

1.48), there “*had been some very good corruption prevention work*” (1.52), “*good work had been done to interrupt the supply of drugs into the centre*” including ‘contact mapping’ and liaison with the police leading to arrests (1.54). The evidence was of “*limited drug availability*” (1.53) and a “*small amount of illicit drug use in the centre*” (2.84).

(x) PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS UNIT

178. Whilst the Home Office is content to address issues relating to the PSU in this Closing Statement, it is vital to note that the PSU is independent from Immigration Enforcement. Mr Khan explained that he had no doubt as to the PSU’s independence and impartiality. He had never experienced or been told of any pressure for the PSU to reach a particular conclusion¹⁶⁵. Mr Riley was clear that the PSU “*has to be absolutely independent*”¹⁶⁶. Therefore, whilst the PSU has shared representation with Immigration Enforcement it respectfully wishes to emphasise that this shared representation was simply in order to best assist the Inquiry in the most cost and time effective way.
179. By way of background, the ‘corporate’ evidence from the PSU has been given in a detailed statement from Mark Hartley King¹⁶⁷, who also addresses the cases of D87, D191, D377, D642, D668, D687, D234, D1527, D1538, D1738, D1747, D1798, D2054, D2953, D3545, D326 and D3548. Helen Wilkinson’s statement and oral evidence¹⁶⁸ address the cases of D668, D687 and D2054. Rukshana Rafique¹⁶⁹ addresses the case of D2953. Finally, Mohammed Khan provided a witness statement adopting the evidence of Mr Hartley King and further oral evidence¹⁷⁰.
180. The Inquiry will also be assisted by a detailed explanation of 24 July 2020¹⁷¹, which sets out the role of the Home Office in dealing with any complaints to it made by G4S, G4S Health Services, Home Office or other Brook House staff complaints, including whistleblowing allegations; an explanation of the work of the Security and Use of Force Team with regard to Brook House during 2017; an explanation of the relationship between the Home Office, G4S and G4S Health Services regarding dealing with and

¹⁶⁵ Mohammed Khan [24 March 2022 5/16](#)

¹⁶⁶ Phil Riley [4 April 2022 160/24](#)

¹⁶⁷ [HOM0331946](#)

¹⁶⁸ [HOM0332047](#), Helen Wilkinson [24 March 2022](#)

¹⁶⁹ [HOM0332123](#)

¹⁷⁰ [HOM0332155](#), Mohammed Khan [24 March 2022](#)

¹⁷¹ [HOM0331998](#)

194. The Inquiry has heard the reflections of those at HMIP and the IMB as to how it was that they, also, did not find the abuse that was uncovered by Panorama, and the changes that they have made since, such as the implementation of enhanced methodology in all IRC inspections by HMIP. The Home Office accepts that in the past, it did not have sufficient dedicated resource in IRCs to make sure that recommendations were being delivered¹⁹⁶. Now, the teams at the IRCs are split to ensure better oversight, and there are also a number of cross Directorate second-line assurance teams.
195. The new contract also requires suppliers to implement recommendations. Serco has explained that they *"have a performance improvement plan, we look at all third party recommendations, and HMIP recommendations, and we will action and go through those and discuss and sit down with the Home Office"*¹⁹⁷. Their view is that HMIP, for example, *"are there to advise, support and look at the decency agenda, et cetera, so we would take the appropriate action to address any concerns that HMIP had within Brook House"*¹⁹⁸.
196. Immigration enforcement, including immigration detention and the running of IRCs, is a complex and difficult area of policy, operations, and law¹⁹⁹. It is a *"difficult operating environment"*, in addition to which *"the debate on migration and enforcement is polarised and entrenched"*²⁰⁰. Underestimating this complexity and difficulty can, from the outside, lead to a view that the Home Office is slow or reluctant to take on board recommendations and effect change. This is not the case.
197. The view of HMIP is that *"we should be clear that the fact that we can't enforce recommendations doesn't mean they're not taken seriously. [...] we think that recommendations which we make and the findings which we come up with are taken pretty seriously, I think, by the Home Office. Their implementation may not be effective all the time, and some parts of the Home Office haven't done well enough, but I think that certainly in immigration enforcement, I think the attitude has changed. This was from a time when I think the attitude was very defensive, and I think, over the years, that's softened and has become more constructive"*²⁰¹.

¹⁹⁶ Phil Riley [4 April 2022 98/10](#)

¹⁹⁷ Steven Hower [1 April 2022 8/3](#)

¹⁹⁸ Steven Hower [1 April 151/16](#)

¹⁹⁹ Phil Riley [4 April 2022 104/23 to 105/17](#)

²⁰⁰ Phil Riley [4 April 2022 128/1](#)

²⁰¹ Singh Bhui [24 March 2022 185/2](#)