172:12	179:11,15 193:24	177:22,22 178:22
	three 22:8 28:23	184:2,19 185:12	195:4	179:2,18,21,22
85:21 86:11	35:9 40:8 53:25	185:14 186:12,16	total 12:16 38:24	179:24 180:5,14
92:13 96:16	58:9,9 79:24	194:15 195:16	39:2,2 40:11,12	182:12 206:7,16
103:19 106:20	128:12 131:15	196:17 197:1,3,5	42:19 56:24	transcript 6:4
	three-month 34:8	200:19 202:17,25	115:3 124:8	64:12 65:12 66:2
120:10,16 121:7	34:16 54:1,8	200:17 202:17,23	194:18 212:24	transcripts 164:20
•	threshold 179:10	times 10:15 39:24	totally 7:10,16	transfer 95:1
124:24,25 127:20	186:8,10 199:12	43:18 51:18,19	28:5 65:6 67:2,5	transferred 13:8
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Thursday 87:25	58:5 62:21 86:8	82:12,17	94:23
12/.21132.21	- 1141 544 y 07.23	50.5 02.21 00.0	02.12,17	71.23
I				<u> </u>

transformation         Tulley 64:5,5,23         90:20 93:4         uniform 83:3         67:2,9 68:16, 26,8 73:24           120:23         65:2 71:24 72:1         100:13 114:1         unique 143:18         72:6,8 73:24           translate 9:12         78:20,22         115:5 126:4         Unit 23:20         74:24 76:15
120:23 65:2 71:24 72:1 100:13 114:1 <b>unique</b> 143:18 72:6,8 73:24
1 translate 9.12 1 /6.20.22 1 113.3 120.4 1 Unit 23.20 1 /4.24 /0.13
translated 165:5   TUPE'd 156:2,5   129:9 130:22   University 158:16   77:11 82:18 9
translates 14:2   156:10,12   133:21 135:17   unjustified 62:15   98:15 104:12
transparency 20:3 turn 8:20 15:21 137:1 153:23 unlock 11:2 110:2 113:20
23:22 27:8 28:16   23:7 34:5 54:18   162:25 166:23   unnecessary 23:14   120:17 122:9
56:24 60:2 74:2 90:6 115:7 170:1,7,10 173:1 unplanned 127:5,9 122:21,22,24
134:24 136:5 <b>turning</b> 15:20 87:8 173:16 174:12 127:16 123:1,6 124:
149:10 95:8 116:8 176:22 178:4 <b>unpredictable</b> 125:2,4,9,21
transparent 28:1   151:20   179:1 181:9,17   127:10   126:3,4,15,22
78:7 <b>two</b> 4:21 15:23 185:13 189:19 <b>unsubstantiated</b> 127:1,1,5,5,2
transported 95:4
<b>trauma</b> 50:4,10   28:24 30:17 32:9   197:6 205:20   147:21,22   129:20,24 13
90:24 174:1,8   38:11 40:12,13   206:19 213:21,25   <b>unsuitable</b> 167:9   130:16,23 13
<b>trauma'</b> 82:10
traumatic 50:16   142:21 147:1,20   understanding   unsure 206:14   133:24 134:1
travelling 192:12   147:22 157:5   48:1 58:23 67:13   untangle 169:8   135:6,17,24
treat 191:15   158:7,9 175:4   67:20 77:24   unusual 184:17   137:25 138:1
treated 3:21,21   176:18 180:25   141:16 151:23   unwell 93:23   140:24 141:3
104:21,22 181:8 191:19 159:22,23 162:4 199:8 141:25 142:1
treatment 3:4 197:18 198:15 168:3,19,20 UOF 58:8 142:18,21 14
18:16,23 21:3   201:24 207:22   169:21,24 170:23   <b>up-skilling</b> 130:12   143:2,3,5 144
105:2,14,22   208:22 212:4   171:5 173:17   <b>up-to-date</b> 126:3   144:9,24 145
106:1 115:23   two-year 42:6   177:12,25 179:2   update 126:3   145:20 151:2
153:6 209:2   <b>type</b> 133:22   181:3,7 186:3   128:7   154:9,14 174
trends 54:3 153:13   136:17 137:17   193:2,20 194:23   updated 60:3   192:4 193:7
<b>triage</b> 165:10 <b>types</b> 179:4 194:20   196:20 201:5   91:11 126:16   204:13,15,24
trialled 51:18   203:14   understands 69:12   131:14 141:18   205:14,19 20
tried 74:20 84:8,8     understating   updates 89:15   206:8 207:10
84:12 85:17
197:20   UK 100:11   understood 162:9   upper 7:19   useful 153:13
tries 72:21   ultimately 126:12   undertake 170:16   upsetting 82:1   usually 38:12
triggering 185:25   unacceptable 63:2   171:18 189:9,12   uptick 122:21   utters 74:12
triple 63:25 64:4   65:6 67:2 72:17   192:2 198:10   upwards 61:13
trouble 188:6 unannounced 3:5 undertaken 149:8 urgency 183:5
true 83:4 201:21   151:12   172:25 189:7,18   urgent 96:17 97:1   vacancies 42:1
trust 28:3 149:8   uncertain 144:10   190:17   97:7 151:25   43:4
172:6,7 undercover 2:24 undertakes 163:19 181:13 Valley 182:18
truth 75:10,13   64:4   undertaking 208:4   urgently 97:9   value 14:6,10
76:12 81:6 <b>underlying</b> 21:2 208:17 196:5 190:15
truthful 77:1 43:21 135:12 unethical 147:10 USB 138:3 values 28:3 18
try 46:18 85:9
108:8 161:6   underneath 55:20   unfortunate   23:14,16 26:20   variety 188:17
178:4 189:19   understand 1:22   174:24   39:5,6 47:11   various 5:21 1
trying 21:8 118:10   3:7 4:6 7:9 10:12   unfortunately   55:9 58:9,14,15   51:18 55:18
140:14 193:11
196:17 213:8 43:11,20 46:18 121:14 129:2 62:15 63:12 64:3 152:13 168:2
<b>Tuesday</b> 87:25 47:16 53:2 67:10 154:20 185:11 65:5,23,23 66:9 179:7,19 190
67:21 69:5,8

vary 12:10 vars 156:16 194:3  Vars 159:17  Vars 159:17  Vars 159:17  Vars 159:18  Vars 111:2:20  Vars 164:15  Vars 169:14  Vars 111:2:20  Vars 164:15  Vars 169:14  Vars 111:3:2  Vars 111:3:3  Vars 159:18  Vars 164:16  Vars 111:3:3  Vars 111:4  Vars 111:3:3  Vars 111:4  Vars					Page 248			
vasi 156:16 194:3         71:20 169:4         109:16 115:1         197:18         withdrawn 147:22         w	12.10	1 1 1114	100 15 10 21	1 (10 (7.7	112.20			
VC 208:21 verbally 74:25 verbally 74								
verbally 74:25         vulnerable 4:2 6:1         56:24,24 157:6         weighted 44:15         witness 1:14 6:2         witness 1:14 6:2         version 74:4 75:15         weight 64:15         witness 1:14 6:2         version 74:4 75:15         version 74:4 75:18         version 74:4 75:15         version 74:4 75:16         version 74:4 75:18         version 74:4 75:19         version 74:4 75:19         version 74:4 75:19<								
Verne [59:7]         90:7 93:9.19         94:10 103:25         200:24 201:14,25         weights 85:14         50:16 80:25         90:0 92:23         90:10 92:23         weights 85:14         90:10 92:23								
version 74:4 75:15 versus 13:16 97:15 pt 118:19         94:10 103:25 torsus 13:16 97:16 pt 118:29         200:24 201:14,25 torsus 13:16 97:16 pt 118:29         weights 85:14 welfare 26:9 51:23 torsus 13:16 97:16 pt 118:24 125:18 torsus 13:16 pt 118:24 125:18 torsus 13:14,18,20 pt 13:22 137:21 torsus 14:162:3 torsus 13:14,18,20 pt 13:22 137:21 torsus 14:162:3 torsus 13:15 136:11 torsus 15:15 132:15 136:11 torsus 15:15 torsus 15								
versus 13:16 97:10 victims 4:11 91:2 118:24 125:18 174:1         116:15;9 118:19 18:24 25:18 118:24 125:18 174:1         203:15 watched 77:18 168:11 173:7         wetflare 26:9 51:23 15:23 91:14 93:13 168:11 173:7         157:22 160:11 168:11 173:7           Victoria 60:25 video 131:14,18,20 135:2 137:21 view 41:1 62:3 72:15 82:24 88:5 82:9 95:23 103:22 104:25 112:15 130:15 132:15 136:11 132:15 136:11 132:15 136:11 132:15 136:11 132:15 136:11 132:15 136:11 170:21 178:23 198:12 170:21 178:23 179:17 viewed 183:11 viewed 183:11 viewed 183:11 viewes 46:23 179:17 viewed 183:11 viewes 46:23 144:19 violence 98:5 violench 98:12 violench 98:13 visitis 170:4 197:12 voice 47:11,111 206:13 208:2 wart 183:24 43:24 203:3 99:21 132:24 warted 56:23 89:23 199:21 1 visitis 163:3 visits 170:4 197:12 voice 47:11,111 206:13 100:2 warts 66:18 warning 149:2 voice 47:11,111 206:13 100:2 warts 66:18 warning 149:2 13:24 warning 149:2 13:24 warning 149:2 13:29 206:16 warn		· ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	o o				
victims 4:11 91:2 174:1         118:24 125:18 127:17 160:1         watched 77:18 108:6.25 129:2         91:14 93:13 120:8.11 121:10         168:11 173:7 177:14 186:6           Victoria 60:25 video 131:14,18,20 135:2 137:21         171:20 172:17 179:15 199:16 vatches 157:1         watches 157:1 184:16         matching 62:24 48:23 209:20 213:14 witness's 209:20 213:14 witness's 214:7 witness's 103:22 104:25 203:25 204:25 204:25 203:25 204:25 203:25 204:25 203:25 204:25 203:25 204:25 203:25 204:25 203:25								
174:1								
Victoria 60:25         162:7 167:14         165:15         484:16         187:20 195:19           video 131:14, 18, 20         179:15 199:16         200:7 202:15         watching 62:24         Wellbing 48:4, 23         187:20 195:19         209:20 213:14         witness's 214:7         witnesses 100:9         witnesses 100:9 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>								
video 131:14,18,20         171:20 172:17         watches 157:1         wellbeing 48:4,23         209:20 213:14           135:2 137:21         200:7 202:15         watching 62:24         Wells 158:25         Wells 158:25         witnesses 100:9           72:15 82:24 88:5         200:7 202:15         watching 62:24         Wells 158:25         Wells 158:25         witnesses 100:9           103:22 104:25         W         waiting 118:2         water 115:19         <			•	•	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
135:2 137:21   179:15 199:16   200:7 202:15   76:20,23 143:24   76:224 88:5   89:2 95:23   103:22 104:25								
view 41:1 62:3         200:7 202:15         watching 62:24         Wells 158:25         witnesses 100:9           72:15 82:24 88:5         29:523         water 41:5 94:19         water 115:19         water 115:19         175:2 198:17         witnesses 100:9           132:15 136:11         132:15 136:10         wait 74:15 94:19         waiting 118:2         26:15 28:7 30:16         water 21:25 122:23         women 2:20         women 2:22         % 2:25 6:11,19,20         2:25 6:11,19,20         2:20         10:25         10:10:10:12 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>								
72:15 82:24 88:5 89: 295:23 103:22 104:25 112:15 130:15 132:15 136:11 139:23 140:7 147:25 163:10 170:21 178:23 179:17 viewed 183:11 views 46:23 144:19 violence 98:5 violence 98:5 violent 98:12 visibility 60:4 87:8 87:11,19 88:5,20 132:1 45:7 63:18 79:3 83:15 90:6 violent 98:12 visibility 60:4 87:8 87:11,19 88:7,20 144:10 visibility 60:4 87:8 87:11,19 88:7,20 144:10 visiting 163:3 visits 170:4 197:12 voice 47:11,11 206:13 volume 147:3 volume 14								
89:2 95:23   103:22 104:25			S					
103:22 104:25   112:15 130:15   mait 74:15 94:19   mait 74:15 94:19   mait 74:15 94:19   132:15 136:11   139:23 140:7   147:25 163:10   170:21 178:23   179:17   malking 70:2   malking		203:25 204:25	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		O			
Table   Tabl		W						
132:15 136:11   139:23 140:7   179:15   179:15   198:14   179:21 178:23   179:17   179:17   179:18   179:17   179:18   189:12   179:18   189:12   179:18   189:12   179:18   189:12   179:18   189:12   179:17   189:11   196:15   189:12   198:14   199:162:5   189:12   199:18   189:12   199:19   189:12   199:19   189:12   199:19   189:12   199:19   189:12   199:19   189:12   199:19   189:12   199:19   189:12   199:19   189:12   199:19   189:12   199:19   189:12   199:19   189:12   199:19   189:12   199:19   189:12   199:19   189:12   199:19   189:19   199:19   189:19   199:19   189:19   199:19   189:19   199:19   189:19   199:19   189:19   199:19   189:19   199:19   189:19   199:19   189:19   199:19   189:19   199:19   189:19   199:19   189:19   199:19   189:19   199:19   189:19   199:19   189:19   199:19   189:19   199:1					′ ′			
139:23 140:7								
147:25 163:10 179:17		S	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		1			
170:21 178:23		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			· · · · ·			
179:17   viewed 183:11   views 46:23   144:19   162:5   132:1 45:7 63:18   132:1 45:7 63:18   132:1 45:7 63:18   132:1 45:8 65:2   100:6 116:9   100:6 116:9   129:12 146:8   153:4 158:12   160:8 162:15   160:8 162:15   132:2 187:10   144:10   visit 88:7 204:4,4   212:2   visit 196:3   visit 88:7 204:4,4   212:2   visit 196:3   visit 197:12   vice 47:11,11   206:13   vulnerabilities   v								
viewed 183:11         wall 188:11         want 1:23 8:20         13:21 45:7 63:18         166:16 182:7         whichever 19:25         whilst 166:5 180:5         wording 18:8           violence 98:5         79:3 83:15 90:6         100:6 116:9         210:13         200:18 21:1         words 66:25 69:21           violent 98:12         100:6 116:9         we'll 119:19         whole-system-a         200:2         work 7:1 26:13           87:11,19 88:5,9         153:4 158:12         113:20 121:17         we're 27:13         200:2         32:5 40:24 42:1           88:14 98:18,18         160:8 162:15         124:22 147:8         we've 30:8 43:2,3         185:19         48:4 52:11 54:20           14:10         199:12,182 200:3         43:7 63:11 91:12         widespread 142:2         71:12 90:22           visit 88:7 204:4,4         213:24         wanted 56:23         weapon 143:16         weapon 143:16         window 100:16,18         155:22 157:8           visits 170:4 197:12         208:2         warnings 146:16         weapon 144:10         Webb 64:12,16,19         weapon 144:10         webb 64:12,16,19         week 27:5 86:5         99:12 100:4         192:17 200:19           98:14,16 101:15         67:11 72:11         10:12,25 103:10         10:12,25 103:10         10:12,26 13         129:6 151:22         39:25					-			
views 46:23 144:19         want 1:23 8:20 13:21 45:7 63:18 79:3 83:15 90:6 violent 98:12         183:11 194:2 210:13         whilst 166:5 180:5 182:8 196:6 200:18 211:1 we'll 119:19         69:20 139:3 words 66:25 69:21 106:12 125:2           visibility 60:4 87:8 87:11,19 88:5,9 88:14 98:18,18 visible 87:13,20         153:4 158:12 153:4 158:12         13:20 121:17 we'll 119:19         whole-system-a 200:2         work 7:1 26:13 32:5 40:24 42:1 widen 211:7         32:5 40:24 42:1 43:20 47:3 48:3 43:20 47:3 48:3 43:20 47:3 48:3 43:7 63:11 91:12 132:9 206:16         we've 30:8 43:2,3 185:19         185:19         60:17,19,24 71:12 90:22         60:17,19,24 71:12 90:22         71:12 90:22 window 100:16,18 warpons 144:10         71:12 90:22 window 100:16,18 warpons 144:10         129:21 119:22 window 100:16,18 warpons 144:10         40:15 84:25 40:15 84:25         166:23 172:18 40:15 84:25         179:21 182:21         128:20 136:4 40:15 84:25         166:23 172:18 40:15 84:25 </td <td></td> <td>S</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>		S						
144:19       13:21 45:7 63:18       210:13       182:8 196:6       words 66:25 69:21         violence 98:5       violent 98:12       100:6 116:9       ways 90:3 193:11       we'll 119:19       whole-system-a       work 7:1 26:13         87:11,19 88:5,9       153:4 158:12       160:8 162:15       124:22 147:8       we're 27:13       200:2       32:5 40:24 42:1         visible 87:13,20       182:2 187:10       182:2 187:10       we've 30:8 43:2,3       185:19       wider 171:5 173:5       48:4 52:11 54:20         visit 88:7 204:4,4       212:2       wanted 56:23       waps 90:3 193:11       wider 171:5 173:5       48:515       48:4 52:11 54:20         visits 170:4 197:12       wanted 56:23       89:23 199:21       43:7 63:11 91:12       widespread 142:2       71:12 90:22         visits 170:4 197:12       wants 66:18       warning 149:2       weapons 144:10       web 64:12,16,19       87:12 88:10,11       179:5 181:2,23         volume 147:3       warnings 146:16       warranted 205:11       week 27:5 86:5       99:12 100:4       185:12 192:11,14         40:19,25 103:10       10:19,25 103:10       10:19,25 103:10       10:19,25 103:10       10:19,25 103:10       18:16 104:6       188:10       week 27:5 86:5       99:12 100:4       20:14 90:9       work-around       20:11 11:2								
violence 98:5         79:3 83:15 90:6         ways 90:3 193:11         200:18 211:1         106:12 125:2           violent 98:12         79:3 83:15 90:6         ways 90:3 193:11         whole-system-a         200:2         work 7:1 26:13           87:11,19 88:5,9         153:4 158:12         153:4 158:12         13:20 121:17         124:22 147:8         widen 211:7         43:20 47:3 48:3           88:14 98:18,18         160:8 162:15         182:2 187:10         we've 30:8 43:2,3         182:2 187:10         43:20 47:3 48:3           144:10         199:12,18 200:3         213:24         we've 30:8 43:2,3         43:7 63:11 91:12         wider 171:5 173:5         48:4 52:11 54:20           visit 88:7 204:4,4         212:2         wanted 56:23         89:23 199:21         132:9 206:16         weapon 143:16         window 100:16,18         121:3 144:13           visits 170:4 197:12         warning 149:2         warning 149:2         weapons 144:10         Webb 64:12,16,19         87:12 88:10,11         179:5 181:2,23           volume 147:3         warning 149:2         warning 149:2         week 27:5 86:5         99:12 100:4         208:4 211:23           98:14,16 101:15         67:11 72:11         81:16 104:6         88:10         98:21 115:9         157:3,10 204:19         209:1         200:1         208:4 211:23     <								
violent 98:12         100:6 116:9         we'll 119:19         whole-system-a         work 7:1 26:13           87:11,19 88:5,9         153:4 158:12         13:20 121:17         200:2         widen 211:7         43:20 47:3 48:3           88:14 98:18,18         160:8 162:15         124:22 147:8         widen 211:7         43:20 47:3 48:3           visible 87:13,20         144:10         199:12,18 200:3         43:7 63:11 91:12         185:19         60:17,19,24           visit 88:7 204:4,4         213:24         wanted 56:23         wanted 56:23         wanted 56:23         windown 100:16,18         20:11 19:22           visiting 163:3         89:23 199:21         145:4,4,69,25         wing 18:14 40:6,8         20:21 119:22           voice 47:11,11         206:13         warning 149:2         week 27:5 86:5         99:12 100:4         157:3,10 204:19         208:4 211:23           98:14,16 101:15         67:11 72:11         81:16 104:6         109:25 153:25         106:1,24 126:18         188:10         20:14         20:17 149:7         20:14         20:11         20:17 144:7         40:15 84:25         40:15 84:25         20:14 20:19         20:14 20:19         20:14 20:19         20:								
visibility 60:4 87:8         129:12 146:8         we're 27:13         200:2         32:5 40:24 42:1           87:11,19 88:5,9         153:4 158:12         113:20 121:17         widen 211:7         43:20 47:3 48:3           88:14 98:18,18         160:8 162:15         124:22 147:8         wider 171:5 173:5         48:4 52:11 54:20           144:10         199:12,18 200:3         43:7 63:11 91:12         widespread 142:2         71:12 90:22           visit 88:7 204:4,4         212:2         wanted 56:23         wapon 143:16         wapon 143:16         145:4,4,6,9,25         window 100:16,18         155:22 157:8           visits 170:4 197:12         wars 66:18         warning 149:2         warning 149:2         warnings 146:16         warnings 146:16         week 27:5 86:5         89:20 90:1 97:24         155:12 192:11,14           volume 147:3         warnated 205:11         warnated 205:11         wash't 45:16 65:17         98:21 115:9         157:3,10 204:19         208:4 211:23           101:19,25 103:10         81:16 104:6         188:10         188:10         204:19 209:9         work-around           109:25 153:25         167:2,8 169:12         17:13 172:4,8         179:20 184:8         39:25         weekends 12:5         weekends 12:5         wings' 89:6         worked 2:5,10           17:12 174:4 <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>								
87:11,19 88:5,9 88:14 98:18,18 visible 87:13,20 144:10 199:12,18 200:3 199:12,18 200:3 213:24 212:2 visit 88:7 204:4,4 212:2 voice 47:11,11 206:13 volume 147:3 vulnerabilities 44:24 92:3 97:25 98:14,16 101:15 101:19,25 103:10 109:25 153:25 167:2,8 169:12 173:20 184:8 173:21 174:4 184:1 185:15  153:4 158:12 113:20 121:17 124:22 147:8 we've 30:8 43:2,3 43:7 63:11 91:12 132:9 206:16 weapon 143:16 145:4,46,9,25 weapons 144:10 Webb 64:12,16,19 Wednesday 128:20 136:4 Week 27:5 86:5 98:14,16 101:15 101:19,25 103:10 109:25 153:25 167:2,8 169:12 171:13 172:4,8 173:21 174:4 184:1 185:15  153:4 158:12 113:20 121:17 124:22 147:8 we've 30:8 43:2,3 43:7 63:11 91:12 132:9 206:16 weapon 143:16 145:4,46,9,25 weapons 144:10 Webb 64:12,16,19 Wednesday 128:20 136:4 98:13,17,24 99:7 99:12 100:4 98:13,17,24 99:7 99:12 100:4 98:13,17,24 99:7 99:12 100:4 188:10 106:1,24 126:18 129:6 151:22 171:13 172:4,8 173:21 174:4 184:1 185:15  widen 211:7 widen 211:7 widen 211:7 widen 21:7 sistin 21:2 vistin 3:20 12:2 vis 8:23 185:19 win 85:23  82:21 11:2 20:11 119:22 vin 85:23  87:12 88:10,11 179:5 181:2,23 179:5 181:2,23 179:13 144:13 179:5 181:2,23 179:21 20:19 202:12 vis 8:29 00:10 7:10 20:4  179:20 184:8  179:20 184:8  207:10 20:4  202:12 win 85:23  87:12 88:10,11 179:5 181:2,23 179:5 181:2,23 179:21 19:12 vis 89:20 90:1 97:24 vis 19:20  87:12 89:20 90:1 97:24 vis 19:20  87:12 89:10 10:17  17:13 17:2:4 87:								
88:14 98:18,18       160:8 162:15       124:22 147:8       wider 171:5 173:5       48:4 52:11 54:20         visible 87:13,20       199:12,18 200:3       43:7 63:11 91:12       185:19       60:17,19,24         visit 88:7 204:4,4       213:24       wanted 56:23       wapon 143:16       win 85:23       92:11 119:22         visiting 163:3       89:23 199:21       208:2       wapon 143:16       window 100:16,18       121:3 144:13         voice 47:11,11       wants 66:18       warning 149:2       warning 149:2       week 27:5 86:5       98:21 115:9       166:23 172:18         vulnerabilities       44:24 92:3 97:25       warranted 205:11       week 27:5 86:5       98:21 115:9       157:3,10 204:19       208:4 211:23         98:14,16 101:15       67:11 72:11       81:16 104:6       188:10       165:7 177:22       179:20 184:8       129:6 151:22       179:20 184:8       165:7 177:22       179:20 184:8 <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>								
visible 87:13,20         182:2 187:10         199:12,18 200:3         43:7 63:11 91:12         185:19         60:17,19,24         71:12 90:22           visit 88:7 204:4,4         213:24         wanted 56:23         wanted 56:23         wepon 143:16         window 100:16,18         121:3 144:13           visiting 163:3         89:23 199:21         208:2         weapon 143:16         window 100:16,18         121:3 144:13           voice 47:11,11         wants 66:18         warning 149:2         weapons 144:10         Webb 64:12,16,19         87:12 88:10,11         179:5 181:2,23           volume 147:3         warranted 205:11         warranted 205:11         week 27:5 86:5         99:12 100:4         185:12 192:11,14           42:24 92:3 97:25         98:14,16 101:15         67:11 72:11         81:16 104:6         188:10         99:12 100:4         208:4 211:23         208:4 211:23           98:21 17:24,8         106:1,24 126:18         129:6 151:22         188:10         weekdays 12:4         85:15 87:8 155:9         work-around         192:13,15           17:12 17:44         179:20 184:8         207:10 209:4         27:5 91:22 93:18         wish 1:16 25:2         wish 1:16 25:2         151:14 155:21	, , ,							
144:10       199:12,18 200:3       199:12,18 200:3       199:12,18 200:3       199:12,18 200:3       199:12,18 200:3       199:12,18 200:3       199:12,18 200:3       199:12,18 200:3       199:12,18 200:3       199:12,18 200:3       199:12,18 200:3       199:12,18 200:3       199:12,18 200:3       199:12,18 200:3       199:12 13:29 206:16       wists 7204:4,4       199:21       132:9 206:16       wists 19:12       wists 170:4 197:12       199:21       132:9 206:16       weapon 143:16       145:4,4,6,9,25       wing 18:14 40:6,8       155:22 157:8       166:23 172:18         wolume 147:3       warning 149:2       Wednesday       89:20 90:1 97:24       185:12 192:11,14         43:20 136:4       warning 149:2       week 27:5 86:5       99:12 100:4       192:17 200:19       208:2       192:17 200:19       208:4 211:23       192:17 200:19       208:4 211:23       192:11 143:4       192:11 143:4       192:12 100:4       192:13 10       work-around <th <="" colspan="3" td=""><td>-</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></th>	<td>-</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>			-				
visit 88:7 204:4,4         213:24         32:9 206:16         win 85:23         92:11 119:22           visiting 163:3         wanted 56:23         89:23 199:21         145:4,4,6,9,25         window 100:16,18         121:3 144:13           visits 170:4 197:12         wants 66:18         weapons 144:10         weapons 144:10 <td>-</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>The state of the s</td>	-				The state of the s			
visiting 163:3         wanted 56:23         weapon 143:16         window 100:16,18         121:3 144:13           visits 170:4 197:12         wants 66:18         weapons 144:10         wing 18:14 40:6,8         155:22 157:8           voice 47:11,11         warning 149:2         weapons 144:10         Webb 64:12,16,19         89:20 90:1 97:24         166:23 172:18           volume 147:3         warnings 146:16         warnings 146:16         warnings 146:16         warnings 146:16         98:13,17,24 99:7         99:12 100:4         192:17 200:19           98:14,16 101:15         67:11 72:11         128:21 143:4         157:3,10 204:19         208:4 211:23           101:19,25 103:10         81:16 104:6         188:10         weekdays 12:4         85:15 87:8 155:9         work-around           109:25 153:25         165:7 177:22         165:7 177:22         weekends 12:5         weekends 12:5         wings' 89:6         worked 2:5,10           173:21 174:4         18:11 185:15         207:10 209:4         27:5 91:22 93:18         wish 1:16 25:2         151:14 155:21								
visiting 163:3         89:23 199:21         145:4,4,6,9,25         wing 18:14 40:6,8         155:22 157:8           visits 170:4 197:12         wants 66:18         weapons 144:10         weapons 144:10         wing 18:14 40:6,8         155:22 157:8           volume 147:3         warning 149:2         warnings 146:16         week 27:5 86:5         98:13,17,24 99:7         192:17 200:19           vulnerabilities         warnings 146:16         warnings 146:16         week 27:5 86:5         99:12 100:4         208:4 211:23           98:14,16 101:15         67:11 72:11         81:16 104:6         188:10         wings 10:19 52:9         work-around           109:25 153:25         165:7 177:22         weekdays 12:4         39:25         155:16         work-arounds           179:20 184:8         207:10 209:4         207:10 209:4         27:5 91:22 93:18         wish 1:16 25:2         151:14 155:21	visit 88:7 204:4,4		132:9 206:16		92:11 119:22			
visits 170:4 197:12         208:2         weapons 144:10         40:15 84:25         166:23 172:18           voice 47:11,11         warning 149:2         weapons 144:10         87:12 88:10,11         179:5 181:2,23           volume 147:3         warnings 146:16         warnings 146:16         week 27:5 86:5         99:12 100:4         185:12 192:11,14           vulnerabilities         warnings 146:16         warnings 146:16         week 27:5 86:5         99:12 100:4         208:4 211:23           98:14,16 101:15         67:11 72:11         81:16 104:6         106:1,24 126:18         129:6 151:22         188:10         weekdays 12:4         85:15 87:8 155:9         work-around           173:21 174:4         179:20 184:8         weekly 20:9,24         wise 27:3 37:25         worked 2:5,10           184:1 185:15         207:10 209:4         27:5 91:22 93:18         wish 1:16 25:2         151:14 155:21			<b>weapon</b> 143:16	· /	121:3 144:13			
voice 47:11,11         wants 66:18         Webb 64:12,16,19         87:12 88:10,11         179:5 181:2,23           volume 147:3         warnings 146:16         warnted 205:11         Wednesday         98:13,17,24 99:7         192:17 200:19           vulnerabilities         warnted 205:11         wasn't 45:16 65:17         98:21 115:9         157:3,10 204:19         208:4 211:23           98:14,16 101:15         67:11 72:11         128:21 143:4         204:19 209:9         work-around           109:25 153:25         167:2,8 169:12         129:6 151:22         39:25         weekends 12:5         wings' 89:6         worked 2:5,10           173:21 174:4         179:20 184:8         207:10 209:4         27:5 91:22 93:18         wish 1:16 25:2         151:14 155:21	visiting 163:3		145:4,4,6,9,25	wing 18:14 40:6,8	155:22 157:8			
206:13         warning 149:2         Wednesday         89:20 90:1 97:24         185:12 192:11,14           volume 147:3         warnings 146:16         warranted 205:11         week 27:5 86:5         99:12 100:4         192:17 200:19           44:24 92:3 97:25         wasn't 45:16 65:17         67:11 72:11         128:21 143:4         157:3,10 204:19         208:4 211:23           98:14,16 101:15         67:11 72:11         81:16 104:6         188:10         wings 10:19 52:9         work-around           109:25 153:25         106:1,24 126:18         129:6 151:22         39:25         155:16         work-arounds           173:21 174:4         179:20 184:8         weekly 20:9,24         wings' 89:6         worked 2:5,10           184:1 185:15         207:10 209:4         207:10 209:4         27:5 91:22 93:18         wish 1:16 25:2         151:14 155:21	visits 170:4 197:12			40:15 84:25	166:23 172:18			
volume 147:3         warnings 146:16         128:20 136:4         98:13,17,24 99:7         192:17 200:19           vulnerabilities         44:24 92:3 97:25         wasn't 45:16 65:17         98:21 115:9         98:21 115:9         157:3,10 204:19         208:4 211:23           98:14,16 101:15         67:11 72:11         81:16 104:6         188:10         wings 10:19 52:9         work-around           109:25 153:25         106:1,24 126:18         129:6 151:22         39:25         85:15 87:8 155:9         192:17 200:19           171:13 172:4,8         165:7 177:22         weekdays 12:4         85:15 87:8 155:9         work-arounds           173:21 174:4         179:20 184:8         weekly 20:9,24         wise 27:3 37:25         worked 2:5,10           184:1 185:15         207:10 209:4         27:5 91:22 93:18         wish 1:16 25:2         151:14 155:21	voice 47:11,11		Webb 64:12,16,19	87:12 88:10,11	179:5 181:2,23			
vulnerabilities         warranted 205:11         week 27:5 86:5         99:12 100:4         208:4 211:23           98:14,16 101:15         67:11 72:11         157:3,10 204:19         213:1           101:19,25 103:10         81:16 104:6         188:10         wings 10:19 52:9         work-around           109:25 153:25         106:1,24 126:18         129:6 151:22         weekaays 12:4         85:15 87:8 155:9         192:13,15           171:13 172:4,8         165:7 177:22         weekends 12:5         wings' 89:6         worked 2:5,10           173:21 174:4         179:20 184:8         207:10 209:4         27:5 91:22 93:18         wish 1:16 25:2         151:14 155:21	206:13		Wednesday	89:20 90:1 97:24	185:12 192:11,14			
44:24 92:3 97:25       wasn't 45:16 65:17       98:21 115:9       157:3,10 204:19       213:1         98:14,16 101:15       67:11 72:11       128:21 143:4       204:19 209:9       work-around         101:19,25 103:10       81:16 104:6       188:10       wings 10:19 52:9       202:14         109:25 153:25       106:1,24 126:18       129:6 151:22       39:25       155:16       work-arounds         171:13 172:4,8       165:7 177:22       weekends 12:5       wings' 89:6       worked 2:5,10         173:21 174:4       179:20 184:8       weekly 20:9,24       wise 27:3 37:25       101:17 144:7         184:1 185:15       207:10 209:4       27:5 91:22 93:18       wish 1:16 25:2       151:14 155:21	<b>volume</b> 147:3		128:20 136:4	98:13,17,24 99:7	192:17 200:19			
98:14,16 101:15 101:19,25 103:10 109:25 153:25 167:2,8 169:12 171:13 172:4,8 173:21 174:4 184:1 185:15  67:11 72:11 128:21 143:4 188:10 weekdays 12:4 39:25 weekends 12:5 weekends 12:5 weekly 20:9,24 184:1 185:15  67:11 72:11 128:21 143:4 188:10 wings 10:19 52:9 85:15 87:8 155:9 155:16 wings' 89:6 wings' 89:6 wings' 89:6 wings' 89:6 wings' 89:6 wings' 89:6 weekly 20:9,24 27:5 91:22 93:18 wish 1:16 25:2 151:14 155:21	vulnerabilities		week 27:5 86:5	99:12 100:4	208:4 211:23			
101:19,25 103:10       81:16 104:6       188:10       wings 10:19 52:9       202:14         109:25 153:25       106:1,24 126:18       weekdays 12:4       85:15 87:8 155:9       work-arounds         167:2,8 169:12       129:6 151:22       39:25       155:16       192:13,15         171:13 172:4,8       165:7 177:22       weekends 12:5       wings' 89:6       worked 2:5,10         173:21 174:4       179:20 184:8       weekly 20:9,24       wise 27:3 37:25       101:17 144:7         184:1 185:15       207:10 209:4       27:5 91:22 93:18       wish 1:16 25:2       151:14 155:21	44:24 92:3 97:25		98:21 115:9	157:3,10 204:19	213:1			
109:25 153:25       106:1,24 126:18       weekdays 12:4       85:15 87:8 155:9       work-arounds         167:2,8 169:12       129:6 151:22       39:25       155:16       192:13,15         171:13 172:4,8       165:7 177:22       weekends 12:5       wings' 89:6       worked 2:5,10         173:21 174:4       179:20 184:8       weekly 20:9,24       wise 27:3 37:25       101:17 144:7         184:1 185:15       207:10 209:4       27:5 91:22 93:18       wish 1:16 25:2       151:14 155:21	98:14,16 101:15		128:21 143:4	204:19 209:9	work-around			
167:2,8 169:12       129:6 151:22       39:25       155:16       192:13,15         171:13 172:4,8       165:7 177:22       weekends 12:5       wings' 89:6       worked 2:5,10         173:21 174:4       179:20 184:8       weekly 20:9,24       wise 27:3 37:25       101:17 144:7         184:1 185:15       207:10 209:4       27:5 91:22 93:18       wish 1:16 25:2       151:14 155:21	101:19,25 103:10	81:16 104:6	188:10	wings 10:19 52:9	202:14			
167:2,8 169:12       129:6 151:22       39:25       155:16       192:13,15         171:13 172:4,8       165:7 177:22       weekends 12:5       wings' 89:6       worked 2:5,10         173:21 174:4       179:20 184:8       weekly 20:9,24       wise 27:3 37:25       101:17 144:7         184:1 185:15       207:10 209:4       27:5 91:22 93:18       wish 1:16 25:2       151:14 155:21	109:25 153:25	•	weekdays 12:4	85:15 87:8 155:9	work-arounds			
173:21 174:4 179:20 184:8 weekly 20:9,24 wise 27:3 37:25 101:17 144:7 27:5 91:22 93:18 wish 1:16 25:2 151:14 155:21	167:2,8 169:12		· ·	155:16	192:13,15			
173:21 174:4	171:13 172:4,8		weekends 12:5	wings' 89:6	worked 2:5,10			
184:1 185:15 207:10 209:4 27:5 91:22 93:18 wish 1:16 25:2 151:14 155:21	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	179:20 184:8		<u> </u>	· ·			
7 60 40 67 0		207:10 209:4						
210:3   watch 63:18 65:9   110:5,15 155:17   56:25 74:16   worker 50:22,23		watch 63:18 65:9						
70:15 77:2,4		70:15 77:2,4	, ,					
i i i i		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>			

				Page 249
			Ì	Ì
114:14 117:14	185:11	23:7 65:9 117:3	<b>158</b> 215:5	97:6 129:14
workers 113:7	wrote 37:4 190:6,6	132:1 152:6,9,11	<b>16</b> 36:12	164:16,23 178:9
117:5	207:1 209:23	163:20 176:25	<b>16.4.1</b> 53:20 89:19	186:12,16 194:8
workforce 38:8		194:1 195:5	<b>1600</b> 143:11	194:16 206:25
working 35:9	X X 21 4 25	215:1,2	<b>162</b> 25:4,5	<b>2018</b> 50:4 125:5,8
38:15,19,24	X 214:25	<b>1.00</b> 138:14	<b>169</b> 115:4 168:8	194:9 208:22
48:21 75:17 81:2	Y	<b>1.1</b> 53:7	<b>17</b> 125:5	<b>2019</b> 28:20 48:10
92:6,12,15,16	$\frac{1}{Y}$ 124:9	<b>1.16</b> 157:19	<b>18</b> 12:6 40:12,13	73:12 125:5,7
126:2 132:7,8		<b>1.2</b> 53:23	94:7 114:4	194:9 208:23
148:25 159:2	Yan 64:10,14	<b>10</b> 4:15 12:4 39:24	123:25 138:17	<b>2020</b> 2:15 6:24
169:21 170:11	yards 85:15	107:9,9 132:14	140:24 141:23	25:4,6 30:17
173:1 174:10	Yarl's 2:11,18,23	138:13 147:20,25	146:11 148:17	34:7,7,25 39:12
178:2,21 179:2	2:25 6:11,19,20	<b>10.00</b> 1:2 10:13	<b>180</b> 122:19	46:4 73:12 90:11
192:9 199:5,18	7:7,10,14 8:2	214:17,21	<b>19</b> 28:21	92:25 100:7,9,21
211:22 212:25	10:2	<b>10.00~pm</b> 11:3	<b>195</b> 194:17	102:20 103:24
workload 26:5	yeah 43:1 64:15,22	<b>100</b> 16:4,7,8 34:20		105:4 115:7,11
works 13:21 14:1	66:17 109:2	60:10 113:3	2	115:13 116:9,13
18:13 25:6 53:23	year 5:3 37:12,13	210:16	<b>2</b> 2:17 9:18 12:6	120:14,21 122:6
149:11 164:4	39:15 43:8 47:13	<b>101</b> 119:10,11	13:14 15:23 22:7	122:8 123:7
169:1 171:3	52:23,24,25 54:8	<b>102</b> 96:6 147:19,24	53:6 94:18	124:20 125:7
181:1	83:22 126:7	<b>103</b> 95:10	115:11 117:3	126:23 138:25
workshop 180:22	161:2	<b>11</b> 18:7 32:7	123:9 183:22	139:18 140:25
181:12 198:11	yearly 29:14,18	107:19 187:23	187:20 190:7	153:5 154:19
202:20	44:6	<b>11.35</b> 83:6,10	193:4 194:2	194:9 195:9,9,12
workshops 46:3,9	years 2:6,12 50:3	<b>11.50</b> 83:7	195:5	208:19
61:6,9	83:20 91:11	<b>11.55</b> 83:12	<b>2.00</b> 157:16,21	<b>2021</b> 24:20 34:23
<b>WORM</b> 20:9,22	131:15 133:6	<b>113</b> 92:23	<b>2.1</b> 12:13 18:21,22	34:25 35:1,3
worn 137:21	149:3 159:5	115 92:23	18:24 19:7 22:14	37:3,13 39:14
145:17	177:7 193:21	<b>118</b> 187:21	23:5,8 59:2	53:6 93:1 122:8
worsened 116:14	196:9	<b>12</b> 2:4 126:8	<b>2.24</b> 50:1	122:12 147:18
worth 13:12	yesterday 37:5	128:10	<b>2.25</b> 51:16	186:5 187:23
wouldn't 21:5	139:23 159:1	<b>12.55</b> 138:12	<b>2.3</b> 14:5 15:5	189:12 194:10
27:25 40:16 57:5	163:9 180:22	<b>120</b> 137:23	<b>20</b> 38:13,23 89:6	195:8,21,21
57:9 63:5 67:18	181:19 198:17	<b>122</b> 151:8	124:17 147:22	203:23 204:14
76:12,23 90:18	213:20,24 Varlatina 206:17	<b>126</b> 81:1	150:3 155:9	<b>2022</b> 1:1,16 186:5
97:19 114:14	<b>Yorkshire</b> 206:17	<b>13</b> 33:23 36:11	198:18	194:10 214:22
120:13 127:5,6	young 136:23	75:17 97:5 116:8	<b>200</b> 156:16,18,19	<b>203</b> 14:4
136:16 142:10	$\overline{\mathbf{z}}$	149:2	<b>2007</b> 2:19	<b>21</b> 2:15 87:13,15
147:6,11 148:2		<b>131</b> 195:18	<b>2010</b> 28:25 152:15	87:20 146:10
154:15 167:11,16	0	<b>14</b> 33:23 36:11	153:1	156:3,13 188:24
201:20 202:8	<b>0.25</b> 14:10	46:10,13 62:4	<b>2011</b> 5:12	<b>21-day</b> 118:2
write 140:1	0000001 143:8	123:19,22 151:21	<b>2013</b> 5:12,17 28:25	<b>21-page</b> 46:2
writing 108:11	<b>000176</b> 141:1	188:9 197:18	152:15 153:1	<b>210</b> 15:21,22
196:25	<b>031</b> 36:21	<b>15</b> 36:12 42:15,19	158:17	<b>211</b> 15:22
written 55:11 59:3	<b>04</b> 208:19	47:22,22 53:6,21	<b>2015</b> 2:25 5:12,17	<b>2123</b> 135:7
96:12 146:16		75:17 175:3	7:16	<b>213</b> 215:6
183:19 203:1	1	<b>15-minute</b> 83:7	<b>2016</b> 2:12 6:9,11	<b>214</b> 16:12
212:12	<b>1</b> 1:1,14,16 2:5	<b>155</b> 215:3	183:25 191:6,11	<b>215</b> 16:24
wrong 17:20 67:5	14:10 16:23 18:6	<b>157</b> 215:4	194:9	<b>22</b> 112:8 132:21
			<b>2017</b> 68:6 88:19	
	-	•	-	•

				Page 250
<b>23</b> 25:3 34:5,6,21	173:14 174:13,17	<b>40s</b> 97:5	<b>93</b> 108:3,19	
59:19 141:19	173.14 174.13,17	<b>40 40 3 7</b> . <b>3 41</b> 123:1	<b>94</b> 146:21	
189:24	174.21 173.2,4	<b>42</b> 95:9	<b>95</b> 148:16	
<b>24</b> 49:13 96:23	177:10,11,14,21	<b>42</b> 93.9 <b>43</b> 81:23	<b>96</b> 127:20	
133:1 134:19	178:7,8,22 179:5	<b>44</b> 45:10,17	<b>97</b> 141:19,22	
140:2,9,11	179:24 180:21	<b>45</b> 195:20	<b>98</b> 127:21	
140.2,9,11	181:21 183:22	<b>45</b> -minute 192:1	70 127.21	
164:22 166:6	184:23 190:25	<b>47</b> 84:16 159:13		
168:17	191:22 192:21,23			
<b>24/7</b> 132:17,24	193:10,17,23	140:5 159:12		
<b>248</b> 194:18	195:10,17,23	140.3 139.12		
<b>25</b> 52:14,17 68:6	198:19 200:13,18	5		
<b>250</b> 41:16	203:21 213:23	<b>5</b> 3:17,22 14:11		
<b>26</b> 73:24 123:20,22	<b>35(1)</b> 183:22	16:14 102:23		
<b>27</b> 2:6 5:4 11:22	185:24 186:5,9	160:17		
12:2 25:6	186:21 187:11	<b>5.11</b> 51:6		
<b>27,441</b> 41:24	188:1,12 190:12	<b>5.9</b> 51:6		
<b>294</b> 61:9	192:5 193:4	<b>50</b> 13:12,13 153:12		
	194:21 201:1,13	<b>50,000</b> 14:11 15:1		
3	202:2,17	<b>58</b> 134:18		
<b>3</b> 94:18 117:3	<b>35(1)s</b> 186:11,13	<b>59</b> 5:17 51:6		
124:1,1,5,12,12	201:9			
<b>3.17</b> 214:20	<b>35(2)</b> 24:5 181:5	6		
<b>3.2</b> 103:19	192:5 194:4,6,7	<b>6</b> 18:7 104:20		
<b>30</b> 43:4	194:11,21,24	<b>60</b> 118:3 194:16		
<b>31</b> 12:14 100:21	195:10,15 196:1	<b>60.8</b> 12:23		
<b>32</b> 108:3,19	197:19,21,22,23	<b>65</b> 13:16 134:18		
<b>330</b> 156:10	198:7,21 200:25	<b>689</b> 147:21		
<b>34</b> 160:10,12,15,18	201:15 202:2,18			
160:20 161:5,9	35(2)s 201:8	7		
161:16,21 163:5	<b>35(3)</b> 194:3	7 4:15 12:21 34:4,5		
164:14,24 166:7	<b>35s</b> 176:15 183:11	34:6 54:18 125:7		
166:19 167:11	<b>36</b> 124:5,5 177:4	142:13 168:11		
168:18 169:3,21	<b>37</b> 177:8	<b>7.00</b> 10:13 11:2		
170:11 172:20	<b>384</b> 74:1	<b>72</b> 81:24 140:1,5		
175:6 200:13	3in3 58:8	<b>73</b> 195:20		
<b>35</b> 5:13 13:16 24:2	<b>3s</b> 124:5	<b>75</b> 12:4 39:25		
25:15 52:14,17		47:15 178:10		
52:19 90:11	4	<b>76</b> 12:6 138:16,21		
91:13,17 92:25	<b>4</b> 6:11 9:18,21	8		
103:16 117:21,22	10:10 32:6 38:13	<b>8</b> 11:22 12:14		
117:25 118:18	160:11 214:22	125:7 173:7		
119:3 160:10	<b>4.53</b> 88:14	<b>80</b> 3:20 178:8		
161:11,17 162:2	<b>40</b> 47:20 73:20	<b>84</b> 210:24		
163:5 164:14	95:8,11,18,21,22			
165:19,23 166:9	96:6,11,15 97:21	9		
167:11,17 168:13	99:5,14,22	93:17 12:5 73:17		
168:20 169:5,13	151:25	9.9 86:23		
169:21 170:11	<b>40(2)</b> 96:17	<b>92</b> 146:10		
171:7 172:10	<b>406.6</b> 12:25			
	1	1	ı	