

*Confidential*

Independent Investigation into Brook House

Tuesday, 1 May 2018

Interview with

Michelle Smith

*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, 1 May 2018

Interview with  
Michelle Smith

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

1. **Mr Marsden:** This is an interview with Michelle Smith from the Home Office. It is part of the independent investigation into Brook House. *[Introductions]*
2. **Ms Lampard:** Michelle, thank you very much for making time to see us; it is very helpful. I think I want to begin with the easy questions, which is really about what your job title is and what your roles and responsibilities are?
3. **A.** I am the Service Delivery Manager for the Gatwick IRCs, and pre-departure accommodation, which looks after our family residents. My main responsibility is to have oversight of the G4S contract on site for both Brook and Tinsley House, or contracts, as they currently are.
4. **Q.** Who is in the chain below or above you?
5. **A.** Currently, you may be aware that the teams are split into two separate teams since *Panorama*, so my team currently focusses on compliance monitoring, ~~and at Brook House specifically~~ Ian Castle is my area manager covering both sites.
6. **Q.** He works to you?
7. **A.** He works to me and has responsibility across both sites, but more of an operational head on his shoulders really more than anything else. Then Simon Murrell at Brook House is the Immigration Manager on site, so he is the most senior person who is routinely on site at Brook House for the Home Office.
8. **Q.** Their titles are a bit misleading, aren't they? If he is the Immigration Manager that sort of suggests that he is responsible for the immigration piece, but actually, he is only responsible for the –
9. **A.** He works for immigration. From the context of the contract that is how it is referred to in the contract, so you are right, in the context of immigration enforcement it is slightly misleading as to what his role is.
10. **Q.** Because actually what he is doing is the contract rather than the immigration piece, and you too?
11. **A.** Yes.
12. **Q.** Who do you report into?
13. **A.** Alan Gibson and Clare Checksfield.

14. Q. In other words, you are the Gatwick "How is the contract doing? Let's see what we can do to deliver this contract".
15. A. I don't work in commercial, but I am the manager of the contract, not the commercial.
16. Mr Marsden: How long have you had that association with Gatwick?
17. A. I joined as a service delivery manager, in a slightly different guise in November 2014.
18. Ms Lampard: For this particular contract?
19. A. Yes. That was the combined immigration team, detainee contact as well as compliance.
20. Mr Marsden: What prompted the re-think?
21. A. It pre-dates *Panorama*, because we were piloting when *Panorama* happened.
22. Ms Lampard: You used a very useful term, something about the split between compliance and –
23. A. Contact. Stephen Shaw did his review into welfare and detention and he recommended that we were clearer with the detainees about their immigration case, and there was a closer link between the immigration caseworker and the detainee. Marc Owen did his strategic review of how we use detention, and he felt that we needed to engage more effectively so that we use detention more effectively, so the throughput of detainees in detention was quicker, we were more focussed on compliance, and compliant returns, etc. The two things combined both led to recommendations, and HMIP, when they have inspected, commented on the gap between the detainee and immigration and the anxiety around indefinite detention of detainees. All of those things into a pool, and somebody has asked to do a pilot, but we are struggling for a vision of the pilot. I said "Let's do it at Gatwick; this is my vision that we have two separate teams".
24. I think there is a real distinction between contact and doing contract and compliance activity and where we have a combined team, and there is so much drive on operational contact at Tinsley, we never geot around to doing compliance work; that is the honest truth. It is always the kind of thing that ends up being left. They split it out and I have quite a clear idea about how we should see detainees, that we should really invest in induction. If we were talking about a compliant environment then, from my perspective, that meant that people should have their facts as soon as possible before they financially commit to solicitors, etc. They should have a factual account of what their options are.
25. Q. Who is your opposite number at Gatwick doing your role?
26. A. Tony Moore is my equivalent~~the resident~~ – he does Gatwick and Heathrow for contact. We piloted a split and did some work about what compliance would look like. Obviously, *Panorama* then fed into that, because we formally split for Gatwick in October last year.
27. Q. What do you do that Ian Castle doesn't do?
28. A. A lot of my work, my particular job, has been mainly focussed on retendering a new contract for Gatwick, so the existing contract is due to finalise or end on 20 May, so I spent the last two years quite heavily involved in re-procurement activity. I do high-level engagement, so I Chair contract review

meetings on a monthly basis at all three centres, meet with the IMB. I have managed the training network across detention-wide, and obviously there are things that I get involved in that are similar to the things that Ian is involved in.

29. Q. The contract review meetings once a month, are there any in-between them?
30. A. Yes, they take place on a weekly basis, so it is a step-up. ~~It is daily, t~~here is a daily meeting, daily briefing, issues log – you have probably heard that from the rest of the team, there is an issues log.
31. Mr Marsden: Does daily briefing mean the 8:30?
32. A. Yes, and where they raise day-to-day issues. For example, my team do cleaning inspections three times a week, and then they give G4S 24 hours to sort themselves out and if ever they have identified any failings, they will pick that up at the next daily meeting. Obviously, if it is an ongoing issue for that week, that will make it onto the weekly issues log, so on a weekly basis they would have a weekly contractual issues, mitigation meeting.
33. Ms Lampard: Ian Chairs those, does he?
34. A. Ian or the HO Manager on site, one of the two, but they would consider the issues and, if there were any performance failings, they would consider mitigation at that point as well, so it is more real-time consideration rather than there being a time delay where everyone is trying to scratch their heads and wonder what happened a few weeks ago.
35. Mr Marsden: Who from G4S would attend; is it Steve?
36. A. No, Steve attends the daily meetings. I don't think Steve attends the weekly meetings, but he might do. Barry is their performance manager and he certainly attends – or attended the one I was at the other day. Mark Damien was there, so it could be Duty Director and Barry, but Barry is the kind of thread through it all, because he generates all the performance reports and he does the performance feed into the monthly meeting.
37. Ms Lampard: The director too is at the monthly meeting?
38. A. Yes.
39. Q. It is the performance manager, the director and probably the DD.
40. A. At the monthly meetings there is a whole merry band of us, so finance come. We don't just talk about performance, it is a wider –
41. Q. Hang on, I am just getting G4S' team who was there?
42. A. At monthly meetings it will be Lee Hanford, Steve Skitt, Sarah Newland, because it is combined with Tinsley House, Barry comes from a performance perspective, Bob is quite often there from a finance perspective, commercial from our side.
43. Q. It is the whole team on both teams?
44. A. Yes, the key people, and then additional specialists might come in, so we have had quite a lot of conversations about staff, recent staffing levels, so Dan Haughton has been attending because he has been doing quite a lot of work on staffing levels just to make sure we understand contractually exactly what we are supposed to be doing.
45. Mr Marsden: Do those meetings get behind the operational problems that present and discuss the sort of implications for the institution? I am thinking



something that we have observed is that the activities programme day-to-day is very hit and miss. I know Luke is now in place and they have nominated staff, but it gets disrupted by other operational pressures, escorts or whatever it might be.

46. A. They have Seb, who does daily classes.

47. Q. Yes, they do, but they might say they are going to run something and then it doesn't happen, or the cultural kitchen is never open – do you, as the Home Office, ever say at those meetings that activities, or whatever it might be, isn't running as it should be and the implications for the centre are -?

48. A. Activities ~~isn't~~ something that is only just emerging as a bit of an issue. I have seen in a couple of IMB reports, they do a weekly IMB inspection about aspects of activities not being on, so I have asked my team to do some work on that, but, for example, cleaning, catering, we are probably more advanced in our monitoring of those particular aspects than we have some of the stuff around reception. We have got quite involved in adults at risk, ~~and we have got quite involved,~~ so I think we are probably more on point with those elements at the moment than we are with some of the regime aspects.

49. Ms Lampard: Okay, that is quite helpful.

50. A. Then we would provide the wider context.

51. Q. The question really is that it feels a bit to us as though the meetings have tended to engage performance matters, it is strictly under the contract, rather than a broader discussion of whether or not the overall operational, the overall experience is satisfactory from the perspective of detainees.

52. A. I think that is probably fair historically, because where we only had a combined contract and compliance team there was no capacity to carry out compliance work outside of staffing levels which we monitored quite robustly. We didn't really do any other compliance monitoring, so you only knew what you knew, because we didn't have any capacity to go and find out anything.

53. In the new model - and we are only just handing over a lot of the contact stuff at the moment which will generate the capacity - we will have a team of six EOs all doing one compliance day each week. I have identified eight risk areas and bespoke compliance activity underneath each risk area, so if it was security I am not going to look at the whole of security because I don't have the capacity to do it, but, I can focus on use of force, I can focus on searching, particularly around visitor searching. I have identified some thematic areas in side those risk areas, which I and the team will go off and focus at. Depending on the scale of the job, depending on how I divide up the work between the six EOs, so I have eight risk areas, six EOs, so for example, Gary is doing vulnerability as well as welfare and regime, so he will be looking at that and he is developing his framework for that at the moment, getting his head around contractually what they are required to deliver ~~and what they are permitted to do detainees~~. He will be attending Adults at Risk meetings, because he is doing the vulnerability bit, and making sure they follow the Adults at Risk procedures. He will be doing that. Once we have that fully up and running we will then have ~~my-the~~ first feedback from the guys on what they have done in the last month. ~~Last month,~~ and it was very much familiarising ~~myself themselves~~ with the operation and the procedures and the contracts.

54. Obviously G4S have a contract which requires them to self-audit, so they have identified the self-audit that will be relevant to the work they are doing so they can accompany the self-audits, just to make sure they are auditing themselves properly. All of that will start to feed into how we have discussions in the monthly meeting. I think we are on our way, but I wouldn't say we are where we need to be yet.
55. Q. When do you think that is going to happen?
56. A. The framework is in place. We have done month one, but the returns that I got were very much fact-finding, so from a security perspective, Jenny, who is doing security was down in Tinsley today; she usually works out of Brook but covering both sides of the thematic areas, checking the use of force reports and the Rule 40/42 reports to make sure they were being completed to a good standard, and there will be feedback coming back from that. I would say we have started, and on cleaning they are doing quite details reports, because they are doing three times a week checks at seven o'clock in the morning. There is someone goes through those checks and there is a list of feedback from that. I think in some areas we are more advanced than others, but I would probably say in the next three months we would really start to get the flow going.
57. Q. That all sounds great, but I suppose what I am not hearing out of that is that part of this process is your people actually. They do that, I know they do that because they have explained it – walking the floor, we know they do on a regular basis. This still goes back to the performance pieces, doesn't it, it doesn't necessarily go to the temperature of the place, whether detainees are actually bored witless, and whether or not staff care for them appropriately. Do see what I mean? Where do you capture that soft stuff?
58. A. Some of that will be captured under welfare and regimes, because that will feed into how detainees are kept entertained, are they bored? Gary will go to the detainee consultative meeting, so he will get some of that from those meetings. There is a weekly wing forum which needs reinvigorating, as a means of talking to detainees.
59. I totally get your point on staffing culture – how do you diagnose whether or not staffing culture is where it needs to be? I think probably Ian learns more going out for a cigarette, chatting to people than he would do having any formal engagement with people.
60. Q. In a sense I was impressed that Ian was appraised of some of the things we were talking about, but he was pretty honest with us in suggesting that actually his conversations have not centred on that, and that he is not expected by anybody above that to centre on that, but give him his due, I know he then did go away to the next meeting and raised an issue that we had talked about with him. I said "I will raise that". I suppose the question is, is the system set up to respond to those soft things?
61. A. Yes, I think it is. I won't say we are in a perfect place. I think we are further on than we were about informal stuff that happens. One of my post-*Panorama* things was about two weeks after *Panorama*, and it is wider than just my team, and the contact team on site. IMB had met somebody who had raised an issue with them, and their advice was to raise it as a formal complaint. It came to me on their weekly report that someone had raised an issue, and it related to another member of staff. I said "We can't rely on somebody to just follow that up themselves and fill out a complaint form".

Surely if any of us were working on site and a detainee or another member of staff is raising something, we have a duty of care to act on it, so what happens with informal stuff, the low-level stuff, where do we monitor that? How do we record it? How do we capture all of that? There is an informal log.

62. I wouldn't say the situation is perfect. We have done a lot of work with my Home Office team on site and the contact team on site to say "Anything that you get told, even if it is just in passing, just a general comment, whatever, we need to follow-up on these things. The compliance team needs to follow-up on these things with a detainee, with IMB, to understand how we go about exploring that further". It is difficult, because some of it is confidential, a detainee may speak to IMB in confidence, so it needs to be done carefully, but we can't just ignore subtle signs that something might be going wrong.
63. I have done a bit of work with IMB on that to make sure there is an established process, and I have done a lot of work with my teams on that, and I know G4S have done some work with their staff on that, but at the end of the day I suppose you are dependent on the people who are working on the ground to raise it and it is not necessarily tried and tested yet.
64. **Mr Marsden:** What do you think your team would think the big issues are at the moment there?
65. **A.** Around staffing?
66. **Q.** Just generally. If they were rating it as a centre and making a judgement about how it is performing and how it feels six months post-*Panorama*, are they concerned?
67. **A.** I don't think they are concerned, and I don't think they are concerned from a staff conduct perspective at all. I think partly that is because there has been *Panorama* and there have been a couple of things post-*Panorama* where everyone knows we are still very much alive to all of that type of activity. For example, two members of staff were suspended earlier on this year for comments made during a training session.
68. **Q.** Hibiscus ~~do-raised~~ that.
69. **A.** Yes. It is such a small community word gets around. Staff know that it is unacceptable for the Home Office teams on site – I did a session on appropriate conduct, representing the Home Office, detainee dignity and respect, ~~conversation~~ with my team, a conversation about if you hear anything and ~~anyone says~~ it is inappropriate, it is your responsibility ~~is~~ to challenge.
70. **Ms Lampard:** That was with your team?
71. **A.** Yes, and with the contact team. Not taking action isn't acceptable, is the message; you just need to work out what your avenues are, and there are different avenues that you can take depending on how ~~non-responsive~~ confident you are in the situation. We had conversations with the teams on that. We need to carry on doing that sort of work. I don't think they have any concerns from a staff conduct perspective, and I think the systems are well in place. Body worn cameras offer the staff a lot of safeguards as well as the detainees a lot of safeguards, so I am really behind that and we are trying to secure access to the body worn cameras for Home Office staff as well, which would be a really good thing.



72. As far as the things that would concern me within the centre, I do feel that it feels overcrowded. If you are out during normal regime, it feels busy, it feels like there are a lot of people around. I can understand if you were somebody who wasn't very confident how the atmosphere or the environment would probably be quite a challenging one to be in.
73. Q. The body worn cameras have a limitation in that they have to be turned on.  
74. A. Yes, they do, absolutely.
75. Q. They are not on all the time.  
76. A. The policy is not to wear them all the time, yes, ~~unless you are in a room with a detainee, there is other footage around, so you would be questioning why they weren't turned on if they weren't.~~ We have had some challenges with people collecting body worn cameras as well, which I know that he is trying to address at the moment.
77. Mr Marsden: You mean people not wearing them?  
78. A. Yes, not picking them up.
79. Ms Lampard: Let's go back to the staffing. We know what they are trying to do about staff, which is just put a lot of staff in there. What is your impression about whether or not that is improving?  
80. A. They are contracted to deliver to have 225 DCOs in post, and they currently have 227, but I think there is about 10 on the current training scheme. They have recruited 107 since September. ~~I think it is bums on seats, but that is~~ 50 per cent, roughly, of the DCOs have been new in the last six months. The inexperience element concerns me, how competent people are in any bespoke role that they have. It just feels like a lot of inexperience in one place, in a pretty difficult environment.
81. Mr Marsden: We have been picking up quite a lot of evidence of people getting into trouble because they have learnt from someone who is inexperienced. Somebody teaches them the wrong way to do the roll-count, spelling out your point.  
82. A. Yes, and I have raised it, and I know Lee shares exactly the same concern, but obviously what they need to do is to slow down the attrition, they need to focus on retention. I know that Lee has some good ideas about how to do that, but that requires a change in contract. Pretty much, if anyone asked me to work in that environment for 48-hours a week with possibly a lunch break or not, I don't think I would be particularly happy doing that on a 12-hour shift four days a week.
83. Ms Lampard: 13-hour shift.  
84. A. Lee's desire, and I would support it, but obviously there will be a commercial element to this, is that he would want everyone on 40-hour shifts, which then means that everyone is a bit fresher when they are doing the job. The days are too long. Can you do that job managing those issues for that length of time? No, I don't think you can. We need to be better when we deliver contracts, setting limits for the working week for people in that environment. I think that is something that we can do in the future for contracts in IRCs.
85. Q. That will be dependent, won't it, on the new bid? Whether they get the new bid. Do you know what has become of that bid?



86. A. I am not sure I am allowed to say or not.
87. Q. Do you want to turn this off?
88. A. Yes, maybe. That would be good, because I know it is commercially sensitive.
89. *[Recording paused]*
90. Q. Can I just ask you about one other thing which has been troubling us which is this – at the time that the 60 extra detainees were brought in at the beginning of last year, as I understand it the discussions with the Home Office were that there would be 17 new DCOs to meet that? We have been told that actually the DCOs were never taken on, that Ben Saunders kept that money and only three DCOs have come out of it. Is that your understanding?
91. A. There has been a lot of work that isn't concluded yet. I am trying to understand that. G4S did recruit 17 DCOs, but also, they lost through attrition a wedge of DCOs as well, which mean that, come the time the beds were put in, it was of –
92. **Mr Marsden:** No benefit.
93. A. No benefit whatsoever, but also at the time Tinsley House was closed. Tinsley House was closed, the work was concluded on the beds in September, albeit they didn't mobilise until early the following year due to fire safety management. At that point, as soon as the work was completed on Brook House, Tinsley House closed. Tinsley House then didn't reopen until the following June, so they had all the staff from Tinsley House deploying down to Brook House. This is where we were unhelpfully in siloes, because I don't see the invoices that come through from G4S, so from an operational perspective it makes perfect sense if you have staff deploying down that you don't necessarily need to have recruited those staff to mobilise those beds, so from a performance perspective we are looking at the number of hours that I need DCOs working. I have enough DCOs in the main. There are some days where it drops under the usual scenario, in the main there is no staff to manage those people.
94. **Ms Lampard:** Yes, but that would be taking your assumptions about what enough staff are, as opposed to the discussions which were held.
95. A. That included the 17 hours for the additional staff. Operationally, I want to make sure that the hours agreed within the contract – so G4S manage the risk, they decide how many staff they need to manage the number of people that they have got in and all the elements that they need to deliver. Against that number that they said that they needed, I am monitoring to make sure they have staff doing those hours, because if they don't have staff doing those hours that triggers risk.
96. Q. Yes, I think there is an issue here.
97. A. The operational bit was satisfied. From managing the pennies, from our bit, which is the commercial side of the business, someone should have been aware that we didn't have those staff recruited and that we were paying for them.
98. Q. That is probably where it does land and it means that the fall-back position is not what was agreed, known and understood. I take your point about how they manage the hours that are produced, but I do think it probably has a

- knock-on effect on what sort of numbers of people you are having around the centre at any given time, even if the hours look about okay and how they are deploying them.
99. A. And having experienced staff on.
100. Q. I think there is something going on about it.
101. A. I absolutely agree. They have a profile about how they deploy people, but what has been established during this process was it was in the Notice of Change of Contract – I can't remember what date it was, but it pre-dates me, where they didn't update the profiles within the contract, so whilst they agreed additional staffing, when they changed the use of E Wing, they agreed additional staffing numbers, but they didn't update the associated profile. Part of the work we did just then is to go back and repopulate those, so we understand where staff should be, what they are basing their knowledge on, rather than just saying "We need 225 staff, DCOs, to manage all those people".
102. Q. Tell me about also DCMs?
103. A. DCMs – what has happened now, which is absolutely the right thing to do, and I would be really sad if they moved away from this, so where the DCMs are in a few non-operation roles, they have been pushed into front-line roles, and G4S have recruited four at their own cost. What that has allowed is for residential units to have a DCM and three DCOs allocated to it.
104. Q. When did the four come on stream?
105. A. I think it was January. The other thing that they are doing is they are investing in training of their DCMs.
106. **Mr Marsden:** The Corndel Programme.
107. A. Yes. I think they have the foundations in place. I think it will take a while for that to bed down. There is a lot of anxiety at the moment with coming towards the end of the contract. We are announcing any decision quickly, the staff don't want to go back to not having managers on wings. There are two members of staff on a wing, there are three on a wing, so they are concerned that getting the new contract will be a retrograde step.
108. **Ms Lampard:** They have a lot of interviews going on now for DCMs. What are those?
109. A. I don't know.
110. **Mr Marsden:** Michelle, at the end of some point it slims down staffing on wings to two officers –
111. A. I don't know whether that was a slim down or if that is part of their initial bid. Even in the bid that G4S are pursuing now, they had –
112. Q. You mean their rebid?
113. A. It didn't have the number of officers that they have now.
114. **Ms Lampard:** We know that there was a conversation - we think it was some time in 2017, but it may have been in 2016 - when there was obviously a decision taken to reduce staff.
115. A. With commercial colleagues, or just G4S?
116. Q. It was a G4S decision. You are not aware of that conversation?

117. A. No, so when we were talking about the increase in beds there was a big push from commercial about financial savings.
118. Q. From your commercial?
119. A. From Home Office commercial. There was a big drive. A letter went from Home Office commercial to all the service providers from the Home Office looking for financial savings, and they were looking for – I want to say £8 million financial savings across all service providers – I don't know whether that number is right. It was a substantial amount of money, so there was a big drive around financial savings. I know that G4S rationalised senior managers; I think they lost one or two senior manager posts as part of that process, but it was all brought in under the closing procedures, reconfiguration of Tinsley, additional beds at Brook House – that whole financial discussion around the cost of that change also included financial savings in posts elsewhere, but I don't know the detail of that. I remember that happening.
120. Q. That might be at the same time.
121. A. Yes, it sounds around the same time, because we did the building work in 2016/17, so I think that discussion happened at the beginning of 2016.
122. Q. That would tie-in with the time at which staff tell us that staffing levels became impossible.
123. Mr Marsden: Was the consequence of those lower staffing levels reflected in discussions?
124. A. At Brook House I don't remember us changing our staffing hours. I don't remember there being a staffing change, there wasn't a reduction – there might have been an increase. That is not to say they didn't re-profile how they were going to use those hours, which is possibly where people felt like there were less people around at different times. I know they did do a re-profiling exercise at Brook and Tinsley to try and align both contracts to a 46-hour week. There are a lot of things that happened that could have had a bit of an influence on the numbers.
125. Ms Lampard: It has been very difficult to try and unpack what is going on.
126. A. Of course.
127. Q. We are only going to have a stab at it probably, because we are not going to get the evidence, but never mind. What we would want to ask you is whether you recognise what we are seeing as a result of what have been very low staffing levels? We would say that activities have been extremely poor, and the activities team is very small, that people from activities get pulled into the rest of the work – there is a residential shortfall. For some time there hasn't been a manager; there is now a manager, but he has had difficulty getting an activities programme running. We see things like the courtyards having to have an officer in them, creating an issue on the wings. The cultural kitchen is never open; it has never been open all the time we have been there. There are a number of other issues all associated with staffing, including that there aren't enough staff to allow people to go and have training, refreshers haven't been done. Do all of these things ring true for you?
128. A. The activities I find slightly surprising. I would need to have a look. I have heard rumours about the cultural kitchen not being open on occasion, and that is one of the things I have asked my team to have a look at.

129. Q. It hasn't been open since I have been there in November, and most people say it hasn't been open for a year now.
130. A. Right, so I certainly wasn't aware of that. Education I think has been good and I know they have invested quite heavily, they are doing some work activities now, which will probably come on in the next couple of months, so to a degree, but not to the extent that you are saying.
131. **Mr Marsden:** We have picked up it is quite a major issue.
132. **Ms Lampard:** It is a major issue. What about training? That is another concern. Only 72% we were told a month ago had done their refresher training.
133. A. In what area?
134. Q. I think it is across the board.
135. A. They don't do refresher training as in you have been here a year, stop work for a week, you do a refresher training course.
136. Q. These are out-of-date refreshers; 72% are done, so that would mean whatever it is – 68%.
137. A. It would very much depend on whether that refresher training is mandatory or non-mandatory, but yes, it does concern me that they are behind on the refresher training.
138. Q. There are important things like safeguarding.
139. A. That is what I am saying.
140. Q. What is the mandatory?
141. A. There is obviously use of force, C&R training, MMPPR if they have anything to do with children, personal safety training, depending on what their role is.
142. **Mr Marsden:** Sorry, what was the children one?
143. A. MMPPR: minimising and managing physical restraint. ACDT. Safeguarding; I know certainly if you have interaction with children, safeguarding children's manager – I am not quite sure about general safeguarding is mandatory.
144. **Ms Lampard:** I don't think it is.
145. A. I can get you a list.
146. Q. Could you? That would be really helpful, thank you.
147. A. Certainly, the training would concern me.
148. Q. These things I have just been talking about are things that your staff will be taking up with them presumably?
149. A. Yes, of course.
150. Q. Because they are on the radar, they are on the delivery, aren't they?
151. A. Yes, absolutely. On the training I know they have had some challenges around refreshing use of force training, and I have had conversations with Sarah Newland about that, but they don't operate to the same refresh policies. Contractually they are required to refresh, but Home Office operate a policy on use of force training, whereby if you are over a year you can only go three months over your year.



152. Q. We were told by Lee that actually it is different in IRCs and you have no leeway; you have to have done it. That grace period for a DCO – is that right?
153. A. That is probably the case for C&R training, but possibly not the case for personal safety training.
154. Q. There was a time last year, according to Lee, when there were people who were out of ticket because they hadn't had their C&R training, and he agreed with somebody in your department that that would be okay while they got things sorted out, but then centrally Home Office came in and said that wasn't acceptable. Do you know anything about that?
155. A. Vaguely.
156. Q. I think he agreed it with Paul Gasson.
157. A. That is probably about right – he probably agreed dispensation and then the certification team said "No".
158. Q. What role were you in at that time?
159. A. I was in delivery manager at that time, but not all of those sorts of things would come through me. Certification is dealt with by a different team within detention and escorting. Paul would have done the right thing; he would have said "It sounds reasonable, let me just check with Rob EllisEnness, and Rob Ellis'-Enness' team from a certification perspective", and it sounds like they came back and said –
160. Q. What was Paul's role? Was he above you?
161. A. No, Paul is Simon Murrel.
162. Q. It was a Paul thing; sorry. I think we have dealt with some of that.
163. I suppose I want to ask you another question which is along the lines of what we have been talking about. I think Paul conceded before this split that actually his focus was possibly more about making sure that G4S performed in respect of the immigration issues, than about the domestic, as it were, operation of the centre. Were people presented for removal on time?
164. Q. Did charters get a copy? Did people get to the legal corridor? All that sort of thing. Was that right of him to suggest that? I imagine it was probably the justification for your whole project, wasn't it?
165. A. Yes. Absolutely. I wouldn't say that if there were issues going on in the centre that are being raised with us or that were about detainee welfare or wellbeing that they weren't addressed, because they would have been raised with the team, but they wouldn't have gone out to look for it.
166. Mr Marsden: Whereas now?
167. A. Whereas now we set ourselves up, so we look across the risk area.
168. Ms Lampard: There have been a number of pretty serious incidents since we have been in the centre. On 28 November there was a mass insurrection.
169. Mr Marsden: On C Wing.
170. A. Yes..

171. **Ms Lampard:** When you speak to the staff about that, that was pretty hairy I think for them.
172. **A.** They pulled in the Tornado team.
173. **Q.** They did. The Tornado team sat outside. I think they didn't actually have to bring them in, which was great credit to the staff. Then there was an incident in February or January where three times foreign national offenders barricaded themselves in the room and became very aggressive. I don't think they were housed together, or were they housed together?
174. **Mr Marsden:** I think they were.
175. **Ms Lampard:** There were all in one, three in a room.
176. **A.** Then they ended up on E Wing.
177. **Q.** Caused a lot of damage, I think. Then there was a very serious assault of a detainee and other lot of detainees when a whole lot of other detainees from another wing barged in. Do you have a sense in your office when those sorts of things happen of how dangerous, how unsafe, how insecure the place feels? Is that a discussion you would have?
178. **A.** Yes. I don't know whether you know, but every Tuesday we talk about excessive disruptive behaviour.
179. **Mr Marsden:** Yes, we have been on the call.
180. **A.** You have been on the call. The purpose of that call is to have an estate-wide view on difficult cases. Because Brook House houses some of the most difficult, it obviously appears quite often on the list. Morton Hall has the most foreign national offenders at the moment, so they fluctuate in and out of particular challenges, and so does Heathrow, but I don't feel that we have any more problems, or there are the same levels of incidents that happen at those other centres as they do at Brook House. Some weeks we will have very few people; we only ever had two or three on the list anyway at most, but some weeks we will have some very low-level places on there that we would identify as being green and not high-risk places.
181. **Ms Lampard:** What is the percentage at the moment of time-served foreign national offenders?
182. **A.** It is around 50 per cent at the moment. It fluctuates between 40 and 50.
183. **Mr Marsden:** When we sat in on the phone call - and I can't remember who was Chairing the one we sat on - but the one we sat on there was RCs from across the estate contributing, and I was very struck by the fact that case owners on the call, Team 6 said something about so-and-so, we went to Heathrow yesterday and one of the things they have with case owners is their local version of that.
184. **A.** They manage complex cases. They manage it as their complex case team, don't they?
185. **Q.** Do you think there is a case for Brook having that kind of -?
186. **A.** I don't know, because with pre-departure teams it kind of supersedes the need. With pre-departure teams working effectively, the nominated officer has responsibility for detainee - the detainee knows who the nominated officer is. If that detainee is particularly vulnerable, particularly disruptive, complex needs, the nominated officer should speak to the nominated case

owner, and that should be escalated through their PDT team. I don't see the point of having a wide group of people discussing in the same place.

187. Q. Do you think that happens?  
188. A. It does. It definitely does, because there were particular cases that want to get flagged with the system.
189. Q. The nominated officer at Brook will –  
190. A. Will speak to the case owner, you can hear them over the phone saying "This is a particularly difficult case", and they will know, so they will have the opportunity to pull in a multidisciplinary team if they want to. Generally, if someone is that difficult, that disruptive, there is a central complex case team. Martin ~~Roskin~~ Wasp at Heathrow, who will have oversight of the complex case.
191. Q. There are officers at Brook who are personal officers to –?  
192. A. Yes, so the pre-departure team is set up with eight engagement officers at Brook House, that is what they are profiled for. They have only got seven in post at the moment, who manage a cohort of detainees, and that detainee knows –
193. Q. They are experienced officers?  
194. A. Yes, well again at least five of them have been long term, been in post for quite a while. Then the other two are fairly new. The idea is that the detainee has their telephone number, they have frequent contact with the detainee, they are accessible, so they can listen to the detainee's needs, they get to know the detainee, they will built up a rapport. If there are any issues they can build a relationship because they have got a cohort of 50 to 60 cases. They can have a direct relationship with the case –
195. Q. Between all eight of the officers?  
196. A. No, for each.
197. Q. Okay; that is an awful lot.  
198. A. They work a five-day week. If you work a five-day week you are seeing 12 detainees a day. When your role is to have the conversation with the detainee and relay information back to the case owner, most of the time if you are seeing the detainee weekly you are not going to want to spend hours and hours with him, but on some weeks, they may wish to.
199. Q. That is working effectively?
200. A. I would say it is still in its early days, because they have only just finished recruitment, we are still handing over work, but in the main.
201. Ms Lampard: That is for everybody, not the most difficult ones?  
202. A. Everybody. It is a case ownership model built on the premise they build a rapport with a detainee. If you were a detainee you don't want to meet someone different every week, you would have to start your story all over again. You should have told your story and then you should be meeting somebody who can refer to your last conversation. It would drive me insane if I was the detainee. That is their model. That is what they are aiming for. They are probably halfway down that road. They are doing case ownership, people are still learning their jobs, they are still trying to get their systems in

place to make sure that they are meeting with detainees on a weekly basis. They are quite reactive at the moment, they are trying to move more planned.

203. **Mr Marsden:** Who leads on that?

204. **A.** Tony Moore, a Grade 7.

205. **Q.** Who in G4S?

206. **A.** No-one leads it within G4S, no. It is the Home Office.

207. **Q.** Okay; when you say "officer" then you are talking about your officer rather than a G4S officer.

208. **Ms Lampard:** I just want to ask you about what some staff say about the strictures that the Home Office puts people under. For instance, the Healthcare staff say that there are people coming who are unsuitable to be detained, who have serious mental health problems, who shouldn't be in Brook House, should be in a mental health institution, and I am afraid we have seen that, that is true.

209. **A.** Hopefully they ended up in a mental health institute if that was the case.

210. **Q.** Then there is also the issue of we put people down into Rule 40 removal and then they get let out too soon and that undermines the regime. What would you say in answer to that?

211. **A.** There were a couple of things, mental health, detention itself is a mental health trigger, so someone can present themselves as being quite stable in the community and then you can pick them up and that is someone you might have had interaction with and they present differently. The other point is the people that we detain we have very little contact with, so establishing if someone has a mental health condition prior to detention is quite a thing to do. People, unless they are coming from a prison, are either detained from reporting where they may be on monthly reporting, so a different officer has gone in, because it is about disruption more than anything else, or arrested either by the police or by an arrest team, at which point that is their only interaction, so it is very difficult to determine pre-arrest, pre-detention that someone has a mental health issue or is unsuitable for detention.

212. To an extent, I get Healthcare's point in that, but I can't see the solution; I can't see how they would operate any differently unless we were a highly resourced model where we had lots of interaction with people in the community as the in-contact population, but that is still never going to get away from the arrest, the police situations we have had. The police picks a drunken man up on the street, takes him in, it is not a police case, it is an immigration case, where does that individual go? You can't just release him to no fixed abode. Safe place – safe place in detention, probably safer than the streets, but unfortunately that puts detention under strain. Luckily, we don't have masses and masses of those sorts of cases, but I don't think we are ever not going to have those cases; even with all the best will in the world and the best systems in the world it won't stop it happening. How quickly we identify and deal with the issue is the important thing.

213. We have done some really good work with, for example, the Polish guy who had been picked off the street and had no fixed abode on release. We worked with the Polish Embassy, they looked after him, he really wanted to go home. Unfortunately, he got very drunk and decided he wasn't going to go



home, but all the right things were in place to make sure that he was well looked after. We treat them as they should be treated in that context and do the best that we can.

214. Q. The issue of people on Rule 40/42, let out too soon?
215. A. That is a really tricky one, because all of our critics around Rule 40/42 say that it should be for a minimum period of time, it shouldn't be a punishment. It should be about de-escalating behaviour, and if someone's behaviour is de-escalating, and when I sign off Rule 40/42 extensions I am looking at what the next step is. I am saying "If you are going to keep him in here for another 24 hours, what are you achieving through that and what is your next step? If you are not going to be doing anything different why are we carrying on with this? To punish him for another 24 hours because he has been naughty?"
216. Q. My sense is that there is a terrific hankering from a number of people in that institution for the life of a prison, so there are a lot of staff who have come from working in prisons. I think there are a lot of people who have a mythologised history about the days when there was a proper regime, IEP, and three tiers of category.
217. A. It makes it difficult.
218. Q. They do see it as a sanction-driven regime that they get frustrated.
219. A. Yes. I have empathy about the limitations of the regime to be able to encourage better behaviour when someone is misbehaving. However, I don't think isolating somebody in a room for any period of a time as a punishment is a way to do it, in my opinion. My team are very hot on making sure that is not why we are doing it. Fine, if it's someone in a fight, that is a different scenario, but not if you are just going to keep them as a punishment.
220. Q. The other issue that has raised quite a lot is getting people out into the regime, to understand how it works when they are doing an ITC. A lot of people on the ITC say "I wasn't prepared for it", and a lot of them leave very early on, so the retention thing is very much to the point.
221. Mr Marsden: It goes back to your attrition.
222. Ms Lampard: We had discussions and the answer we have had from the senior management team is that there are issues to do with security clearance. Then we talked to Ian and we said to Ian there are people just wandering around the wings unaccompanied. He has clearly taken that up with Steve. Steve told us proudly that there was now an agreement that they would be able to go around when people are locked up. Why do they have to be locked up?
223. A. I wasn't aware of that. The last conversation I had with Lee was that they were looking at the second week of the ITC bringing those within the ITC into work a week in the life of Brook House.
224. Q. He is having that discussion with you?
225. A. Yes. The ITC is being reviewed. Currently they have a revised plan.
226. Mr Marsden: To do that.
227. A. Just general content being refreshed, which the next step of that is for Lee to talk that through with myself and possibly commercial. That is certainly the

conversation that I have been having. I wasn't aware about bringing them in while we are in lockdown.

228. **Ms Lampard:** Is there any reason why they couldn't come in when they weren't in lockdown, because that is what they do at Heathrow.
229. **A.** Do they? That's interesting. Not if that is what they do at Heathrow. My comments were going to be DBS-related.
230. **Q.** They are accompanied.
231. **A.** How many people to how many people?
232. **Mr Marsden:** I think it is two people.
233. **A.** Lee's idea was that they worked in the centre for a week rather than just go and look around.
- 234.
235. **Ms Lampard:** Very sensible.
236. **A.** I don't see any reason why people couldn't come on a tour.
237. **Q.** Do you have the authority to give them that permission?
238. **A.** I do. I would have to check that with Rob and the certification team, because there are loads of rules and regulations about who is allowed on site.
239. **Mr Marsden:** In principle, the Home Office would be in favour of things that are within the rules that help expose people to the job that they are going to be asked to do.
240. **A.** Absolutely. As a principle I think it is a really good thing. The only thing that we need to be able to nail down is making sure that everybody who is onsite ~~who~~ is buddied up with somebody, everybody was very clear that you can't leave that person to just wander aimlessly around the centre, from a training perspective around use of force, from a safeguarding perspective of the individuals, certainly if you are doing it in week two of an ITC, which Lee's idea is to do it right up-front, so that you are not investing in training somebody –
241. **Q.** Only for them to dip-out.
242. **A.** They get a flavour of it after a week of classroom-based training. I am really supportive of the idea, we just need to work through some of the safeguards; if there is an incident, that sort of thing.
243. **Ms Lampard:** What I really want to know is why has all of this conversation taken so long to get anywhere?
244. **A.** It is one of my key frustrations. How are we nine months on and we haven't sorted this stuff out?
245. **Q.** Ed and I said to your Ian "Why aren't these people coming into this centre?" He obviously went back to Steve Skitt.
246. **Mr Marsden:** Initially he clutched his head, because I don't think he saw there was a problem.
247. **Ms Lampard:** Steve Skitt didn't even see it was a problem. He said "We were being told by the centre they can't come in because they can't get clearance, full stop." We talked to Ian about it, and Ian said "I would be supportive of them coming in just to visit." Then we hear that it is Ian goes to speak to Steve,

Steve comes to me and says very proudly “We are going to have people in the centre. We are going to let them go around when it is lock-up”, and I found myself thinking, first of all, why did it take my conversation with your Ian to get you to deal with this? Why are they only going to come in during lock-up?

248. A. How have we ended up here?

249. Q. Why have we ended up here, and now we are having this conversation with you, and, no doubt, you can see where we are going, and that might put a bit of a bomb under somebody? What is the problem? Where is the stagnation in that centre?

250. A. A lot of these things are in the action plan, post-*Panorama*.

251. Mr Marsden: Yes, the G4S action plan. We have seen it.

252. A. A lot of these things are within the action plan – for example, the ITC review, of which recruits coming in are part of that process. I said to Lee “Why are you changing it once you have agreed to the 107 staff? Why wouldn’t you do that at the beginning?”, but they didn’t have time to quickly scale-up and do a thorough review a new ITC, so they haven’t even introduced elements of it. From my perspective, the whole action plan has lacked traction in some areas, and that is primarily because Lee and Peter have been trying to deliver it single-handedly.

253. Mr Marsden: Peter Corrigan.

254. A. Peter Corrigan. Lee is like the lynchpin of Brook House or Gatwick, trying to deliver all these changes, but I don’t want to say it is a one-man band, because it sounds like I don’t think it is good, because I do think it is really good, but I don’t think he has enough people to deliver all the things that he needs to do quickly, and I think that is the blocker.

255. Q. We would share that concern. Given the amount of time there has been, it doesn’t feel like it is rising – recruitment might be.

256. A. Yes. Lee is the one driving it forward, Lee is the one with the vision. Lee stepped out – he fell off his bike, for two weeks was ill and then he comes back for a week and then goes to Australia for three weeks – his daughter was in the Commonwealth Games.

257. Q. He has lost traction.

258. A. Yes, so Lee is out for five or six weeks. I didn’t get a sense during that five or six weeks that there was anyone else that picked up the baton and was driving it forward. Unless Lee is there working 12-hour days, and Lee is trying to deliver business as usual as well as all the change, I think it is too big.

259. Ms Lampard: What is your view of the rest of the senior management team?

260. A. I think they are really good. Sarah Newland, I have a lot of time for; I think she is really competent. I am really pleased that Mark has taken up as Head of Residents, brilliant. He was great in safeguarding but wasn’t there long enough to make a massive difference. It has to be the right person. I think Michelle is good on security.

261. Mr Marsden: Steve?

262. A. I think Steve is very good at maintaining safetydelivery. I don’t think he is ever going to take it anywhere, he is just a good safe pair of hands when he is not

around to make sure things are managed. Individually there is no-one with any –

263. Q. Drive. Steve doesn't provide that drive?

264. A. Not in his absence, no.

265. Q. He is a sort of holding operation, to make sure he is safe.

266. A. In the main we can all be critical of other people's performance – I am sure people say that I don't do things I should do at times. In the main I find him good. I find it frustrating that my team don't find him like that. I know that if I phone him, he'll answer the phone, but I'm not sure if some of my team did he would. I know Paul found him very frustrating that it felt with the personality clash whatever they, danced around the job quite a lot and didn't get a lot done.

267. Q. Paul?

268. A. Paul Gasson. I would like to be able to phone Steve and say "Can we just sort this out?" Paul had been dancing around for two weeks trying to sort it out. Steve would have it sorted out immediately. I am like I don't want to have phone you every time something needs to be done.

269. Q. The quality of that relationship between the Home Office locally and the centre is really important. We really noticed that at Heathrow. It was interesting that both the Home Office was in the meeting, and you could tell – there was a common understanding. It wasn't just about they were nice people, but they knew what they were trying to do.

270. A. It is an interesting balance, because you need to be the authority and the friend. It is quite a difficult line to tread.

271. Ms Lampard: How much do you walk the floor, or do you try and leave that to your staff?

272. A. In the main I leave it to the team, but I do obviously go around on occasions.

273. Q. How often do you go around?

274. A. Each centre probably a couple of times a month, so not that frequently. The teams are in there every day. Part of the stuff they do around the monitoring, so they go and eat lunch with the detainees on the wing once week or in the canteen at Tinsley House once a week. That is part of their food sampling – "I am eating with you and isn't this lovely?" or "Isn't this awful". If it is awful I will let someone know, or "This wasn't very nice". You get a lot of feedback. We are trying to be far less shut behind a door and far more in the world of a detainee.

275. Mr Marsden: You think your team have the self-confidence to deal with the "It wasn't good enough?"

276. A. Yes.

277. Q. For example, cleaning – we had a conversation with Brian Harrison last week about cleaning, but we have been on wings, lunch is about to be served, the tables still have breakfast on them, and no sense of responsibility from the wing staff that this is a problem, and someone needs to do something about it. I can see it is the kind of thing that if not only someone more senior in G4S was griping about "Someone get this cleared up", but also the Home Office was saying "This isn't good enough", it would begin to filter through.



278. A. It absolutely is. We have started monitoring cleaning and we are now talking about cleaning, because it is one of our areas we look at.
279. Q. It is a real concern actually.
280. A. Yes. Lee is now talking to me about cleaning. He has been to speak to Aramark. There has been a contractual discrepancy, a spat going on for a while because over-dependence on detainees, were paid workers supposed to clean the wings? I am saying over-dependency on paid work, they should be contracted separately. When they get the contract in 2009, that pre-dated the over-dependency on paid work thing, we keep going "This isn't good enough. This is what we do about cleaning up. I will go and speak to somebody", and they go "It isn't clean enough". We are about to have a conversation about what we do around deep cleans on wings, routine weekly cleans on wings, but in addition to that, where my team are monitoring they are now going to do for us on a daily basis, going "You didn't empty the bin there. There is a spit mark on the wall there".
281. Q. Are they going to go around at different times of the day?
282. A. Yes. They have agreed to do early morning, but they are doing random. In the main they are going to do the early morning, because at different times of the day – obviously after lunch it is going to be busy because people have just finished their lunch.
283. Ms Lampard: Try doing it before lunch.
284. A. They do before breakfast.
285. Q. I was there on Sunday. It was disgusting. Disgusting, with cigarette ends. Egg and cigarette ends.
286. A. Really? It is getting more focussed with G4S, and the things that we focus on are going to be the things that they focus on is the upshot.
287. Mr Marsden: Putting our cards on the table, the other thing that we feel quite strongly doesn't work there is Juls is Head of Residential.
288. Ms Lampard: What is he there for?
289. A. Mark will sort him out. I am very confident of that. I saw the early stages of that the other day when the detainee group forum G4S didn't turn up, Juls didn't turn up, and Mark walked through, and he had obviously heard about it – I hadn't heard about it at that point, it came by me later on from my team, but Mark was like "Why didn't that happen? Not good enough".
290. Q. Who was there from G4S?
291. A. No-one.
292. Mr Marsden: Is that the equivalent of the consultative needs on the wing?
293. A. Yes.
294. Ms Lampard: Because that is the thing that your Steve is trying to lead on.
295. A. Simon.
296. Q. Your Simon is trying to sort out.
297. A. Him and Mark have had quite a few conversations about how it won't work.
298. Q. They are going to have it weekly?

299. A. Yes.
300. Q. This was one of the first ones?
301. A. Yes. It was organised, advertised, and then Juls was supposed to be leading, because we had a Cabinet Office visit, Mark was with us, so it was probably the first one that he had stepped away from. He stepped away and delegated it to someone else and then Juls didn't turn up.
302. Mr Marsden: It didn't happen?
303. A. The other people were there, but Juls wasn't there. I am pleased that they have now got a Head of Residents in place. I don't think that changes the fact that Jules isn't – he is a DCM at best.
304. Ms Lampard: The other one too that we are a bit concerned about, we think the IMB may be a bit cosy.
305. A. Really, what, at Brook?
306. Q. Yes.
307. A. I think the IMB, when people say it is an independent monitoring – I am going to get on my soap box a bit now, but I think people think there are a lot more than they really are. The perception is it is similar to a prison and there is IMB floating around on quite a regular basis independently monitoring what is going on. It is not the case. Once a week they come onsite and they do quite a regimented -
308. Q. What is required of them is once a week, is that what you are saying?
309. A. Yes. There is some budgetary thing around finance for travel, so number visits a year, and I tried to unpick that because I was like "This is mad". If that is the thing that is driving how frequently people are on site, someone needs to just pay them more money, so they come more frequently. If they did what I, when I first started, thought they did, which was be around more often, be more contactable, because they are not even contactable when they are not there – I might want to call or email anybody so if the detainee has an issue –
310. Q. They do get told, don't they, it is going to be a serious event. They do get rung. The Chairman gets rung.
311. A. Or if someone is in Rule 42.
312. Q. Or there is a Gold command, whatever.
313. A. Absolutely, some incident.
314. Q. They are contactable in that respect.
315. A. But only via G4S. If you are a detainee and you have a problem and you want to speak to somebody independent, the Independent Monitoring Board would suggest that the people to go and talk to – "How do I get hold of you and how do I know when you are next in?", because their visits are ad hoc. I don't think it really does what it says on the tin for the detainee. Because they are not on site when the inductions take place, they are given by G4S, if that happens at all. Who inducts them? How does the detainee know they exist?
316. Q. I have to say our sense of them is that they are much less present than they were when we were in Yarl's Wood. I don't know the regime under which they are required to operate, but I do know that they are definitely not there as

well, and I know that in Yarl's Wood they had up a list of where they would be in their room and people could come and speak to them.

317. **Mr Marsden:** They work together more effectively.

318. **A.** When there was the IMB down at Tinsley House, Anne Duffy has done some really good stuff about promoting what they do.

319. **Q.** Are they more active?

320. **A.** They are not around necessarily more frequently, but they just are better known. They have even now really thought about how they advertise what they do. I went to one of the IMB Chairs Board and they were talking at that time about trying to bring some consistency and asked some questions about "Can you be contactable outside of hours? Can you give detainees an email address that they can email stuff through?" Most detainees have an email account now.

321. **Ms Lampard:** What did they say?

322. **A.** "We can have a look at that". They still haven't managed to get it up and running at Brook House. To be fair to Mary, I know it is something that they have tried to do, and I don't know what issues they have hit in relation to that.

323. **Mr Marsden:** If your drive is for greater oversight, more challenge, that are you being compliant, are you running the place decently, they could play a useful role in that.

324. **A.** Yes. Routinely I get their reports every week when someone has been on site and I scrutinise their reports, because they are a good source of information for me, and I will often pick up on comments that they make and get the compliance lead for each site to go off and do their thing.

325. **Mr Lampard:** There is one other issue in relation to them which is we have sat in on their meeting –

326. **A.** The IMB monthly meeting?

327. **Q.** Yes, their monthly meeting – Ian is present, and for us there was definitely a different flavour from what we had seen in the IMB at Yarl's Wood, which was very good. It was much more pally, it was gossipy, it was cosy, it was over-dominated by Dick Weber, who is the former prison governor. I am not sure that actually a former prison governor has the freshest of eyes that you need, and he definitely referred a lot to "In prison this is how we would do it", and everybody lapped all of that up. We just left with a sense that this is not quite the right balance or challenge.

328. **A.** There is definitely a difference with Tinsley, because Tinsley is quite robust. It's all very friendly, don't get me wrong, but they are quite robust with how they address staff with G4S. My experience of the Brook House one is that that has been the case previously. They have had a recent change of Chair, so I don't know whether that has changed. I haven't been to one of their IMB meetings since Mary has taken over, so I don't know whether that has changed the tone at all. Jackie was always very fair, but quite forceful.

329. **Mr Marsden:** Michelle, do you have any sense of how effective G4S corporately are in overseeing Brook House, as in there is local management, Lee, but what does the organisation above him look like?

330. **A.** We know that obviously they are very focussed on **planning performance**, aren't they, so any performance indicators that attract a financial penalty is

something that there is a lot of scrutiny around. On a monthly basis they have a trading review where they ~~cut-off~~ discuss a lot of that stuff. One of the things they are doing I think is going to be a really good thing, which is going to be one of Lee's future jobs, is to set up a totally dependent assurance team that will sit separate from the operational team. Whereas a lot of the assurance work is overseen by the director on site, they would want that to report in separately, to a separate team of people, which I think would be a really good move if they got that up and running.

331. **Ms Lampard:** My last question is about the use of force and, in particular, governance of the use of force. As we understand it there has been no governance of use of force for some time, is that a concern for you?
332. **A.** It is a concern, historically it has been a concern, but I am really pleased that David Killick has been appointed to deal with use of force. They introduced director review of any use of force, and David Killick does a review within 48 hours of any use of force. Then there is a weekly use of force meeting.
333. **Q.** Is there?
334. **A.** Not the use of force scrutiny meeting; there is a use of force meeting that is now happening, but they are not going to be doing the use of force scrutiny meeting any more, but David Killick is going to review, because the use of force scrutiny meeting was attended by people who had no use of force knowledge or experience, so how can you scrutinise something you have no idea what you are looking at, is Lee's view. What they have introduced is David and the Duty Director are doing scrutiny and then if either of them identify that there is an issue that then feeds in, and the issue will be discussed at the use of force meeting, but that is very recent, within the last two or three weeks, but that is up and running.
335. My ongoing concern is around use of force capacity for trainers and scrutiny. What happens if David is off for the week, it doesn't have anywhere else to go, so no-one reviews it for two weeks. He would, no doubt, acknowledge the point that they have a single point of failure at the moment, until they get more use of force staff on site. That is part of the issue with some of their refresher training is having appropriate use of force, or the capacity for use of force.
336. **Mr Marsden:** Dave is internal, isn't he?
337. **A.** David, yes. There is no independent –
338. **Q.** Heathrow have introduced someone independent.
339. **A.** Yes, I am not surprised, it was in the Mitie bid that they were doing that.
340. **Q.** Which I think was quite a novel idea.
341. **Ms Lampard:** Thank you very much. I have no more questions, thank you. Is there anything you wanted to ask us?
342. **A.** I don't think so.
343. **Q.** Done?
344. **Mr Marsden:** I think so.

**345. Ms Lampard:** Thank you. Sorry it was such a grilling, but we have our ideas now, so it is a bit of a case of let's test some of this stuff out rather than letting you have your say.

*[Interview concluded]*