

BROOK HOUSE INQUIRY

FIRST WITNESS STATEMENT OF CLARE SPOTTISWOODE

I, **Clare Spottiswoode**, will say as follows:

BACKGROUND

1. I make this statement pursuant to the Inquiry's Rule 9 Request dated 3 March 2022.
2. By way of a summary of my career, I was the CEO for Spottiswoode and Spottiswoode from 1984-1988. My main key role before I joined G4S as a non-executive director was as the Director General for Ofgas between 1993 – 1998. Since then I have held several non-executive director appointments and been appointed as the Chair for various businesses over several years. I have predominantly worked in the energy sector, but not exclusively so. My appointments include non-executive directorships at the Payments Council 2012, Enquest 2011, Energy Solutions 2009-2013 and Tullow Oil 2002 – 2011.
3. I have also been a non-executive director and Remco Chair of RBC Europe 2012, non-executive director and audit Chair for Ilika Technologies Limited. I was the Chair for Flow (formerly Energetix) in 2011, Magnox Ltd 2010 and Gas Strategies 2000. Most of my roles have involved consumer protection in one way or another.
4. I confirm that the G4S biography in document VER000012 is accurate.
5. I joined G4S as a non-executive director in June 2010. That was the only role I held with G4S. As part of that role I was the Chair of the CSR committee from I think

around 2011, and I would also have sat on various committees as part of the non-executive director role. I cannot remember the details of those committees now. When I joined G4S I didn't have any specific knowledge of CSR, but at that point in time very few people did and we were one of several other companies developing a CSR Committee.

6. I left G4S in May 2018 as non-executive directors are appointed for a maximum of 9 years and I had almost reached the end of my 9-year term. We also had a number of people who had joined around the same time so we had to stagger the departures. Since I left G4S I have continued to hold various non-executive director and Chair positions in the energy sector.

7. My involvement with Brook House was very limited. Prior to the Panorama programme being broadcast and before we were aware that there were any issues at Brook House, I visited the centre once, I can't remember exactly when this was but I think it was in the summer of 2017. G4S had a huge number of businesses across the world and I had never visited an Immigration Removal Centre (IRC) before. I felt that it was important to know what an IRC looked like and how it operated. The purpose of my visit was to learn more about how an IRC worked so I could ensure I understood it properly and could work effectively as part of the CSR committee. As far as I was aware, I could find only one other company at that time with a similar CSR committee so there was little experience to be found in other companies to compare good practice.

8. As Debbie Walker has said in her statement [VER000241], I thought that the centre would be much more open, and hadn't realised that it would look more like a prison environment. When I visited we had no knowledge of any problems at the centre, all of the reports from the government inspectors indicated the centre was green and was doing fine, and no issues were flagged up internally. I was strong on checking on culture, I know that Ashley Almanza is a very good moral man and I felt we had good leaders at G4S. I was confident in the management at Brook House. I felt they would absolutely do the right thing regardless of cost. Nothing was raised with me about Brook House before Panorama. I have detailed my involvement at Brook House after Panorama aired later on in this statement.

G4S CSR COMMITTEE / INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATION INTO BROOK HOUSE

9. I have seen Ashley Almanza's statement [CJS0074049]. I only remember visiting Brook House once and that was before Panorama aired. After Panorama aired, a lot of work was done trying to find out what had gone wrong at Brook House, when we had mistakenly thought it was all running without any problems. I interviewed at least two firms, one of which was Verita, to identify an independent company to carry out a detailed review. I can't remember who the other firm was. I appointed Verita as they were independent and I felt they had the right kind of expertise and would do a good, thorough job. I made sure that they had everything they needed to carry out the investigation and checked whether they were getting any pushback from anyone. I met with them about once a month to check in on their progress, whether they needed anything else and asked them to identify any quick lessons we needed to learn and which we could address immediately before the report came out rather than waiting for the full report.

10. The terms of reference were drawn up by the legal team and the CSR committee checked the proposed terms. We didn't feel anything was amiss in the draft terms of reference, we could have made any changes we felt were necessary, and the CSR Committee would have approved the terms.

11. Document VER000191 is notes from a meeting I attended with Ashley Almanza and Debbie Walker. In that document it is noted that there were concerns about 'all barriers' appearing to fail and how G4S management rely on checks and balances but concerningly didn't detect anything. I agreed that where you have thousands of employees, no matter how well you do checks and balances there is always a risk of a rogue employee. We tried our best to manage and mitigate that risk.

12. In terms of actions taken and what lessons were learnt as a result of 'all barriers' appearing to fail, I know that body worn cameras were introduced although I am not sure of exactly when that was. We also had quite a lot of cameras around the centre. I

understand the Director also left the business. I left G4S in May 2018, so I am not aware of any other changes that took place and would not be involved in the day to day changes at the centre.

13. I have seen document VER000203, which is a file note from a meeting I had with Peter Neden. It states that my expectation and those of the board were discussed, including the complex terms of reference and the implications for timetable and cost. From my perspective, timetable was only an issue for me on a personal level as I was leaving G4S in May 2018. Timetable was not an issue for G4S as a business. Cost was not a concern and did not influence the investigation. We were aiming to get the right solution to resolve the problem, so we needed to pick the right people. The only thing that mattered was getting a detailed report to enable us to address the problems identified.

14. The board were expecting to receive any quick lessons that could be addressed immediately and then when the report came through to be able to look at what the lessons are that need to be followed up. We were expecting more short term lessons, but I don't remember being given any major immediate short term lessons in the months before I left. It is possible we did have some but I can't remember. The Board wants to have confidence that the report has been done truthfully and properly.

15. I have seen document VER000200. This is a draft letter from Kate Lampard and Ed Marsden to Elizabeth Fleuriot dated 26th October 2018. I left G4S in May 2018, so this letter post dates my departure from the business. I can confirm that I was the chair of the G4S CSR committee when the report was commissioned, but I was not at the time of the letter as I had already left.

16. As I have confirmed earlier in this statement I was the Chair of the CSR committee from around 2011 until May 2018 when my term ended and I left the business. As Chair of the CSR committee I chaired the committee, we had quarterly meetings with an agenda and we went through a series of items on the agenda and then had any special reports and anything that required special attention. Clearly, after Panorama Brook House would have been on the agenda for the CSR committee. We

would look at things like whistleblowing at each meeting. As a CSR committee we always wished to have more whistleblowing as it is a good fail safe.

17. The CSR committee would only deal with the major issues.

18. Document CJS005923 is a draft report following an independent investigation into concerns about Brook House which was prepared for the division chief executive of G4S Care & Justice and the main board of G4S. The report came out I believe in November 2018. I had left G4S in May 2018 so I never saw the report and did not have any involvement after May 2018. I cannot comment on what actions were taken by the CSR committee after May 2018.

19. I cannot comment on the issues in document VER000200 where Kate Lampard and Ed Marsden refer to issues they believe need to be 'kept an eye on' by the non-executive directors as I left G4S in May 2018 and therefore did not see this letter. I do not know what action was taken in response to the letter.

20. At pages 4 and 5 of document VER000241 Debbie Walker comments that I would have been written to as chair of the CSR committee about the potential Panorama programme and I might allow them to ask questions. My recollection is that I first became aware of the panorama programme at a board meeting. I don't remember being given a briefing about the content of the programme or when it would be run. I believe the programme in fact was broadcast the week following the meeting.

21. I confirm that I was not interviewed as part of the investigation following Panorama. I had monthly meetings with Verita to check on progress, ensure they were getting the access they needed and to establish whether there were any short term learnings we could address.

22. I agree with paragraph 63 in document VER000241 where Debbie Walker says that she didn't think the CSR Committee would have intervened or delved any more into Brook House than they had before if we had known what the environment was like. As a board committee the CSR committee cannot micromanage. Our job is to ensure

the senior management has the right culture and attitudes. G4S is a huge multinational company with many diverse businesses. Our job was to monitor the businesses and mentor senior management, not to manage.

23. Paragraphs 70-71 in VER000241 refer to the 'reaction' being 'reactive' because they were not involved in daily 'doings'. I don't agree with this. The first thing that we have to do is to check that the culture is right and that we have the right people in place to manage the centre, we would then expect them to cascade the right behaviours down through the levels. We were confident that the person in charge was doing the right things to get the right behaviours but it was impossible see inside people's minds. We hadn't seen any evidence that there was a culture of fear or repression, it seemed that the manager had a good open attitude and was open to the staff.

24. I agree with the summary at paragraph 123 in document INQ000119. CSR was still quite new in 2011 and there were very few CSR committees in other businesses so we were trying to find our way. We were the moral guardians of good behaviour across the whole of G4S across all of its countries and its businesses.

25. I am sure that Brook House was mentioned as one of our businesses in CSR meetings that took place before 31 August 2017 as that is why I wanted to visit it but I don't recall there being any specific focus on Brook House before 31 August 2017.

RELATIONSHIP WITH THE HOME OFFICE

26. I didn't have any relationship with the Home Office. The management on site would deal with the Home Office.

THE PANORAMA PROGRAMME

27. I wasn't able to watch the BBC Panorama programme when it first aired. I watched it later from a link. I was appalled and it was clearly meant to be appalling. How has this happened on our watch without us knowing anything about it? I felt it was utterly unacceptable.

28. I cannot comment on the impact that the Panorama programme (which aired on 4 September 2017) had on staff morale. I had no knowledge of that as I wasn't part of the management team and did not work at Brook House. It was clear that it wasn't good and was awful for everyone involved. We had tried really hard to avoid being in that kind of situation and it had still happened.

29. I didn't have any contact with the detainees so I cannot comment on their reaction to or awareness of the programme.

30. Changes were made at Brook House following the Panorama programme, for example the top level of management was changed. I wasn't part of that decision and the CSR committee were simply told of the changes. I left shortly after changes were made so I can not comment on how effective they were.

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENTS

31. I don't have any other suggestions for improvements to be made.

ANY OTHER CONCERNS

32. I didn't have any concerns about Brook House prior to Panorama so I don't have any other concerns to raise. I am not able to provide a list of names of individuals working at Brook House who may be knowledgeable about the matters mentioned in my statement in addition to the people already mentioned in my statement. It is a long time ago and I cannot remember the names of any other individuals.

33. The only other point I wish to make is that I felt that Ashley Almanza, Debbie and Peter were all highly motivated to ensure that a culture of behaving well and doing the right thing was instilled in the business. I felt that that message was sent down the business.

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:

Signature

Dated:

24 March 2022