

Confidential

Independent Investigation into Brook House

Tuesday, 17 April 2018

Interview with

Debbie Walker

Group Corporate Affairs Director

This transcript has been prepared from a recording taken during the interview. Whilst it will not be attached in full to the final report, extracts from it may be included in the report. It forms part of the evidence to the Investigation and as such, will be relied on during the writing of the report and its conclusions. When you receive the transcript, please read it through, add or amend it as necessary, then sign it to signify you agree to its accuracy and return it to Verita. If the signed and agreed transcript is not returned within two weeks, we will assume that you accept its contents as accurate.

Independent Investigation into Brook House

Tuesday, 17 April 2018

Interview with
Debbie Walker
Corporate Affairs Director

Investigators: Mr Ed Marsden (Verita)
Ms Kate Lampard (Verita)

1. **Mr Marsden:** This is an interview with Debbie Walker. It's part of the independent investigation into matters concerning Brook House. [Introductions]
2. **Ms Lampard:** Debbie, thank you very much indeed for making time to see us. I'm going to lead the questioning but Ed will interrupt if something occurs to him and that's allowed. Can you begin, Debbie, simply by telling us your job title and explain what you are responsible for within G4S?
3. **A.** Of course. I'm the Corporate Affairs Director and I'm part of the Group Exec Committee reporting to the Group Chief Executive. I have two hats; one is a Group role and the other is a UK role. That's largely because our Group and UK businesses are just based in the same place and it seems silly to have two teams doing similar things so we have one.
4. We have PLC Corporate and then UK. Specifically, the old UK and Ireland region but the bulk of that work comes from the new Care and Justice Division, which is a business led by Peter [NeedhamNeden](#). The different aspects of my role are corporate social responsibility, digital, employee communications, media and government affairs. That is, on behalf of the PLC as I've described, on matters relating to the business, us as a UK PLC in the UK but also for international matters as well.
5. Then working with the UK businesses slightly differently, particularly on internal comms, which is trying to engage a bit more with the frontline employees as well, through the internal comms function. At a PLC level our internal communications is more about programmes and specific projects than it is about us trying to reach every single employee from the UK head office in 100 countries, 570,000 people; that just wouldn't work.
6. **Q.** How many employees were there?
7. **A.** 570,000.
8. **Mr Marsden:** Across the world?
9. **A.** Yes.
10. **Q.** The Group encapsulates what; in your corporate affairs?
11. **A.** Do you mean lines within my team?
12. **Q.** No I just wondered what businesses come under within –

13. A. Everything - three service lines, 95 countries and that's Care and Justice Services, Cash Solutions and Secure Solutions globally.
14. Q. Okay so when you talk about 'the Group' it is the entirety of the business?
15. A. The entirety of the business.
16. Q. Yes okay.
17. A. Yes, the global approach.
18. Ms Lampard: Care and Custody Services, or do you call it Care and Justice?
19. A. Care and Justice Services.
20. Q. Care and Justice Services encompasses what, prisons, IRCs?
21. A. Electronic monitoring, employment services, facilities' management within government sites, immigration, housing, asylum seekers, (the Compass contracts) and all of which are led by Peter Neden, in the Care and Justice Division. He took on the Australian business, which is largely prisons, and some other government related services in Australia recently.
22. Q. He is UK, Ireland and Australia?
23. A. He is Care and Justice Division now, which happens to just have businesses in the UK and Australia. We don't really have those businesses anywhere else. We have a prison in South Africa but it's run completely separately, under a different structure.
24. Q. I understand. I suppose the question I really wanted to ask was about the Care and Justice business, how much of a focus is that of a Board's terms? All that you've described sits here in London, has a global remit, global businesses to think about but it also acts as a Board, as it were, for the UK business. Is there much of the UK business outside Care and Justice, or is it only Care and Justice?
25. A. I may not have described that very well. The PLC Board, the actual non-executive directors on the Board, doesn't really have a specific UK remit. It's just my function happens to have a very specific UK remit because there isn't a corporate affairs team for the UK. For example, we have in our regions - just to explain, we have Cash Solutions Division with a divisional head and he will have some corporate affairs people sprinkled around his businesses in different countries.
26. Our Secure Solutions businesses are in four different regions, they will have corporate affairs people sprinkled around. Care and Justice is based in this building here, it doesn't have anyone else so we do it for them and that's my team, Corporate Affairs Team, not the Board as such. The Board is the PLC Board. Of course it happens to get involved in matters relating to Care and Justice but it doesn't have a specific responsibility, or remit, for UK versus PLC. It is a PLC Board.
27. Q. Thank you that's helpful. Just then tell me, in the Board's world, how much of it is focused on the UK Care and Justice system, or the Care and Justice system, which we now know, also incorporates something in Australia?

28. A. It's hard for me to work out how much time they spend because I'm not in Board meetings as such but, inevitably, they will do, perhaps, a visit to a site and each year are one of those might be a Care and Justice operation as an [entiretyexample](#). They will receive reports on new business opportunities that have been assessed and they will, potentially, depending on the size and scale and complexity of those bids, review those in some detail.
29. We have a Board Risk Committee and if there is a particular matter, or a particular contract, that deserves the attention of the Board Risk Committee then it will be reviewed by the Board Risk Committee. The CSR Committee look a little bit more at issues such as this one [\[Brook House\]](#). As you know Clare [\[Spottiswoode\]](#) is sponsoring this independent review and Peter now attends the CSR Committee as a regular attendee.
30. Only the NEDs can be full-time members but Peter, as CEO of that division, attends the CSR Committee as a full time guest attendee. Largely because there are important reports on his businesses – actually there is a good [\[independent inspection\]](#) report coming out on HMP Altcourse. The CSR Committee have [a](#) particular interest in keeping an eye on those businesses and the effect they're having on the rest of the group.
31. Q. CSR could look at other issues but I think what you're telling me is that Justice produces particular issues that needs CSR attention.
32. A. It does.
33. Q. It actually tends to be looking at Justice issues?
34. A. It does. We have a CSR materiality exercise that we do and we look at matters that are material to the group, in terms of CSR. They are usually to do with anti-bribery and corruption, health and safety and human rights and, if you look at all of our businesses across the world, [some of](#) the greatest human rights risks are probably likely to be in businesses where we're responsible for the custody of others.
35. Q. You mentioned the specific risk factors, which lead into the CSR and those are anti-corruption?
36. A. Anti-bribery and corruption, health and safety, human rights and, within all of that, is [wrapped-up-culturalculture &](#) values. [Culture &al](#) values is a permanent discussion topic for the CSR Committee; behavioural standards really.
37. Q. You're not on the main Board but you're on the Exec Committee?
38. A. That's right.
39. Q. Who attends the main Board, as it were to hold the brief for corporate affairs? Clare, obviously, as the non-exec will have the portfolio of CSR and feed in but who, from the Exec team is picking up those issues?
40. A. The only executive directors on the main Board are the CEO and the CFO. Everyone else is a non-exec director but, from time to time, we, individually, might be called, during the discussion, to have a debate, respond to questions and that could be at either the main Board, or any of the committees.

41. As an example, I presented recently to the Risk Committee on geopolitical risks but a big portion of that is human rights and how we're mitigating any human rights risks in our supply chain and other ~~things~~ areas. I ~~would~~ have also, previously, gone to the Audit Committee to discuss with them a particular matter that came out of an audit, to do with the treatment of migrant workers in Qatar. I will have taken that action away, liaised with the regional president responsible for that business and ask them to look into the matters.
42. I would be giving a report back to the Audit Committee on findings and actions that were being taken, in response to a particular issue that came up. ~~Whilst the rest of the Group Exec Committee are permanent attendees for any of those other things,~~ I attend every CSR Committee. I work very closely with Clare on the agenda and where we focus our time. On occasion, I will attend the, sporadically audit committee, risk committee and the main Board, on a subject matter basis.
43. Q. If you're attending the CSR Committee, or something to do with Care and Justice in England, for instance, Brook House, and you divvy up the responsibilities between you and Peter, who is obviously there all of the time?
44. A. I'm there all the time too. He's been a recent invitee in the last, probably, six months. Before that it was one of the other regional CEOs and I can't remember who it was but I think it came about, frankly, because (due to the nature of the services and the higher likelihood of issues arising in relation to those businesses) I was always-often bringing matters, relating to those businesses, to the committee. It made sense for him to come along and report himself.
45. Q. I understand. How often does that committee meet?
46. A. Three times a year formally and, if there is a matter such as this [Brook House] ongoing, we would have, perhaps, conference calls two or three times outside of those formal meetings, for updates and for the committee to ask questions.
47. Q. I understand. Just tell me how an issue like Brook House was handled at the CSR and what sort of forewarning members of the CSR had about Brook House because we know that they had written to you. You were written to by *Panorama* who said they're going to put this out - just talk us through that?
48. A. I'm not sure I can remember the timeline but I'll talk about the theory of what happened. On Medway and Brook House, both *Panorama* programmes, the enquiry comes into the Press Office. They would alert us to the fact that they have some information and are planning to show the programme a few weeks hence and these are provide an overview of the sorts of things if they plan will to include. They ask us to give a response to those matters.
49. Mr Marsden: This is your right to reply moment?
50. A. Yes. Then, we take a huge gasp, a huge intake of breath, and think 'gosh'. The first thing we would normally do is get onto Peter and/or Jerry, depending on whose business it was, explain that this enquiry has come in and get us around a table to discuss what actions we're going to take, what resources we need and the next steps.

51. ~~Depending on what? Not much really. It would be the business unit leader who would advise Ashley, as the Chief Executive, to Peter or I would notify Ashley that an serious issue has arisen~~ - but usually it would be Peter. He would say 'a big issue has come to light here, we've put this team together, this is how we're planning to handle it'. We would discuss that with Ashley as the CEO.
52. Brook House specifically, I believe, and I could check this if you need a factual response, Ashley wrote to the chairman and to Clare Spottiswoode, Chair of the CSR Committee ~~once he had been notified of the potential programme~~. He would let them know that this had happened, the action we were taking, the team that were in place and give them a chance to ask any questions that they have at that stage. Then, really, the communication with the Board is largely based on a timeline of when things happen.
53. Q. Updates?
54. A. Yes, and there isn't a regular pattern to that. I can't say we give the Board a weekly update but, if we had the evidence and we've prepared a statement, or we've made a response and there are milestones within the thing as it moves forward, we would give an update to the Board. Either Ashley would, I would or Peter would do that, depending on where it was at any given time.
55. Q. Given human rights is one of the triggers for Board interest, would Brook have been on the radar?
56. A. I think if you ask different people you will get a different answer to this. My personal view is the Board have a good understanding of the businesses we are involved in and understand the risks of those businesses, in terms of prison immigration, asylum seeker housing - those ~~ones-businesses~~ that could have those risks within them.
57. If you ask Clare Spottiswoode, she would respond saying she hadn't realised that an immigration centre was like a prison. She thought it was more open, a bit more like Cedars was, people have a bit more freedom to come and go - they are probably not criminals who have committed an offence. Talking to Clare about it, I don't believe she had that level of understanding. She thought it was a much softer environment and not as prison-like ~~environment like as it is~~.
58. Subsequently, since she's visited that has only reinforced her view that she hadn't realised that it was like a prison. I thought the Board did know that. We all assumed they did and we'd explained it to them but clearly, in her conversations with me, she hadn't picked up that that was the sort of environment that Brook House was.
59. **Ms Lampard:** As I understood it, from when we saw her, she, in fact, only first went to Brook House sometime in the autumn. That was the first time she'd been?
60. A. Yes. She had been to other places, she had been to prisons before and other places but I don't think she specifically visited Brook House.
61. **Mr Marsden:** The follow-up to that then is knowing what she does now, would that have affected the kind of oversight and the level of understanding?

62. **A.** I don't think it would have done honestly because if that sort of thing had happened in a prison she would have perhaps thought 'I really understand, I can get my head around that' because of the environment. I think it took her a little while to get her head around the Brook House environment was like that.
63. I don't think the CSR Committee would have intervened or delved any more into Brook House than they had before. Bearing in mind we'd had Medway previously with *Panorama*, a different environment, secure training centre, young people and we are in and around those things all the time. I genuinely don't think they would have specifically done anything differently about Brook House.
64. **Ms Lampard:** Who else is on the CSR Committee?
65. **A.** Paul Spence.
66. **Q.** Is he a non-exec?
67. **A.** Yes and Winnie Fok; she's a non-exec and now we have a new non-exec, John Ramsey, who has just joined the group.
68. **Q.** They are going to be on it too?
69. **A.** Yes. It's Clare, Paul Spence, Winnie Fok and John Ramsey and, of course, Clare is stepping down and we will get a new Chair for the CSR Committee. It will be the new person, I think, the new NED.
70. **Q.** In some senses, and this is not surprising, I think what you're telling us is that the response of the CSR Committee is, for something like the thing that's just happened, necessarily reactive because they're not going to be alongside the daily doings within any particular contract?
71. **A.** It is largely reactive, unless we were bidding for a new one. If we are bidding for a prison somewhere, as part of the Group Investment Committee process, which is an executive management committee-it's - not the Board, we do a CSR review of new contracts. I will give you an example, we were are bidding for a women's prison in Australia and would scrutinise the human rights aspects of that and what does that mean in terms of staffing.
72. Do you need a different profile of females, what are the risks of that from a human rights point of view, from a cultural point of view, from a values point of view? We would challenge the business, as part of the bid process, on those matters and I would report to the CSR Committee of those types of reviews that have taken place in the period since the last meeting. The other thing I haven't mentioned -
73. **Q.** When you say you would report to them, the scrutiny would be done by the executive but you would say what sort of input you have had?
74. **A.** Yes.
75. **Q.** Where you may have changed matters in the bid?
76. **A.** Or where we may have recommended we didn't bid and then sometimes we don't. It's not just for information, the CSR Committee do probe a little bit, they usually ratify any decision that we've made elsewhere but they would be aware of it. The one thing I haven't mentioned and it's quite remiss of me, is I give a quarterly report on whistleblowing to the CSR Committee.

77. Q. I'd like to come to that.
78. A. Just make sure that's a bullet for later.
79. Mr Marsden: At what point do the people who are working on the bid, challenge the executive?
80. A. There are lots of different stages in a bid. You have to get qualified locally, regionally, or divisionally, and then they come to a Group Investment Committee if they meet a number of, or one of any criteria. There are lots of different stages. The difference now (and it is a positive one) is that colleagues are more aware of the expectation of the group's standards and there we are lots of more informal conversations about things to do with human rights and CSR, around the business than there ever have been before. A lot of things, Nigel, my colleague and I, will get a call and someone will say 'we're being asked to train the Saudi Police on 'X', how far do you reckon that will get up the chain'. We might kill something before it's even getting to us We might then advise our colleagues that the type of work being proposed would not meet our ethical or other standards and recommend that the business unit does not proceed with any bid.
81. Q. That's a government somewhere has said to G4S 'would you be interested in ...'?
82. A. Yes, for example, the British Government would say 'can you help us train the Saudi Police in British policing techniques'.
83. Q. You'll get a phone call early on from someone?
84. A. We'll go 'are we going to train them to chop their hands off', how does that work In that particular example, we would ask about the scope of the contract and the content of the training to make sure it meets the groups standards. If we feel it does not, we will say so. That feels really good to me because it means people aren't just going off and doing things and we get to hear about it at the last minute. They're actually asking themselves 'is this something we want to be associated with, is it right for us, does it meet our values', and there is a lot more of that informality - that's good.
85. Q. Is that fairly recent?
86. A. Last two years probably.
87. Q. Alright.
88. Ms Lampard: Just going back to this issue of a new bid; we know that there was a new bid in relation to the Gatwick IRCs, which was being prepared at the beginning of 2017. It was probably starting at the end of 2016.
89. A. Yes.
90. Q. It's clear that, at some stage, a decision was taken by local management to reduce the staffing at Brook House and Tinsley house. We haven't had the opportunity to talk to Ben Saunders about what motivated that but it has been implied to us by others that he was getting himself ready for the bid and making a more economical bid.
91. Q. It's no secret that, the staffing body who was looking at it, thought it was not very satisfactory and Lee has reversed it although there's been a longer period of staff decline as a result of that.

92. A. Yes.
93. Q. To what extent would that be something that your team, doing this ethical oversight scrutiny, might have picked up that the staffing levels look very low?
94. A. We wouldn't because we're not experts in knowing what the right model is. Those sorts of things do get probed so if we have a previous contract and there's a new one and the staff numbers go down those sorts of questions would be asked by, I've heard them be asked by me, by others in members of the Investment Committee review, but we're not really doing that from a position of expertise. We're just saying 'is that the right thing to do' and challenging the sponsors of the bid to test their models thoroughly - but the people presenting to us are the experts. In some cases there are reviews by people independent of the bid with relevant expertise. I don't recall if this happened with the Brook House bid.
95. Mr Marsden: You expect them to –
96. A. Yes, they could explain it and we would challenge it, they would explain it, we would challenge it. They might go away and do some work on it but we are really reliant on the expertise of the people putting the bid forward, as well as any Red Team review that happens within the businesses or across the businesses and I'm not an expert on the Red Team review. I don't know how much they do of that.
97. Ms Lampard: I think what you're telling me is that the CSR Committee is very much an overview/oversight, 'how does it feel, from an informed but not expert outsider', raising generalist issues of ethical and moral human rights concerns?
98. A. Yes.
99. Mr Marsden: I suppose the place where Ben's decision about staffing of Brook would, conceivably, be a trading review?
100. A. It should be.
101. Q. Is that one of the hundred sites that say something about staffing?
102. A. In the normal course of business he would be doing a trading review at which he would be reporting on things like staff numbers, recruitment, sickness levels, etc – as well as the performance against the contract. If he was putting forward another bid he would have to be justifying a different model to his line managers, going forward, who would have to have supported it for it to reach Group Investment Committee.
103. Q. Yes.
104. Ms Lampard: Issues of staff retention, staff turnover, all of which are indicators of stress in an organisation, are picked up, as it were, through the executive line of a division. The Board, as it were, is picking up a very high level and the CSR is looking at it from a generalist point of view. Does that sound right to you?
105. A. I think it's a fair description. I'm sure there are times when other things happen but, generally speaking, that's a fair description.
106. Q. I just wondered then shall we move on to the issue of how that reporting, as it were, between the top of the division and the Board, actually

works. How high a level is high level? There are some very obvious features coming out of what was going on at Brook House. As I say the reduction in staffing numbers, very high levels of sickness and absence very high levels of staff turnover, and that's still an issue, coupled with large numbers shown, in the detainees going in and out of that building, and a change in the mix of the nature of the detainees. Many more, very high risk, very challenging time spent on national offenders.

107. That's all quite a cocktail - who is consuming that in the organisation? We know it will come through 100 slides in review, about which I have my own views and I don't want to share those views. We know that some of that information will land on Jerry's desk. Where does it go from there?
108. A. I think there's a trading review pyramid. I'm calling it that - it's not called that.
109. Q. Is Peter in the trading review meetings?
110. A. It depends which level. I don't know this, you might have to ask someone in Peter's organisation but my understanding is the [\[immigration centre management\]](#) trades with Jerry, Jerry trades with Peter, Peter trades with Ashley. If that's the pyramid Peter is talking about all of his businesses. I don't know what that agenda is. It will, I'm sure, have some of the current risks and opportunities in each of those businesses - I've heard those words used. Peter is talking about everything, Jerry is talking about all of his businesses.
111. Q. They are set?
112. A. Yes, and whoever it is running that [\[immigration\]](#) centre is just talking to Jerry about their bit.
113. Mr Marsden: Paul sits between the centre directors, prison governors and Jerry?
114. A. I don't know if he sits between, or alongside.
115. Q. He does the trading reviews, I think, from our conversation with him?
116. A. I don't know. I'm not involved in those. It may be Paul and Jerry. I'm afraid I can't answer that for you.
117. Q. Yes, I know. That's fine, I think we have that answer from Paul.
118. A. Yes. Of course, by its nature, if something is flagged as high risk in that chain, ~~and then~~ it ends up on Peter's agenda.
119. Ms Lampard: Then it will end up on the Board's agenda?
120. A. If it's deemed necessary.
121. Q. In your experience, in the ordinary run of things, those sorts of tensions, in a particular institution, are not going to be on the Board agenda? She's nodding her head -
122. A. I'm shaking it.
123. Q. Sorry, it's a no.
124. A. It's a 'no', ~~yes~~. No, not that I'm aware of. Only if something's been seriously flagged it gets on the agenda because someone chooses to put it on there, but not as a matter of course.

125. **Mr Marsden:** As I understand, what we're saying is that Brook House's month by month business is really the subject of the trading review discussion held by Jerry before Paul arrived. It was consumed and dealt with locally.
126. **A.** In fairness I think you should ask them because I'm not in those meetings and I don't know. I don't know from Ben, Lee, whoever's agenda; I don't know which of those items make it to Peter. I'm not in those reviews. ~~I'm assuming, from what I hear, I'm not there, -it's~~ probably best to ask someone who is at those meetings.
127. **Q.** Yes, okay.
128. **A.** Certainly, from a Board perspective, if it's a new bid and meets certain criteria they would be involved in reviewing the [reviewbid](#). If it's a major reputational issue of something that's happened they will receive a report and have a chance to challenge that. However, they are not involved in the everyday staffing levels at Brook House. They would not have any visibility of that.
129. **Ms Lampard:** What Jerry told us very early on was that actually this was an issue in a sense that the information was there but he was distracted by Birmingham and other things. The pyramid had ~~fledged-flagged~~ to him but it wasn't something that he had and I just wanted to be clear that it probably hadn't gone, in that sense therefore, beyond him to Peter.
130. **A.** It may well not have done. ~~Certainly it would not have gone beyond that.~~
131. **Mr Marsden:** Just while I remember it, Debbie, when we saw Ashley a few months ago he talked about the risk profile of the business generally. I'm using my words not his but I got the impression from him that the risk profile had changed. That the Board was minded to do less risky things?
132. **A.** Yes, I would agree with that and there is a lot more scrutiny at different levels of [the business](#), particularly, new opportunities and taking on risk. The balance of risk reward, not just financial but you will hear him talking a lot about safety of our own people and of others and can we do it in line with our values. It's not just financial.
133. Those risks are reviewed regularly and, tonally, that's really changed in the company and, since London 2012 actually, the Board's appetite for risk has changed and our scrutiny of risky contracts has ~~changed for whatever reason~~. The Board oversight of those things has changed for the better and we have exited some things that we felt we couldn't make work. We have also made some decisions not to bid on things that, previously, we might well have bid on because ~~we would have previously considered them to be they were~~ good opportunities and I think that's a good thing.
134. **Ms Lampard:** Can we turn specifically to the issue of complaints and whistleblowing and you said something about how you oversee whistleblowing?
135. **A.** Yes.
136. **Q.** Describe that process?
137. **A.** On a quarterly basis, I did it personally for the first couple of quarters last year but a member of my team does it now with the legal team. They scrutinise every case that comes in to try and identify themes and not the specific matters themselves. There's a process for dealing with those matters

but are there any themes that we need to address, or any concerns that we need to address, and that report goes to the CSR Committee.

138. I present that and they ask questions and we debate it at length. They have a split by region, we discuss the types of cases coming through, the fact that we have slightly fewer this year, this is global whistleblowing of course. This is the ultimate place to go if all else fails because we do encourage people to talk to their line managers first but, by all means, contact the global whistleblowing hotline if you wish to.
139. We discussed the fact that the numbers have gone down but actually the quality is better. The previous year we would get people saying they didn't have the right uniform and that's not the place to report that, even though they were caught up in the numbers. We are getting slightly fewer calls but actually they are about proper whistleblowing type matters.
140. Q. Is there any attempt at trying to do that with complaints?
141. A. We don't capture complaints because the organisation is too big.
142. Q. What about the whistleblowing, in terms of triangulation - what do you do about that?
143. A. Can you explain what you mean?
144. Q. Yes, you have your whistleblowing and where do you go to assess whether something that's been told to you through whistleblowing is, in fact, true, it will be investigated?
145. A. We have a case management system and every case goes into the system. It has to be owned by someone who follows it up, usually a member of HR, or the legal team but can be others. It is followed up with the individual, it's investigated, the case management system has a closeout report, actions taken and, essentially, it should all be in the case management system. That's what we look at, the data in the case management system, but the wording of every case - it's not just one of these two of those and seven of those.
146. We look at each case because often, if someone calls, they might say 'I want to report a human rights issue' but actually, maybe, they didn't get paid their overtime. They think that is human rights but actually, [our description of human rights](#), 'is that human rights or is that an HR matter that needs to be dealt with somewhere else?'. We do scrutinise them down to that level of detail to make sure we really understand what that person is saying, what action has been taken, who is responsible and whether it's been closed, or whether it hasn't been closed, where it is.
147. Q. If it turns out to be an issue to do with just their pay, or an HR issue, do you deal with that or do you send it back to the local manager?
148. A. It's back to HR and, in fact, we try to do that at the beginning. It's an external service and they have a script they follow and if it says it's pay, or there's no luo roll, or the tyres were flat, whatever, they have a mechanism to divert it out of that system. Then it doesn't clog it up and down the chain and it actually gets moved out before it gets into the process of the global whistleblowing system.

149. Q. If it then is a genuine whistleblowing case, which you then investigate, what sort of things are you doing? Again, I go back to this word 'triangulate', to make sure you don't just deal with that whistleblowing issue and it isn't indicative of something wider in the culture of the organisation?
150. A. I may have misled you - we don't investigate anything. They are investigated either by legal or HR as it might be a regional matter. [HarveyGawie](#), who I'm sure you've spoken to and you know, will be responsible for whistleblowing in the old UK and Ireland region and new Care and Justice Division. He would be allocated, or would allocate those cases, to specific people like Richard Allenby. I don't know if you've met Richard, he [has-is](#) an audit type of investigative chap in his team and he will say 'there have been two issues here, Richard, can you do an independent investigation into these'.
151. They would be responsible for the investigation and the reporting within the system. What we do is interrogate all the data to try and do exactly what you've suggested. Are there themes here? Sensitive/Irrelevant
Sensitive/Irrelevant If so, let's delve into those and try and see what's at the bottom of that. What I can tell you is that, other than in a particular country in Europe, where we had a few complaints that turned out to be similar about a certain management team, we haven't identified big trends.
152. It's very individual matters. We are a little bit reliant on the data that goes in and the investigation and the investigator closing things properly and putting in the findings of their investigation. We don't investigate; we are purely looking at the data, as a whole, and saying can we spot anything in here. If your next question is did we spot anything about Brook House, we didn't.
153. Q. Did you have any whistleblowing about Brook House?
154. A. I think there were 11 cases. They were all about different things. There wasn't really a thread.
155. Q. We know that one of them was about the security manager at the end of 2016 and that that led to his being dismissed, or for him leaving under an agreement?
156. A. Yes.
157. Q. You're not aware of that?
158. A. I haven't looked at that data for a while. I did at the time, I haven't looked at it for a while.
159. Q. Can you just explain to me what is the interplay between the CSR, the Risk Committee and something we heard about called the [Ethnics](#) Steering Group?
160. A. The [Ethnics](#) Steering Group is nothing to do with the Board, it is executive team members chaired by our General Coun~~isel~~[cisel](#). That started when the anti-bribery and corruption legislation came out, to make sure we were prepared for dealing with everything, in relation to anti-bribery and its remit has expanded. After we implemented the anti-bribery controls we didn't just ~~break it close~~[break it close](#) down ~~the group~~[the group](#) it actually expanded. [Today it is called the Ethics Steering Committee](#).

161. We discussed whistleblowing, we discuss specific whistleblowing cases there. A Category 1 whistleblowing case, which is usually to do with fraud, once they get seen at that level, can't be closed out without the Ethics Steering Group confirming and ratifying the decision, by the Regional or Division to close it. We review specific cases there and make decisions about whether we're happy for them to be closed, or whether we want more investigation undertaken.
162. That's more an Executive Management Committee, if you like, looking at specific matters. We have a whistleblowing policy, modern slavery statement, it would review those to make sure they were fit for purpose and then recommend them to the Board for approval - those sorts of things. It's a much more day-to-day management of issues, rather than a committee with just general oversight. The interplay is I represent that group with CSR, other people represent that group in other committees, Board committees.
163. Q. Risk and CSR?
164. A. There is also Risk, CSR and Audit. The crossover between CSR and Audit is whistleblowing. They both review whistleblowing reports and the findings of internal audits relating to culture and values. Risk has a slightly broader agenda, where the group has a number of principal risks that are set out in the annual report. The Risk Committee will review, essentially, each of those principal risks throughout the year.
165. One of those is geopolitical - I would have gone to present to the committee on how we're mitigating geopolitical risk, in particular human rights risk. Then they would have a chance to probe and question us on those particular matters. I'm sure I can grab you an extract, which explains what those different committees do, if you're really interested in the reported version of that but that's my understanding of how they work.
166. Q. I think CSR is where this would come to, what we're talking about, but there might be some more generalist audit reports, which relate to matters of risk in relation to behaviours. Those might also be looked at by CSR, as well as by Risk and Audit.
167. A. If there is a big issue it would get escalated to the main Board. I am sure Ashley will have written papers, for the main Board, on Brook House and it will have been discussed at a meeting. Clare, of course - all of the committee chair people of the Board sub-committees - do have to report to the main Board on matters arising. They would also be reporting at each Board meeting on the work of the committees. I'm not in those meetings, I don't know how in-depth they are, or whether there are questions and how far that goes, but they certainly are required to make a report to the entire Board.
168. Q. I want to ask you a question, which you may not feel is really a question, maybe it's an observation. The use of 'Speak Out', which is in your whistleblowing programme, is, so far as we can gather, not something that staff feel wholly comfortable with. They don't feel very comfortable with that. We heard of one person who had reported and said that nobody got back to him about his particular complaint, although he was told he would be got back to in four days and it didn't happen.
169. Other staff suggest it's not something for them - it's a bit 'other'. I suppose our observation on it is that, certainly the noticeboard suggests that

it is really about matters of financial probity, corporate concerns, as opposed to matters of human behaviour. Certainly the posters we see at Brook House all relate to somebody who is evidently trying to steal the office furniture. That's the example given. There is clearly something to be done about tailoring it or sorting those terms.

170. A. There are other materials available - they've just chosen to use that one.

171. Q. Are there more appropriate ones, about you see somebody beating somebody up in an immigration removal centre?

172. A. Yes and if you have a look, I don't have them with me but the values training we've been doing we have flashcards and they give a whole bunch of different scenarios. Those scenarios have been developed by the staff themselves and the people who do training. We have a set for the US business as well where they have a particular number of issues. We have different sets for different countries and different businesses where there might be 150 different scenarios and the business used on~~esce~~ they want to use in conversation with their staff. There is a wide variety of material.

173. Mr Marsden: They don't have to have the –

174. A. No.

175. Q. The manager may be –

176. A. If you catch someone stealing toilet roll, no, they could have other things.

Commented [DW1]: Not sure what this section relates to – it doesn't seem to make sense.

177. Q. One of the things that comes, quite strongly, out of the interviews at Brook is frontline staff not, necessarily, feeling confident to tell managers, frontline managers, first line managers, about things that they are concerned about. However, keeping that to themselves or, perhaps, sharing it with colleagues but not reporting it to managers, for a variety of reasons.

178. You know 'I don't want to bother them' or 'they'll think ill of me in coping with my job', and the feeling that if they do say something, or there is a bit of a history of 'if you report things, things becoming an investigation into you'. Is that culture unusual to you now? It's a very unfair question.

179. A. No, I don't recognise that. As in I've never experienced someone telling me they were treated badly, as a result of blowing the whistle, or anyone telling me (, but then why would they), that they don't trust the system or their manager. Going back to your earlier points, I do recognise that 'Speak Out' awareness and usage is better in the UK, actually, than in some of the other regions. It is, perhaps, seen as for the serious things and there's a big bunch of stuff below, just for what might be considered as most serious that and people might think 'I don't know whether to report that or not', or whether that's the right place or it isn't.

180. Q. There's a lot of stuff that just needs to be dealt with by local management, isn't there?

181. A. Yes, and I would want there to be a range of options for people and they could choose which option worked for them; you know this better than me. 'Speak Up-Out' is one avenue.

182. Q. Yes, absolutely.

183. A. I would hope that there are lots of others and that our staff would feel comfortable in reaching out to at least one of those. After Medway happened, the Group Executive Committee all visited ~~an~~ establishment in the UK and some of us did more than one. I did Birmingham Prison and stood up in front of every member of staff, throughout the day in a few working groups, saying 'we want you to speak out'.
184. This is not us saying 'make it go away'. 'We want to hear from people if there are issues that you are concerned about and if you don't feel comfortable we really want you to do this, it's the right thing to do, don't leave it to someone else - it's the right thing to do'. I felt, at Birmingham, I got a really good reaction to that but I don't ~~think know if~~ it made anyone behave any differently afterwards.
185. Q. I think one of the strong issues, one of the big issues coming out of Brook, is the effectiveness of frontline management in encouraging people to report concerns. To deal with concerns, locally on the ground, as they emerge rather than having to be escalated.
186. A. Yes, yes.
187. Q. I can actually see that, even if a senior manager said 'this is what we want you to do', it actually needs a lot of reinforcement from frontline managers in order to get people doing that.
188. A. It does and going back to the earlier point we may have produced, globally, 150 different items to help our businesses promote the whistleblowing line but it's them who have to use them. It is middle managers, it is supervisors, who have to say 'I really want you to put this card in your wallet and know that number off by heart'. Did they do that, I don't know if they ~~do~~ did that. I know that Jerry did after Brook House happened. He got these produced for every member of staff and they handed them out but I wonder whether they have them in their wallets now, I don't know.
189. Ms Lampard: Do you know if ~~any member of the senior management team~~he went Brook House after Medway?
190. A. I don't, but I could find out probably.
191. Q. It would be nice to know that actually.
192. Mr Marsden: The whistleblowing 'Speak Up' or 'Speak Out', I get muddled up with the NHS programme.
193. A. ~~I think it's 'Speak Up'~~Ours is 'Speak Out'.
194. Q. You want people to be using that as a last resort, wouldn't you?
195. A. Yes.
196. Q. Actually what you want people doing, is talking to colleagues, challenging colleagues, talking to their manager.
197. A. In the training material it says exactly that; here's the scenario on one side 'okay what do I do? Is 'X' the right thing to do?' You turn it over and it says 'of course it is, you should speak to your line manager, you should do this, you should do that'. I guess what I'm saying is, we have those things for ~~them-colleagues and supervisors~~ to have those conversations. To explain what the types of things ~~are that~~ they want to hear about - in a supervisory, management, establishment, whatever, level.

198. If they aren't having those conversations, have they got that pack that's ~~relative-relevant~~ to people in custody and have all the supervisors been trained in how to have conversations with their people? Have they had those conversations and handed out the materials and had a debate about it and aired their concerns? It's fine having a toolkit, but that's not engaging with people, ~~having a toolkit, and that's my point~~. We can get these printed and Jerry can hand them out and that's great, that's really helpful. There's a poster up, okay it's the wrong one, that's helpful but it's not really giving people the confidence to say 'okay I'll talk to someone'.
199. Q. I'm saying this to illustrate the point; there are DCOs at Brook who, if you said 'who is your line manager', would say 'I don't know who my line manager is'.
200. A. Really?
201. Q. I think, therefore, they are at a point where they're not even clear who is doing their EDR. They might not have had an 'end of probation review', so the likelihood of them seeking out a manager to express concern to is very variable.
202. A. I can understand that.
203. Q. There are some people who would say that it would but there are others who wouldn't but we have been to another G4S institution just last week and I have to say it felt very different to Brook. What we are beginning to identify is there is a particular issue at Brook House about how staff, frontline staff, behave, how managers manage, or don't manage, actually.
204. A. Yes, it's interesting.
205. Ms Lampard: Can we move on to more general cultural issues of G4S over the last many recent years? I just wanted to ask you about issues, in relation to development training and that sort of thing. Whether or not you think this is an organisation that values training and development, or whether that is actually a new bit. The impression we got from Jane Shannon was that this is a bit of a new thing with this organisation. That the focus we're now seeing at Brook House, and perhaps training some DCMs and the senior management team, was a bit of a new focus; is that fair?
206. A. I can only really answer at a Group level, not at a Brook House, or Custody in Detention level, but our global employee survey always says that training is not an issue, but they would like the company to invest more in training. I'm sure most organisations would have that in their employee survey probably, possibly; many would. I also think that we, perhaps, rely a little bit on self-service training. So we provide lots of stuff, 'here it is and off you go'.
207. Mr Marsden: As in you have to find the time?
208. Ms Lampard: Do it yourself.
209. Mr Marsden: Do it yourself, yes.
210. A. I don't know whether that's the case at Brook House but I do know we have invested in a lot of development materials, training and modules that you can do online. However, in what type of job is it easy to find the time to

do some of those things? There are a lot of resources available but if you're pushed for time you probably won't choose to do that.

211. Q. People there are pushed for time, as in staffing levels short and quite a lot of new inexperienced DCMs.

212. A. They are not sat at a desk, are they?

213. Q. No.

214. A. They're not sat at a computer thinking 'I know, it's my lunchtime I'll do an hour of that training I'm supposed to do'.

215. Q. It's interesting people will put there about the frontline managers doing a course with Corndel but they talk about 'well it's there but it's finding the time and, actually, it's two-way because the organisation is meant to give me the time but I'm also meant to make the commitment'.

216. A. That's an observation. I don't know anything about that particular site but I recognise that from elsewhere.

217. Q. No, but it fits that you're supplying the opportunity but people are struggling to take advantage of it?

218. A. Yes.

219. Ms Lampard: The other question, I suppose which is more cultural, is about what sort of a management culture there is? What we're hearing is that there's a strong need to fulfil expectations amongst directors and, obviously, the staff who report to them in certain contracts. You would expect that but equally, it is quite a heavy-handed, perhaps quite demanding, as opposed to developmental approach. You have the trading reviews, you have to be meeting targets and, actually, you've probably got to be doing a bit better than simply just delivering. You have to produce what people would like, which is, perhaps, savings etc.

220. There's more of a focus on that, perhaps, than understanding what the problems are, what the challenges are and that people want to present good news rather than problems. I'm not saying that that's not usual in most commercial organisations and I'm not saying that that's not unusual in the very, very cutthroat and difficult world of outsourcing. However, it feels a little heavier handed here than I recognise from elsewhere. Does that chime with you?

221. A. It does and it doesn't. I'm not in trading reviews, I don't see that first hand but I do hear it from some colleagues, who want to go to any review on what's going well and not really what's going wrong. We probably all want to aim to please. Whether that's a directive that's come down and tone that's been set and, therefore, that's what everyone's doing, it's hard for me to see that specifically because I'm not in those meetings, but I do get the sense from other people.

222. The other thing is, with this pyramid of reporting, let's go to Peter, let's not go to Ashley. Peter is responsible for quite a large business and if ~~someone comes to him with a trading review he could ask a question about somebody over here he is undertaking a trading review, he might ask a question on a very broad range of topics.~~ My impression, with trading reviews, is people over-prepare, spend a lot of time producing additional material so that they can respond to any question they're asked, they don't

want to look foolish in front of their boss, if they can answer it, or don't have data to hand.

223. Whether those questions ever get asked or not, or whether they're even asked to prepare in that way, I don't think they are. That is because I hear Ashley saying, in every Group Executive Committee meeting, 'I don't want supplementary data, just take it out of Salesforce'. Or 'take it out of that system, ~~or take it out of that system~~ and we'll have a conversation. I don't want you to have 15 people spending 28 days producing separate materials. Let's take the materials we have and have a conversation.'

224. Whether the reality of those meetings is the same as the sentiment beforehand I don't know, I'm not in those meetings. We do rely on experts quite a lot. Jerry is considered, in his business area, to be an expert. We rely on him to flag what's necessary and I don't have an opinion on whether he does that well or not. I've always assumed he does, I've always had a huge amount of respect for him and I can't really comment any further in terms of that.

225. Q. I don't have any more questions - do you?

226. Mr Marsden: At your level how does the organisation show its appreciation of people? If you talk to people at the frontline in Brook House you'll get a particular flavour but how does the organisation –

227. A. The only real group-wide thing we have for that is we have values and recognition schemes. If someone has gone above and beyond in a particular area they get recommended to receive recognition from Ashley ~~and that's~~ not a reward, its recognition. We write a story about them and put it on the group intranet, we make a case study of them, they get a personalised letter to say thank you for something they did.

228. Q. That could be staff at any level?

229. A. It could be anyone but it's reliant on someone saying he or she did a good job and putting them forward as a Values Champion.

230. Ms Lampard: Does each organisation have somebody in there who is meant to nominate people?

231. A. Yes, it's not just one person who is meant to nominate. The HR teams are looking, in theory, for people to nominate.

232. Q. It's down to the HR teams?

233. A. HR and the line management. If I was your supervisor I could say 'Kate's done a great job, I want her to be considered for a Values Champion Award'.

234. Q. Do they know that that's what they're meant to be doing? How are they told about it?

235. A. They're not necessarily all in the same job. We have 70 Values Ambassadors around the group and they could be PA to the MD, they could be an HR person.

236. Mr Marsden: Would Brook House have –

237. A. I don't know. Jerry's business would have. Now whether there is somebody specifically at Brook House, and they're not necessarily the only

person putting other people forward, they should be sharing all of the Values' materials with those businesses and telling them what things are out there and how to recommend people and what they need to do. It's not their job to do the recommending but it's a Values Ambassador's job to spread the word about values and help us get the posters on values, behaviours and things right down into the organisation.

238. Q. People didn't feel valued and recognised, perhaps, in a way that, corporately, the organisation would want them to feel. How would you see that being dealt with? I'm just thinking to our recommendations now.

239. A. It's a really good question. I do feel that the PLC is quite a long way removed from those people and, if I was running the south-east of England, all of our cash branches, I think I would have a view as to how I might do that. However, as soon as you get away from a driver to Ashley Almanza, they probably don't know who he is. They might not even know we're a British company. I shouldn't say this but I think there is quite a [void-gap](#) between the frontline and the group.

240. Ms Lampard: Do you think Ashley has ever been to Brook House?

241. A. I think he has. He's certainly been to some prisons. I don't know specifically whether he's been to Brook House, I can't remember.

242. Mr Marsden: Does it start at Paul and Jerry? Do they have to create the circumstances? It's their operational management responsibility?

243. A. I think it probably does because if I look at the pyramid again, Peter has an ExCom but it's so big it discusses matters that affect all of the businesses. Things like the employee survey are really important. We had 440,000 people take part in our employee survey [in 2017](#). I don't think any other company in the world gets that type of engagement and we can drill down to a specific country, [or](#) business unit and look at the data just for that area. I think any manager who isn't interested and I don't know whether they are or not, I don't know whether Brook House has its own data set. Custody and detention certainly does.

244. Ms Lampard: When was the last 'Stop That'?

245. A. Last year.

Commented [DW2]: I don't recognise this – is it meant to say "survey"?

246. Q. When?

247. A. In the UK it probably happened in the last quarter of last year.

248. Q. No-one at Brook House tells you that they've been asked to do a staff survey.

249. A. Every employee should have been in the whole world. Whether or not a decision was made because it happened slightly after the *Panorama* thing that the timing wasn't right; I'm not sure about that but I can find out.

250. Q. Could you find out whether the staff survey was given to the people at Brook House because none of them told us anything about it?

251. A. Sure and maybe there was an HR decision not to do that. I know the UK and Ireland was delayed but the rest of it happened about this time last year, and it takes a long time to do because we have to reach so many people. Some of it's on paper, some of it is online; there are all sorts of different ways to do it but I'll definitely check on Brook House.

252. Q. Could you let us know?
253. A. Yes I will do. Let's assume it was done in Custody and Detention Services, Jerry should be really interested in that information because it does rate the company in a number of ways. However, there is also an opportunity to comment and that's where the value is; in the comments really.
254. Q. When we asked Jerry, we suggested some sort of survey about taking the temperature of Brook House, via staff, suggested that was something that had never been done either. Now that might be a very different sort of survey but, equally, I think there would be ties-up and I thought it was interesting that he didn't mention to us the staff survey.
255. A. That's interesting. Maybe they decided not to do it there.
256. Q. Would you let us know?
257. A. I will. It does have questions like 'I know where to go' and 'I feel confident raising issues with my line manager, I do understand the values'. It was a rating - a very simple 10 or maybe 15 questions, just a rating system.
258. Q. I assume it would have a box for anything else you wanted to add?
259. A. Comments on every single one if you wanted but I will check on Brook House. [\[Debbie subsequently confirmed that of 332 colleagues at Gatwick IRCs, 160 completed the survey which was undertaken in September 2017\]](#)
260. **Mr Marsden:** This is a comment but I will be interested in your view of it. We interviewed a member of staff last week, who was accompanied and the person who accompanied her was more senior to her. He described himself as 'I'm a shirt; I'm a shirt to G4S'. He saw himself in those terms and, actually, there are lots of good people at Brook House. I just wondered how do you get him to think of himself as someone other than –
261. A. That's a really good question.
262. Q. It's sort of functionary, isn't it, that he thinks this? It's about local managers.
263. A. It has to be localised because, dare I say it, our CEO and many of us are corporate people and we sound like corporate people. The best engagements I have, is if I go to a cash branch in Manchester, talk to the branch manager and go around and talk to the people out there doing the job and from here we are very corporate.
264. Q. Yes, and there's no corporate solution to this other than providing the values, living the values and providing the wherewithal for people.
265. A. Let's put people in our care to one side, we know what's happening there. Look at safety of our staff, historically it is unique because if you put the Care and Justice part aside, which is actually quite small in context of the group, historically, 50 people, 50 of my colleagues, die every year at work globally and that is horrific to me that 50 of my colleagues don't go home to their families.
266. Q. As a result of work circumstances?
267. A. They've been attacked by someone with a gun who wants to get the money and they've shot them in the head. Now Ashley, who has an oil and gas background, is very safety orientated. Last year 25 people died. That's still horrific, but I think that change has come about because of his relentless questioning and focus and challenge on safety. If a safety alert comes up

that says 'this person was killed for this reason', he's straight on to the managing director of that business saying 'what did you learn from it, what are you going to do about it'.

268. To the rest of the organisation, 'how can we share this information to make sure it never happens anywhere else?' It has halved the number of people that have died. [Sensitive/Irrelevant]

[Sensitive/Irrelevant] We get attacked, people are trying to steal things, they get hurt, but that was not acceptable to him. From a cultural perspective, even those really, really difficult things at the frontline, can be done but in my view they need a relentless focus, right from the top and all the way through and not get blocked anywhere on the way up or on the way down. ~~I don't know~~, if we've done it on safety, I don't know why we shouldn't be able to do it on other things too.

269. **Ms Lampard:** Thank you very much indeed.

270. **A.** Thank you.

[Interview concluded]