

by two ACOs, well, it's run by the ACO group, that I don't have direct management over.

58. Q. Stores is just all goods receivable, everything from catering material through to new furniture, to fire extinguishers or whatever.
59. A. Yes, all of the strange and wonderful things –
60. Q. Need to run the place.
61. A. Yes.
62. Q. Okay. In terms, then, of the third party welfare organisations, is that an area of responsibility for you, or not?
63. A. It was pitched to me as it would be my area, but it never fully came over to me, so Steve Skitt kept hold of healthcare, and Aramark.
64. Q. Aramark being the cleaners?
65. A. Yes, Aramark being the catering and cleaning company, so he does regular meetings with them and he manages that side of it. From that point, it was never overly released to me.
66. Ms Lampard: What about the welfare organisations like the Samaritans, and Hibiscus - who does that?
67. A. The Samaritans, I believe generally tie in with the Safer Community role and Safeguarding.
68. Mr Marsden: That would be James.
69. A. It would be James, yes. Safer Community Team generally liaise with the Samaritans, Hibiscus, I have nothing to do with Hibiscus, that was a PDA, it was done in and around a PDA, so I don't have any involvement with them.
70. Q. Day by day, what is the nature of your job, what are you spending your time doing? Is it principally in the management suite here, or is it outward-facing as well?
71. A. Predominantly it's in the management side of those functions, so it's based in the admin office, and that's where I am for a large chunk of the time.
72. Ms Lampard: There's one other organisation we've heard about, which I just want to ask you about the relationship with, that's the Gatwick Detainee Welfare Group – do you have anything to do with them?
73. A. Yes, I started having something to do with them because they are predominantly a social visiting group, I took over involvement with them because I was looking after visits at the time.
74. Q. This is when you were a DCM?
75. A. No, this is when I was in this grade, back at the start of 2016, my predecessor, Chris Millican, was the Operations Manager, and he used to meet with the Gatwick Detainee Welfare Group, at the Home Office. We have an SLA or an MOU with them.
76. Q. With whom?
77. A. With the Gatwick Detainee Welfare Group. It was in the process of being reviewed, so I came into it and took that on after it had been reviewed, just to touch base with that, to make sure it was all present and correct. Then along with Steve, earlier in the year we've been reviewing it with their new director.

78. **Mr Marsden:** James.
79. **A.** James.
80. **Ms Lampard:** What have you decided about the relationship?
81. **A.** We've met twice, to discuss the MOU – again, I haven't been involved with it recently, Steve has taken that on to a degree.
82. **Mr Marsden:** The MOU spelling out their relationship with Brook House –
83. **A.** Yes, their relationship with us at Brook, yes.
84. **Q.** Your relationship with them. Is the MOU a new thing?
85. **A.** No, the MOU has been in place for a number of years, as far as I understand, it was recently reviewed, I think towards the start of this year or end of last.
86. **Q.** What about?
87. **A.** There were some issues around some of their members getting overly involved in cases, so I think one of them had written a character reference for someone in court, someone had put up surety for bail, I believe. The line was being blurred between being a visiting support group, a befriender-type role, to bordering on casework and taking on more of a casework role with people. There were concerns that they weren't sharing some information with us around safeguarding.
88. **Q.** Such as?
89. **A.** Such as people that were potentially vulnerable, detainees that were potentially vulnerable in the centre, or that had mental health concerns, that they thought that they could help with, without telling us. This is not a broad thing, there have been a few isolated incidents, bits and pieces. There were some concerns, so that's why we started meeting again, to re-discuss the MOU.
90. It was agreed by Chris previously that they could have a surgery-type session, whereas before they were just social visitors. The surgery, as it was pitched to us at the time, was for them to come in, to identify what members would be suitable to visit that detainee in a social capacity, so it was almost like –
91. **Q.** Triaging.
92. **A.** Yes, but it was to say, yes, I think you would be suitable to meet with this volunteer. They started seeing the same detainee several times in a month, they'd see the same person three times, and you think, hold on, surely you've seen that person once, you've said, you're the perfect person for this volunteer, we'll get you to see them in a social capacity. That's where the casework was coming into it, and I think they were starting to interfere with the Home Office in terms of the Home Office's objective of removing people from the UK, Gatwick Welfare Group were then starting, I think, to cause issues in that.
93. **Ms Lampard:** They're quite explicit though, aren't they, that they do have a sort of campaigning role, so it seems odd that people should feel uncomfortable with them when they do that.
94. **A.** That's why the MOU, I believe, why they wanted to re-establish it, because that is their campaign and that's what they do. It was to do that as social

visitor in a social visitor setting, whereas they were then having surgeries in a legal visit, one-on-one room, closed doors, where they were having almost legal surgeries as such, whereas their remit and role within Brook was to offer support and to visit people that didn't have a social -

95. **Mr Marsden:** There was a sense that their role had changed, and they had started getting into supporting detainees to stay in the country, or make an appeal or access –
96. **A.** Yes, and they should be there to signpost detainees to say, if you need legal advice, these are the people to speak to, that's their role, they're a welfare organisation, but it was thought that they were almost taking on that casework function which wasn't what they initially were due to be doing.
97. **Q.** Other than coming to the visit centre, have they ever been into the Centre?
98. **A.** No, not really, they come to the visit centre and come through to social and legal visits. I remember meeting up with Nic Eadie, who was the previous Director before James, and I was discussing the MOU with Nic initially. I think, they have about three or four staff, the rest all volunteer. I brought them in and we went for a walk around the building, but it's not something that we would do normally, it was just to give them a bit of a sense of the layout, so that when they were talking to detainees they were saying, have you been to the Welfare Office, and they understood where in the building it was. As far as I'm aware, that's the only time they've come in and had a look around.
99. **Q.** You've been here a long time, how does the Centre compare with when you started to how it is now, in general terms?
100. **A.** It's fluctuated over the years, so I suppose the best way to describe Brook when it opened was chaotic, and that's probably polite. When we came off our ITC, the training we'd received was based on Tinsley's training, because that's what they knew. The vast proportion of staff had come from unrelated sectors, a lot of people had come from the airport, because they'd been laying off baggage handlers, people had come from all sorts of different jobs, so no-one really had any experience working in a custodial setting. The general consensus I think around the immigration estate was to offload their problematic cases into Brook House.
101. When it opened I think it was a bit of a green light moment, and we got some of the most difficult and challenging detainees, and probably weren't overly prepared to deal with some of the most difficult detainees - it was chaotic. We didn't get out till 11, 12 o'clock at night most nights, and were back in the next morning because they didn't want to lock up. There was not a lot of control, we were doing four or five planned removals a night, you were running from alarm bell to alarm bell, it was chaotic - but experience and character-building, in fairness.
102. Then a lot of work was put in at the time to get control back. I think realistically some of the stuff that had been set up for mobilisation wasn't quite right, so we didn't have a regime that incorporated all four wings. When we opened the doors we only had a regime for one wing, and as the second wing got brought online that regime changed to incorporate two. Then when the third one came online we had to again change the regime to incorporate the three, and alike with the four. It was constantly in a state of flux, and evolution, which you expect with a new building, but for inexperienced staff to