

Title:	N68 - Risk Assessment
Summary:	Assessment of risk in the event of identification during the Undercover Policing Inquiry (UCPI)
Relevant to:	UCPI
Author:	Mark Veljovic
Peer Reviewer:	David Reid
Version:	Gisted
Date created:	25/5/17
Security level:	Official Sensitive

PURPOSE

This risk assessment has been prepared in relation to the Undercover Policing Inquiry, and concerns the officer known as N68.

The purpose of the document is to provide an objective assessment of the creation of or increase in risk to N68 and third parties if information is disclosed by the Undercover Policing Inquiry (UCPI) which directly or indirectly leads to the identification of N68 as a former undercover police officer (UCO). The report covers the situation in relation to both N68's pseudonym and real identity if details became known.

A risk assessment is a 'snap shot' in time. New information received, or a change in circumstances, could raise or lower the risk. It is therefore appreciated that assessments require regular monitoring, and may require updating.

AUTHOR;

The author of this risk assessment is Mark Veljovic

It has been peer reviewed by David Reid

THE PROCESS ADOPTED

There are a number of methods used in the assessment of risk. The process adopted in the production of this report has been documented

The terms are defined and have been documented

The risk assessment includes the sources of the material as requested by the Chairman of the Inquiry (Risk Assessments – note to core participants - paragraph 11). A copy of the material is annexed to the assessment (paragraph 12). The risk assessors are aware of the contents of that direction, and note the Chairman's need for evidence and assessment of present risk, as well as future risk should the restriction order not be made (paragraph 17).

They also note the comments re differential risk in terms of disclosure of the undercover identity (paragraph 18), and specifics around how the 'jigsaw' could be completed (paragraph 19).

The reports are structured to include all of the areas covered by the Chairman in his note dated 20th Oct 2016, specifically in paragraphs 29 and 30.

LIMITATIONS ON THE RISK ASSESSMENT PROCESS AND GENERAL COMMENTS

There are a number of limitations placed on the process, either due to time constraints, or in compliance with directions given by the Inquiry. This includes the parameters set for researching subjects or organizations that may present an ongoing risk to the former undercover officer.

Documents used to compile this report are referenced as follows:

Details

CONTENTS:

- 1. Real identity**
- 2. Summary**
- 3. N68 pre-deployment**
 - 3.1 Life before joining the MPS
 - 3.2 Police career pre-UCO role
 - 3.3 Recruitment to UCO role
 - 3.4 Assurances re future anonymity
- 4. Undercover deployment**
 - 4.1 Dates of deployment
 - 4.2 Main groups infiltrated
 - 4.3 Peripheral interactions
 - 4.4 Covert identity adopted
 - 4.5 Tasking
 - 4.6 Assimilation into the group
 - 4.7 Group size

- 4.8 Geographical locations
- 4.9 Cover occupation
- 4.10 Compromises or security concerns DURING deployment
- 4.11 Risk assessments DURING deployments
- 4.12 Relationships or other behaviour that could heighten risk
- 4.13 Arrests
- 4.14 Key associates
- 4.15 Other UCO's who could be affected if a restriction order for N68 is not issued
- 4.16 Withdrawal / exit strategy
- 4.17 Return to regular policing
- 4.18 Commendations
- 4.29 Support DURING deployment
- 4.20 Whether N68 is a core participant at the public inquiry

5. Current situation

- 5.1 Age and marital status
- 5.2 Current location
- 5.3 Family circumstances
- 5.4 Subject to any formal investigation
- 5.5 Current employment
- 5.6 Route to work
- 5.7 Roles within the community
- 5.8 Partner's employment
- 5.9 Children
- 5.10 Internet profile
- 5.11 Knowledge of their previous role amongst family and close friends
- 5.12 Physical health
- 5.13 Psychological health

6. Current level of exposure

- 6.1 Cover name
- 6.2 True identity
- 6.3 Where sourced
- 6.4 Compromises or potential compromises subsequent to posting
- 6.5 *Details of pseudonym*
- 6.6 Official confirmation regarding deployment and / or identity
- 6.7 Other deployments by N68

7. Interview between risk assessors and N68

8. Causal link in terms of completing a Mosaic / Jigsaw effect

- 8.1 General impact
- 8.2 Specific impact

9. Threat considerations

- 9.1 Current terrorist threat level

10. Research conducted

- 10.1 Initial research on HOLMES and Relativity
- 10.2 Basic research on individuals (PNC / PND / IIP)
- 10.3 Additional research
- 10.4 Open source research

11. The risk currently posed by the groups infiltrated

12. The risk from individuals within the group

- 12.1 Associate causing N68 particular concern / perception of risk by the UCO
- 12.2 Associates with a propensity for violence

- 12.3 Associates with research skills
- 12.4 Associates with previous experience of harassing their targets
- 12.5 Geography of people of concern

13. Indicators of psychological risk requiring expert assessment

- 13.1 Perception of the risk by the UCO
- 13.2 Counselling, welfare, psychological referral etc.

14. Interference with private and family life

- 14.1 Perception of the risk by the UCO
- 14.2 Nature and gravity of the risk
- 14.3 Media intrusion
- 14.4 Effects on friends and family

15. Mitigating the risk

- 15.1 Previous risk assessments
- 15.2 Security arrangements in place
- 15.3 The anticipated result of revealing pseudonym only
- 15.4 Withholding, redacting or gisting documents in the context of this UCO
- 15.5 Use of a cipher
- 15.6 Screening
- 15.7 Voice modulation
- 15.8 Prohibition around publication
- 15.9 Receiving evidence in private

16. Conclusions

- 16.1 General comments
- 16.2 Assessment scores

17. Appendices

Appendix A

Open Source research

Appendix B

Description

1. REAL IDENTITY

Real name – *Name*

Undercover pseudonym – *Pseudonym*

From this point **the officer** is referred to as N68.

2. SUMMARY

- N68 died in **year and details in relation to any family.**
- There is no information recorded on Holmes to confirm that N68 used a deceased person's identity as a cover name.
- **Whether N68 had a relationship. Whether N68 was ever involved in the criminal justice system**
- N68 was deployed between **dates and details. Post deployment information including that N68 returned to the unit later.**

3. SUMMARY OF OFFICER'S LIFE PRE-DEPLOYMENT

3.1 Life before joining MPS

Details in relation to life before joining MPS

There is nothing from this period that affects the current risk assessment

3.2 Police career history pre-UCO role

Details in relation to pre UCO police career

There is nothing from this period that affects the current risk assessment

3.3 Recruitment to UCO role

- It is not known how N68 was recruited onto the SDS, whether N68 undertook any psychometric testing, or how long N68 spent in the Back Office.

When deployed as a UCO.

- *Dates*
- *Post deployment information*

Given N68 is deceased, there has been no opportunity to ascertain any information regarding N68's back story or legend.

3.4 Assurances re future anonymity

This section is limited given the comments of the Chairman as to whether it naturally falls into a risk assessment process.

It would have been standard practice at the time for assurances of lifelong anonymity to be provided.

4. UNDERCOVER DEPLOYMENT

4.1 Dates of deployment

- *Dates*

4.2 Main group infiltrated

- *Details*

4.3 Peripheral interactions

- *Discussion*

4.4 Covert identity adopted

- *Name*
- *Other details*

4.5 Tasking

Discussion

4.6 Assimilation into the group

Discussion

4.7 Group size

Discussion

4.8 Geographical location(s) based

Discussion

4.9 Cover occupation

Discussion

4.10 Compromises or security concerns during N68's deployment

Discussion

4.11 Risk assessments during deployment

Discussion

4.12 Relationships entered into, or other behaviour that could heighten the risk

Discussion

4.13 Arrests

Discussion

4.14 Key associates

Details in relation to key associates

4.15 Other Undercover officers who would be affected if a restriction order was not issued

Discussion

4.16 Withdrawal / exit strategy

Discussion

4.17 Return to regular policing

Discussion

4.18 Commendations

- ***Details of any commendations***

4.19 Support during deployment

Discussion

4.20 Whether N68 is a Core Participant at the Public Inquiry

- N68 is not a core participant in the Inquiry.

5. CURRENT SITUATION WITH N68

- Deceased, died in ***Year of Death and details in relation to any family***

5.1 Age & current marital status

- Not applicable

5.2 Current location

- Not applicable

5.3 Family circumstances

Details in relation to any family

5.4 Subject to any formal investigation

- Not Applicable

5.5 Current employment

- Not applicable

5.6 Route to work

- Not applicable

5.7 Role within the community

- Not applicable

5.8 Their partner's employment

- Not known

5.9 Children

- Not known

5.10 Internet profile

- See Open Source section

5.11 Knowledge of their role amongst family and close friends

- Not known

5.12 Physical health

- Not applicable

5.13 Psychological health

- Not applicable

6. CURRENT LEVEL OF EXPOSURE

The Chairman of the Inquiry makes clear that any risk caused by self-disclosure or third party disclosure will be material considerations (Part 6, conclusions and summary of findings, the public interest balance under section 19 (3) (b), section A.6)

Details of whether or not the following are currently in the public domain:

6.1 Cover name

Discussion

6.2 True identity

Discussion

6.3 Where sourced

Discussion

6.4 Compromises / potential compromises subsequent to N68's posting

Discussion

6.5 Details of pseudonym

6.6 Official confirmation regarding deployment and/or identity

There has been no self-disclosure, no court order, no police revelation, and no official disclosure.

6.7 Other deployments by the UCO

Discussion

7. INTERVIEW BETWEEN RISK ASSESSORS AND THE FORMER UCO

- Not applicable

8. CAUSAL LINK IN TERMS OF COMPLETING A MOSAIC/JIGSAW EFFECT

This section does not intend to prove the existence of the Mosaic effect, but looks at the likelihood of it applying in this case.

8.1 General impact

In general terms, a number of matters can be said.

Firstly, the risk assessors do not assume that the material currently in the public domain represents the totality of the information available. For example, there is evidence that people 'build a picture' before naming a person as an ex-UCO. Therefore the risk assessors cannot reasonably know what other 'pieces of the jigsaw' are required before the full picture is revealed.

Secondly, the risk assessors acknowledge that 'believing' is different from 'knowing'. Assessing how official confirmation of the identity of a UCO impacts upon risk is speculative. The argument is that official confirmation raises the risk as it will increase the efforts to establish the real identity of the officer, and additional time and resources will be put into those attempts. In essence, that would depend upon a number of factors, including the level of certainty with which the person is already exposed. If there is no real doubt that the person was a UCO then official confirmation of that person is unlikely to add to the attempts to identify him or her, as those attempts will have already occurred or be proceeding. However, if the exposure is largely speculative then official confirmation could add significantly to the attempts to discover their real identity.

8.2 Specific impact

Whether or not N68's pseudonym is in the public domain

9. THREAT CONSIDERATIONS

9.1 Current terrorist threat level

The terrorist threat level is currently severe.

That is relevant to all officers, but arguably in particular to those ex-SB and CTC officers whose details become public knowledge.

10. RESEARCH CONDUCTED

10.1 Initial research on HOLMES and Relativity

The individuals and organizations that could be considered to present a risk have been identified from researching the HOLMES accounts for HERNE and PITCHFORD; accessing 'Relativity'; interviewing the officer; and considering other reports as highlighted.

HOLMES and Relativity hold separate albeit overlapping documentation. All of the material on HOLMES has been used for the assessment, as recorded against their nominal profile. It is accepted there may well be material that is not shown within that profile, particularly generic documents, that could be argued to have relevance to risk. However, given the time scales that apply this is deemed a proportionate search.

Relativity contains a vast amount of material. To check all of the documents would be simply impossible within the time scales, even should fairly restricted search terms be used. As a result there is a reliance upon the DLS profile that has been prepared. The risk assessors do have access to Relativity should further enquiries be required.

The risk assessors have worked through examples to quantify the amount of material. The results of these searches are recorded and have been retained. Should it be felt that the risk assessors should have attempted to review more material in preparing the risk assessments these details can be provided.

10.2 Basic research on individuals (PNC / PND)

The second phase of the research has been a need to then research those individuals identified during the first phase to see what risk they currently present, as there is often a significant period of time between deployment and the present day.

A number of computer systems have been researched, including PNC (which shows convictions) and PND (nationwide intelligence).

However, it needs to be made clear that undercover officers commonly interacted with a large number of people during their deployments. As a result it is not possible to research thoroughly all of the subjects with whom they engaged. The risk assessors have therefore concentrated upon subjects with a known propensity for violence or for disrupting family life, or where the UCO has specific concerns, or where the UCO was particularly close to an individual, or where there is another specific reason to research that person. There is not a blanket intention to research everyone with whom the UCO came into contact, or upon whom N68 reported.

PNC/PND/IIP checks have been conducted on *some individuals. Details.*

10.3 Additional research

- *Discussion*

10.4 Open source research

- *Details of any internet profile*

11. THE RISK CURRENTLY POSED BY THE GROUPS INFILTRATED

- *Details of risk*

12. THE RISK FROM INDIVIDUALS WITHIN THE GROUP

- Due to N68 being deceased, there has not been any opportunity to speak with N68 regarding any particular concerns N68 might have had regarding individuals, especially those N68 was closely associated with
- Research has been conducted on the above, *details*

13. INDICATORS OF PSYCHOLOGICAL RISK REQUIRING EXPERT ASSESSMENT

- Not applicable

14. ASSESSMENT OF RISK OF INTERFERENCE WITH FAMILY AND PRIVATE LIFE

The risk assessors are aware of the comments of the Chairman of the Inquiry in relation to Article 8, and an individuals' right of respect for private and family life terms (Part 6, conclusions and summary of findings, the public interest balance under section 19 (3) (b), section A.10)

14.1 Perception of the risk

- N68 is deceased so not applicable

14.2 Nature and gravity of the risk

- There is no threat to N68.

14.3 Media intrusion

- Not applicable

14.4 Effect on friends and family

- See conclusion

15. MITIGATING THE RISK

The Chairman of the Inquiry makes clear that any alternative methods available to avoid or reduce a risk of harm or damage will be material considerations (Part 6, conclusions and summary of findings, the public interest balance under section 19 (3) (b), section A.6).

He has subdivided that grouping (B.1) into "*means other than a restriction order that may be available to avoid or reduce a risk of harm*" (section B.1.7) and "*whether those means would, without the restriction order, avoid the risk or the extent to which those means would, without the restriction order, reduce the risk*" (section B.1.8)

15.1 Previous Risk Assessments and recommendations (if allowed access)

Discussion

15.2 Security arrangements in place

- Not applicable

15.3 The anticipated result of revealing pseudonym only

- See conclusions

The question of how official confirmation as opposed to unofficial publicity could increase the risk, albeit possibly marginally, is discussed in section 8.1.

15.4 Withholding, redacting, or gisting documents in the context of this UCO

In general terms, these would need to be considered on a 'document by document' basis, and falls outside of the scope of this risk assessment.

There is not a specific exemption to this principle in this case.

15.5-7,9

Using a cipher, screens, voice modulation and receiving evidence in private is not applicable in this case

15.8 Prohibition around publication

- Not applicable

16. CONCLUSIONS

16.1 General comments

- Given the fact that N68 is deceased, there is no risk to N68

Risk assessor's assessment of risk

16.2 Assessment scores

N68 – Risk of physical attack if pseudonym officially confirmed

- Nil but see comments below regarding **family**.

N68 – Risk of physical attack if real identity officially confirmed

- Nil but see comments above

N68 - Risk of interference with family and private life if pseudonym officially confirmed

- This risk only relates to N68's **family**.
- I assess the likelihood of risk as very low (1), given the length of time from deployment to the SDS.
- I assess the impact of any interference as moderate (3).
- The overall threat is therefore scored as 3.

N68 - Risk of interference with family and private life if real identity was officially confirmed

- This risk only relates to N68's **family**.
- I assess the likelihood of risk as low (2), given the length of time from deployment to the SDS.
- I assess the impact of any interference as moderate (3).
- The overall threat is therefore scored as 6.

Signature of author;

M. Veyan

Date: 25/1/17

Signature of moderator;

Date: