

BROOK HOUSE INQUIRY

THIRD WITNESS STATEMENT OF GORDON BROCKINGTON

I, **Gordon Brockington**, Managing Director, Justice and Government Chief Commercial Officer, G4S Care and Justice Services (UK) Limited ('CJS'/'the Company'), 46 Gillingham Street, London, SW1V 1HU will say as follows:

1. I make this statement following the Inquiry's Rule 9 request dated 26 April 2022.
2. I am asked to address the actions taken by G4S following receipt of the January 2017 report HMIP [CJS000761] and say below in respect of each key highlighted area:
3. **A third of detainees reported feeling unsafe, similar to the last inspection:** Levels of violence were fairly low and there had been few serious assaults or other incidents. Consultation with detainees on safety issues was good. Collection and analysis of data on safety were excellent and led to tangible action. Investigations into violent incidents were good and victims received good support. **Action** - G4S conducted further surveys to monitor how safe Detainees felt. These surveys were conducted on an annual basis and were known as the "Brook House Safer Community Survey 2017". The results of this survey are disclosed to the Inquiry (ref: 080722-CJS-0010). Next steps were monitored via an action plan. An example action plan is disclosed to the Inquiry (ref 080722-CJS-0011). Following Panorama, these surveys developed into the Candour Logs and were conducted more frequently.
4. **43% of detainees said they had problems with feeling depressed or suicidal on arrival:** Levels of self-harm were lower than at the previous inspection and similar centres, and detainees on open ACDTs were generally positive about the care they received. A large number of detainees had been on constant watch, but they were not

confined to cells and were well supported. **Action** - G4S conducted the “Brook House Safer Community Survey 2017” described at paragraph 3 above. Activity was also monitored via monthly Safeguarding and Equality reports.

5. **About three-quarters of detainees had a positive view of the attitudes and behaviour of staff:** This outcome (proportion) was higher for those who did not speak English. HMIP saw staff dealing with a range of issues with resilience and even-handedness. Many staff integrated well with detainees, although there was limited evidence of regular contact with individual care officers. **Action** - G4S conducted the “Brook House Safer Community Survey 2017” described at paragraph 3 above.
6. **80% of detainees felt that their religious beliefs were respected.** **Action** - G4S conducted the “Brook House Safer Community Survey 2017” described at paragraph 3 above. Activity was also monitored via monthly Safeguarding and Equality reports.
7. **31% of detainees said that the food was good or very good compared to 18% at our last inspection and more than half the detainees said in the survey that the shop sold a wide enough range of goods:** Portion sizes were good and the quality of the food that we saw was reasonable. Meals were served at appropriate times and catered for a diverse range of cultures and dietary needs. Hot options were offered at lunchtime and the evening meal. Breakfast packs included eggs and were distributed on the day they were eaten. **Action** - G4S conducted regular Food and Shop surveys and monitored service delivery via monthly Safeguarding and Equality reports. In 2018, this area also formed part of the Candour Log. Aramark, G4S’s catering provider, were engaged in the feedback. In order to improve in this area, steps were taken to regularly understand the makeup of the community and ensure the menus were flexible and appropriate for the current community at any given time.
8. **Two-thirds of detainees told us they had a solicitor but only a third of those had received a legal visit.** **Action** - Access to legal support to be reviewed by the Home Office - G4S invested in the Welfare provision to support and signpost Detainees. This included additional staffing and training above contractual requirements to deliver welfare services. Welfare Officer roles were created and staff received Home Office

accreditation to perform this role. Owen Syred was one of the G4S employees who performed this role post HMIP's report; a role that did not exist previously.

9. **Only a quarter of detainees in our survey said it was easy to obtain bail information. Action** - G4S invested in the Welfare provision to support and signpost Detainees, as described at paragraph 8 above.
10. **Only 19% of detainees said it was easy to see the centre immigration staff, compared with 27% in other IRCs. Action** - G4S invested in the Welfare provision to support and signpost Detainees, as described at paragraph 8 above.
11. **The HMIP survey found that most detainees said it was relatively easy to clean their clothes and to have a daily shower. Action** - G4S conducted further surveys and monitored service delivery via monthly Safeguarding and Equality reports.
12. **77% of detainees said that most staff treated them with respect and 84% of those who did not speak English reported respectful treatment by staff:** Two-thirds said there was a member of staff they could turn to if they had a problem. One detainee wrote to us that: *'The positive thing here is that you can ask any member of staff if you don't know English. The staff is cooperative and friendly'*. **Action** - G4S conducted further surveys and monitored service delivery via monthly Safeguarding and Equality reports.
13. **The survey found that non-English speakers were more positive than English speakers about access to education, having enough to fill their time and access to the library. Action** - G4S conducted further surveys and monitored service delivery via monthly Safeguarding and Equality reports.
14. **80% of detainees felt that their religious beliefs were respected. Action** - G4S conducted further surveys and monitored service delivery via monthly Safeguarding and Equality reports.
15. **23% of detainees said they were taking part in education and it was impressive that 100% of detainees said the education was helpful. Action** - G4S conducted

further surveys and monitored service delivery via monthly Safeguarding and Equality reports.

16. **88% of detainees said that it was easy to go to the library against the comparator of 76% and 75% at the previous inspection. Action** - G4S conducted further surveys and monitored service delivery via monthly Safeguarding and Equality reports.

17. **81% of detainees said that it was very easy to go to the gym. Action** - G4S conducted further surveys and monitored service delivery via monthly Safeguarding and Equality reports.

18. **Only 39% of detainees said that they had received a visit at Brook House and 73% of those who had received a visit said they had been treated well or very well by visits staff. Action** - To improve access to Visits, G4S introduced an on-line booking system, and conducted further surveys and monitored service delivery via monthly Safeguarding and Equality reports.

19. **62% of detainees said it was easy to use the telephone. Action** - G4S conducted further surveys and monitored service delivery via monthly Safeguarding and Equality reports.

20. During my oral evidence session, I was shown document HOM0331707, an internal memo from the Home Office identifying a number of staff members being involved in serious incidents prior to Panorama. I am asked to confirm whether G4S was aware of these.

21. G4S was aware of these as all had been subject to investigations conducted by PSU, of which three were partly substantiated: (1) Steve Webb - whilst PSU partly substantiated a complaint, the element that was partly substantiated related to another DCO returning to the incident to challenge the Detainee. No recommendations were made that related to DCO Steve Webb; (2) Derek Murphy - he was involved in a removal, where the loss of a dental plate was raised by a Detainee - another DCM acknowledged that they were responsible for locating and issuing the plate to the Detainee - no recommendations or concerns raised by PSU in relation to CDM. In relation to the complaint about use of

force, whilst not substantiated, there was a recommendation relating to an issue with accuracy in the use of force and incident reports, re length of time that the handcuffs were used and (3) Chris Donnelly - he was identified as a witness to numerous use of force incidents but no recommendations or concerns were raised by PSU in relation to him. Mr Donnelly was also involved in the above mentioned removal with DCO Murphy, where the loss of a dental plate was raised by a Detainee - another DCM acknowledged that they were responsible for locating and issuing the plate to the Detainee - no recommendations or concerns raised by PSU in relation to Mr Donnelly.

22. I have been asked to confirm whether there were any staffing shortages in the period September 2016 to December 2016, and whether G4S incurred any contractual penalties during this period for failing to meet minimum staffing levels.

23. G4S monitored staffing numbers for Gatwick Immigration Removal Centres (“Gatwick IRCs”) both prior to and during the relevant period collectively; this included both Brook House and Tinsley House. Prior to the refurbishment of Tinsley House in October 2016, the minimum staffing level (“MSL”) for Gatwick IRCs was 189 DCOs, including 115 for Brook House and 74 for Tinsley House.

24. In December 2016, the MSL for DCOs increased to 206 as a result of the additional bed spaces that were put into Brook House.

25. The table below sets out the number of posts budgeted for, i.e. the MSL in the contract between G4S and the Home Office, the full-time equivalent that was actually employed, how many vacancies existed and how many penalty points G4S incurred for falling below the MSL between September and December 2016. An E2 post is the G4S grade for a First Line Manager.

Month	September '16	October '16	November '16	December '16
E2 Budgeted	44	44	44	44
E2 In Post	40	41	40	40

E2 Vacancies	4	3	4	4
DCO MSL	189	189	189	206*
DCO In Post	152	182	190	168
DCO Vacancies	37	7	-1	38
Staff related Penalties	900	0	0	0

26. Penalty points were imposed in September 2016 for failing to meet the MSL, however, refurbishment works commenced in October 2016 at Tinsley House so existing Tinsley House staff were deployed to work in Brook House. Consequently, whilst G4S did not meet the MSL for the two sites, whilst only Brook House was operational and all DCO staff had been deployed to this site, the MSL for Brook House was met and therefore no penalty points were imposed. This is the same for the subsequent months shown in the above table.

27. Finally, I have been asked to confirm how staffing levels from September to December 2016 compared to staffing levels during the Relevant Period.

28. Tinsley House remained closed until May 2017; throughout the month of May, detainee numbers at Tinsley House were ramping up again. Consequently, KPI penalties were not triggered until June 2017. Once Tinsley House re-opened, Tinsley House staff started to move from working in Brook House back to Tinsley House, on a proportionate basis to number of detainees being accommodated. The below table shows the staffing levels for the Relevant Period:

Month	April '17	May '17	June '17	July '17	August '17
E2 Budgeted	51	51	51	51	51

E2 In Post	48	48.5	46	47	46
E2 Vacancies	3	2.5	5	4	5
DCO Budgeted	**225	225	225	225	225
DCO In Post	202	202	210	200	210
DCO Vacancies	23	23	15	25	15
Staff related Penalties	0	0	300	600	375

29. The above table shows that during the Relevant Period, the MSL for both sites had increased again from 206 DCOs to 225; this was in line with the Tinsley House refurbishment. Similarly, the MSL for E2 posts also increased from 44 to 51. In the months when Tinsley House was closed, all staff were deployed to Brook House, exceeding the MSL for Brook House. Once Tinsley House re-opened, staffing levels were across the two sites.

STATEMENT OF TRUTH

I believe that the facts stated herein are true.

I am duly authorised to make this statement.

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

Signed:

Signature

Dated: 17 October 2022