



Home Office

Increasing detention capacity at Brook and Tinsley House

FBC

December 2015

Executive Summary

You must refer to Business Case Guidance Chapter 2: Executive Summary

Please complete questions 1 to 7 below:

Question 1: What decision are you seeking?

Approval of funding for a capital spend of up to £[REDACTED] (down from £[REDACTED] at OBC stage) and additional annual resource costs of £[REDACTED].

Question 2: What is the project trying to achieve?

Additional bed space capacity at Brook (60 beds) and Tinsley House (47 beds).

Question 3: How will you go about delivering it?

The construction element will be delivered by Wates (preferred contractor following a tendering exercise). Our client rep and our PM will monitor the build work.

The additional resource component will be supplied by the current operator G4S and a couple of additional staff will be required by the Home Office to help manage the additional detainee numbers at these sites.

Question 4: What options have been considered?

- Do Nothing. (Short list)
- Do Minimum taken as only doing the beds at Brook House*. (Short list)
- Increasing capacity at Brook and Tinsley House by double bunking a number of the rooms (the option set out in this OBC). (Short list)
- Expanding Tinsley House using a new build extension. (Long list)
- Increasing the number of beds at Brook House by putting in an additional bunk bed on the higher floors as well as the ground floor. (Long list)
- Increasing capacity through a new build extension at Campsfield. (Long list)

*Only adding additional beds at Tinsley House was rejected on the basis of cost as the bulk of the costs fall on this site and if additional beds are not added here then we will not need to do the additional enhancements works such as the ventilation.

| |
|--|
| |
| |

3.3.2 Resultant service requirements

As stated above the resultant service requirements are for G4S to operate the enlarged facilities.

The operation of the facilities will be monitored by the on-site team and maintenance requirements will be monitored by Steve Brinkworth from NOMS, who monitors the rest of our detention estate.

3.4 Recommendation

That the preferred option of adding beds and Brook and Tinsley House is supported, as it provides the Home Office with a very cost effective and quick way of increasing capacity at one of our strategic locations.

3.5 Lessons learned

That projects of this nature require close project management to ensure that they deliver on time and to budget, and that the project manager needs to be able to directly have sight from NOMS of both the actual and forecast spend.

The Client Rep will be required to monitor work on-site on a regular basis so that the number of snags at the end of the project are reduced and a smooth transition to the operator can be achieved.

3.6 Determine benefits, risks, constraints and dependencies

3.6.1 Main benefits

Savings to the Home Office/Government

Increased bed capacity in the South East (Gatwick cluster) which in turn reduces the bed rate per night at these IRCs as follows:

Brook House Saving of £■■■■ per bed per night

Tinsley House Saving of £■■■■ per bed per night

(See Section 7.8.2 for a breakdown of the impact of this saving over 25 years)

Improves Services

Facilities at both sites will be enhanced thereby improving the detainee experience.

This increased capacity can assist our enforcement activity nationally.

Management Section

You must refer to Business Case Guidance Chapter 7: Management Section

7.1 Governance, assurance, approvals and controls

7.1.1 Governance

The project has established a Project Board, which generally meets monthly. Its composition is as follows:

| BROOK & TINSLEY HOUSE INCREASE CAPACITY PROJECT BOARD | | |
|---|--|--------------------------------|
| Martin Yale Programme Manager Senior Responsible Officer (SRO) | Alan Gibson Head of Operations, Returns Directorate Senior User | |
| Steve Sumitomo-Wyatt Business Project Manager | | |
| Maria Rusk Project Assurance Programme Office/ Communications/ Stakeholder Management | | |
| Katy White Operational Lead | Garth Furnidge Finance Lead | Colin Welch Commercial Lead |
| Steve Brinkworth Maintenance Adviser | Professional Advisers: James Masters Mott McDonald Client Rep | |

The roles of colleagues involved in the project's governance are as follows:

| Role Name | Purpose (how this role adds value) | Person's name | Accountabilities (what the individual is accountable for) |
|---------------------------------|--|----------------------|--|
| Sponsor | Strategic Director | Clare Checksfield | The strategic need for the Project in the context of Returns and the Detention Estate. |
| Senior Responsible Owner | Providing direction to the Detention Estate programme as a | Martin Yale | Clear definition of the project and agreeing budgets and resources. |

| | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|--|--|
| | whole. Interface to Home Office senior management team | | Appropriate and effective delivery of the project within the agreed time, cost and quality parameters and appropriate management of risk Monitoring progress against programme, quality and cost. | |
| Senior Business User | Effective co-ordination with operational needs | Alan Gibson represented at Project Board by Phil Schoenenberger | Definition of the end-product – compliance with Operating Standards/ Rules, other statutory recommendations, effective outcomes. | |
| Business Project Manager | Managing the Project Coordination of external and internal professional teams | Steve Sumitomo-Wyatt | Management of all aspects of the overall administrative delivery of the project, including costs and business case. | |
| Senior Supplier – Commercial | Provides oversight of procurements | Colin Welch | In respect of the operating contract, compliance with procurement rules/ procedure to secure appropriate procurement route for implementation and ensuring that Value for Money is achieved. | |
| Finance | Provides agreement on budget availability | Garth Furnidge | Confirmation of budgets. | |

7.1.2 Assurance and approvals

The project requires approvals from PIC at each Business Stage. It has been agreed with PIC Secretariat that given the urgent nature of this project it will be considered out of committee at both OBC and FBC stage and that a Gateway Review will not be conducted as the case for the