

BROOK HOUSE INQUIRY

FIRST WITNESS STATEMENT OF PETER THOMAS CORRIGAN

I, **PETER THOMAS CORRIGAN**,

will say as follows:

BACKGROUND

1. My date of birth is [DPA] and I make this statement following the Inquiry's Rule 9 request dated 18 February 2022.
2. I graduated with a sociology degree in 1980 from Manchester Polytechnic. I completed my post-graduate diploma in criminology in 1992 and I then went on to do a MBA in 1997. I joined HM Prison Service in 1988 and worked there for 12 years. I resigned at the end of January 2000 and went on to work for UK DS Limited (now Sodexo Limited). I worked on the opening of HM Prison Forest Bank from early January until May 2007.
3. I began working for G4S Care and Justice Services (UK) Limited ('G4S') in May 2007 as an operational support manager. My job title changed to senior project manager after a couple of years. I cannot remember exactly when this changed, as it was a smooth transition and I gradually began being given more responsibility.
4. I left G4S in November 2018. I realised I didn't really like working, so I retired aged 58. G4S did however sometimes contact me for occasional projects for me to do, but this is not very often.

INTERACTION WITH BROOK HOUSE

5. I went to Brook House in August 2017 as a consequence of us finding out that the Panorama documentary was going to be aired on the television. Peter Small and others conducted an investigation into Brook House and Mike Gibson and I arrived at Brook House to put together an action plan based on Peter Small's investigation.
6. When I arrived at Brook House in August 2017, it seemed to me that the Home Office wanted to keep costs as low as possible in relation to the centre. They had previously negotiated with us for the number of staff and managers to be reduced. A few supervisory staff grades were removed. I cannot think of any specific examples.
7. In my opinion, there were not enough staff and not enough supervisors to safely manage the detainee population. There was a reduced number of staff and lack of supervision. The first time that I went to Brook House, the staff were behind a counter in the office. A large number of detainees were at the counter asking for a number of different things and there simply were not enough staff members to meet their needs. We dealt with this by negotiating with the Home Office in order to increase the staffing numbers.
8. It seemed to me that there were some detainees struggling with their mental health in Brook House. Mental health issues in custodial environments are always a concern. I do not know enough about healthcare in Brook House for me to comment on how they were treated or protected.
9. I have been asked to give my opinion of the management and leadership at Brook House focusing particularly on my understanding of the values and priorities of the senior management team and how this impacted on staff. I did not arrive until the very end of the Relevant Period therefore the problems that Brook House was experiencing with staff and management etc. had already become apparent. It is difficult for me to comment on what the values and priorities were prior to arriving.

INVESTIGATIONS ON BEHALF OF G4S

10. I have been asked to comment on my involvement in investigating grievances raised by Duncan Partridge against Ben Saunders in 2014 and the findings reached. I cannot

recall any detail about this as it was so long ago. All I remember is that I was assisting Lee Hanford.

11. I have been asked to comment on my involvement in investigating grievances raised against Dave Roffey in 2018. There were two complaints made against Dave Roffey both of which had a racial element to them. One of the two complaints had actually been reported on behalf of a Portuguese employee. Upon reading the statement, it transpired that the Portuguese employee actually liked Dave. She stated that whilst he could be a bit intimidating and noisy, he was always very helpful when sorting out any problems she was having in the control room. There was nothing to substantiate the allegation. I cannot recall finding anything in relation to the second complaint.

12. I do not think that I had any involvement in any other disciplinary or grievances investigations at Brook House. Many of the complaints were dealt with by the Home Office.

SPECIFIC POINT OF CONTACT ("SPOC")

13. I have been asked to provide a summary of role as SPOC on behalf of G4S for the Home Office PSU investigations. Whenever there was an action plan being drawn up, I would receive a lot of work for people on site to complete. I would help with logistics and ensure that people were available for the Home Office investigators. I was not investigating, I would just facilitate the investigation. I did not experience many difficulties or obstacles when trying to obtain evidence, documents or arrange interviews. The only thing I can think of is that there were not many documents to support the Panorama footage. Callum Tulley was recording incidents and not reporting them as he should have done. I tried to find evidence to support or refute the things shown on Panorama but it was difficult, as there were not many incident reports etc. to support the footage.

14. I did not face any difficulties with PSU.

15. I never felt any pressure to not co-operate with PSU. They were our employers and we were the contractor. We always co-operated.

INVOLVEMENT IN ACTIONS FOLLOWING PANORAMA

16. I have been asked to refer to Document CJS0000813 and summarise the report on the outcome of allegations of inappropriate behaviour by G4S staff at the Gatwick Immigration Removal Centres highlighted by the BBC Documentary and document CJS0000812. My role was a sort of "Mr Fix It.". I was there to try to substantiate the allegations made in the Panorama documentary and help form solutions. My job was to sift through the documents and ask further questions. This was probably the last time that I was sent in to carry out this sort of work. I was selected to be involved because I had done similar investigations before for different sites.
17. The purpose of this report was to investigate the allegations made during the Panorama documentary.
18. It was difficult to find any documentation in relation to the allegations. The process was a paper chase. All allegations were historic and considerably pre-dated my involvement. Callum Tulley should have reported these incidents and he did not, so the paperwork that should have existed did not. The alleged underage detainee shown on the Panorama documentary was also proven not be underage. The relevant assessments were carried out and it was confirmed that he was 18. This was not shown on the documentary.
19. An action plan was put together as a response to the whole investigation and there were a series of update reports that I was involved in producing. An update report was done every week in order to report progress. I don't recall any of the findings or actions being challenged. We would put together an action plan, agree it with the Home Office and then report progress against it. From memory, there was never any push back.
20. I have been asked to refer to Document CJS0000736 and summarise my overall role in the development, carrying out and monitoring of the G4S Brook House 3 month Action Plan and my role as project manager. In particular I have been asked to provide a detailed summary of the introduction of new body worn cameras. I was one of the

people who put the action plans together based on investigations and review of documentation. It was my job to report on progress. I then transitioned into the role of Project Manager. The body worn cameras for staff were introduced and deployed in September 2017. This was the first thing that we did following the creation of the action plan.

21. I have also been asked to provide a summary of exploring sound intelligence's aggression detection system. The purpose of this system was to detect anger or aggression in a person's voice in the hope of enabling staff to diffuse a hostile situation before it escalated. This was not implemented. We had received feedback from the prison service that it did not work very well (explained further below).
22. There were no other areas under my ownership or supervision that I recall.
23. I do not recall there being any difficulties with introducing body worn cameras. We already had a supply chain, relevant documentation and training. It was a smooth process. The cameras were a relatively new concept at the time therefore they had not have been introduced prior to the Panorama documentary being aired. We originally introduced them in HMP Oakwood and as they were successful there, we rolled them out across the G4S prison estate .
24. I have been asked to refer to Document CJS0073977, G4S Brook House 3 Month Action Plan dated 9 March 2018 and provide an update/outcome on the discussions with G4S medical services to be provided with body worn cameras. I have no recollection of the outcome of whether nurses had body worn video. I remember that there was a debate about whether it was appropriate for nurses to wear them, as it may compromise medical confidentiality.
25. I have been asked to provide an update of the sound intelligence's aggression detection system. From my recollection, it was put to use in HMP Berwyn and did not work very well. The feedback was quite negative from the prison service therefore it was decided that we would not implement it.
26. I have been asked to refer to Document VER000251 and confirm whether there have been any difficulties or reluctance faced when trying to implement the Brook House

Action Plan. I do not recall there being any difficulties or reluctance faced. Everything was straightforward.

27. I do not know whether any proposed actions remain outstanding as I no longer work for G4S. I left the project in autumn of 2018.
28. I have been asked to refer to Document VER000279 and expand on the changes that I assisted James Begg with in relation to violent incidents and safer community reporting. This is to include an explanation of what was proposed, issues with the previous proposal, where the other places are that already reported as you proposed, whether the proposed change was part of the Brook House Action Plan. James Begg was the violence reduction manager. He was fairly junior and newly promoted at the time. I remember that he did not really know what to do. The prison service was good at managing violence and there were already good strategies and procedures in place. It was fairly easy for me to dip into previous documents I had prepared and amend them to fit the current situation.
29. Brook House was quite isolated, as it was an Immigration Removal Centre and not a prison therefore it didn't really draw on other systems and processes. There wasn't really a process for investigating incidents properly. There were just allegations and people walking around with unexplained black eyes etc. I brought previous experience of managing these sorts of things from my time working in the prison service. G4S did not investigate complaints, Borders Agency did this.
30. G4S sites and prison service sites had already implemented these changes. The PSOs and PSIs seemed more sophisticated than what was implemented by the Home Office.
31. I cannot recall if the proposed change was part of the Brook House Action Plan. I don't think it was, as the action plan was done the year before. The action plan did relate to making Brook House safer but these particular changes were not included.

STATEMENT OF TRUTH

I believe that the facts stated herein are true.

I understand that proceedings for contempt of court may be brought against anyone who makes, or causes to be made, a false statement in a document verified by a statement of truth without an honest belief in its truth.

Signed: Peter Corrigan.

Dated: 15 March 2022.