

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Title: | N341 - Risk Assessment |
| Summary: | Assessment of risk in the event of identification during the Undercover Policing Inquiry (UCPI) |
| Relevant to: | UCPI |
| Author: | Brian Lockie |
| Peer Reviewer: | Graham Walker |
| Reference: | |
| Version: | Gisted Version of Closed – Version 1 |
| Date created: | 15/11/2017 |
| Security level: | |

PURPOSE

This risk assessment has been prepared in relation to the Undercover Policing Inquiry, and concerns the officer known as N341.

The purpose of the document is to provide an objective assessment of the creation of or increase in risk to N341 and third parties if information is disclosed by the Undercover Policing Inquiry (UCPI) which directly or indirectly leads to the identification of N341 as a former undercover police officer (UCO). The report covers the situation in relation to both the pseudonym and real identity if details became known.

DATE OF DOCUMENT

10/09/2017

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 Brian Lockie. It has been peer reviewed by Graham Walker.

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 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 documented 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.

CONTENTS:

1. Real identity

1.1 Real name

1.2 Pseudonym / cover name

1.3 Other names used / known by / referred to as

1.4 Core participant and / or subject of investigation

2. Summary

3. Pre-deployment

3.1 Life before joining the MPS

3.2 Police career pre-UCO role

3.3 Recruitment to UCO role

3.4 Guarantee or assurance of anonymity

4. Undercover deployment

4.1 Dates of deployment

4.2 Main group infiltrated

4.3 Secondary / peripheral interactions

4.4 Covert identity adopted

4.5 Cover occupation

4.6 **Details of other behaviour that might increase risk**

4.7 Tasking

4.8 Assimilation into the group

4.9 Key associates

4.10 Group size

4.11 Geographical locations based

4.12 Compromises or other security concerns during deployment

4.13 Relationships entered into

4.14 Other behaviour that could heighten the risk

4.15 Arrests

4.16 Prominent successes / arrests / convictions of other(s)

4.17 Other UCO's who could be affected if a restriction order is not issued

4.18 Withdrawal / exit strategy

4.19 Support during deployment

4.20 Return to regular policing

4.21 Commendations

5. Post UC Deployment - Police

5.1 Career path

5.2 Sensitivities

5.3 Areas of concern (including 3rd party recognition)

6. Post police employment or engagement

6.1 Position(s)

6.2 Sensitivities

6.3 Areas of concern (including 3rd party recognition)

7. Formal Investigation

7.1 If yes, details

8. Current situation

8.1 Age and marital status

8.2 Current location

8.3 Family circumstances

8.4 Children

8.5 Current employment

8.6 Route to work

8.7 Roles within the community

8.8 Partners' employment

8.9 Internet profile

8.10 Knowledge of their previous role amongst family and close friends

8.11 Physical health

8.12 Psychological health

9. Current level of exposure

9.1 Cover name

9.2 True identity

9.3 Where sourced

9.4 Compromises or potential compromises subsequent to posting

9.5 Details of pseudonym

- 9.6 Official confirmation regarding deployment and / or identity
- 9.7 Other deployments
- 10. Interview with risk assessors**
- 11. Causal link in terms of completing a Mosaic / Jigsaw effect**
- 11.1 General impact
- 11.2 Specific impact
- 12. Threat considerations**
- 12.1 Current terrorist threat level for UK
- 13. Research conducted**
- 13.1 Initial research on HOLMES and Relativity
- 13.2 Basic research on individuals (PNC / PND / IIP)
- 13.3 Additional research
- 13.4 Open source research
- 14. The risk currently posed by the groups infiltrated**
- 15. The risk from individuals within the group**
- 15.1 Associate causing the UCO particular concern / perception of risk by the UCO
- 15.2 Associates with a propensity for violence
- 15.3 Associates with research skills
- 15.4 Associates with previous experience of harassing their targets
- 15.5 Geography of people of concern
- 16. Indicators of psychological risk requiring expert assessment**
- 16.1 Perception of the risk by the UCO
- 16.2 Counselling, welfare, psychological referral etc
- 17. Interference with private and family life**
- 17.1 Perception of the risk by the UCO
- 17.2 Nature and gravity of the risk
- 17.3 Media intrusion
- 17.4 Effects on friends and family
- 18. Mitigating the risk**
- 18.1 Previous risk assessments
- 18.2 Security arrangements in place
- 18.3 The anticipated result of revealing pseudonym only
- 18.4 The anticipated result of revealing groups infiltrated / associated with

- 18.5 The anticipated result of revealing dates of deployment
 - 18.6 The anticipated result of revealing geographical areas of operation
 - 18.7 Withholding, redacting or gisting documents in the context of this UCO
 - 18.8 Use of a cipher
 - 18.9 Screening
 - 18.10 Voice modulation
 - 18.11 Prohibition around publication
 - 18.12 Evidence in private
19. Conclusions
- 19.1 General comments
 - 19.2 Assessment score
20. Appendices

There are 44 footnotes in this risk assessment

Section 1: The risk assessment sets out N341's real identity, pseudonym and warrant number. N341 is now part of the 'Designated Lawyer Officers' group who has core participant status. N341 is not the subject of any misconduct investigation.

Section 2: The risk assessment sets out details of N341's deployment in the 1970's and details of N341's current personal situation

Sections 3.1-3.2: The risk assessment details N341's life before joining the MPS and police career pre-UCO role. There is nothing from this period that affects the current risk assessment.

Sections 3.3-3.4: N341 was recruited to the SDS by two other nominals. N341 received no formal training and did not undergo psychometric testing. No guarantee or assurance of anonymity was made, the risk assessor states anonymity 'was accepted as part of [N341]'s duty in Special Branch'.

Section 4: This section sets out the details of N341's undercover deployment, and covert identity, using the sub-headings in the index. N341 and 341's colleagues met twice a week. They discussed any issues and intelligence. This was a debriefing and briefing process. N341 believed that there was an excellent management structure at the time. N341 was not aware of any formal risk assessments for the deployment. N341 was never arrested during the deployment. N341 denies any relationships were entered into.

Sections 5 and 6: The risk assessment discusses N341's post-UCO career. A sensitivity is discussed, namely that there is some public exposure of N341's work as a Special Branch officer, but not of N341's SDS work.

Section 7: N341 is not the subject of any formal investigation.

Section 8: N341's current situation is set out using the sub-headings in the index. N341's partner is particularly concerned about the effect of the inquiry on their family, and a reason for heightened impact is given regarding ill health.

Sections 9 and 10: N341's current level of exposure is discussed. There has been no self-disclosure, no court order, no police revelation, and no official disclosure. The Risk Assessor met with N341 in June 2017.

Section 11: The risk assessment discusses the general impact and specific impact of the Mosaic effect, including a discussion about whether N341's real name and pseudonym were in the public domain.

Section 12: The risk assessment discussed the current terrorist threat level.

Sections 13-17: The risk assessment sets out the research conducted, the risk currently posed by the groups infiltrated, and the risk from particular individuals.

The risk assessor assesses the risk from the group(s) infiltrated and sympathetic third parties as high. Several individuals are discussed whom N341 believes would present a risk to N341 and N341's family were N341's identity to be revealed as a result of this inquiry.

N341 was extremely stressed towards the end of the deployment. N341 is now more concerned for N341's partner and the stress and anxiety that is being caused due to this inquiry. N341's partner describes N341 as someone who does not show if they are worried.

N341 is concerned about public exposure resulting from the Inquiry. N341's perception is that N341 and N341's family would be targeted.

N341 fears the media harassing N341 or N341's family. N341 is also fearful of more direct physical confrontation and assault.

Section 18: The likely outcome of revealing the matters set out in the index are discussed. Various steps to mitigate the risk are then discussed.

Revealing the group(s) infiltrated is assessed as being likely to have the effect of confirming N341. The use of a cipher is considered a benefit to N341 as it would allow N341 to give evidence without a direct link back to N341's real or cover identity. This would be of limited value once N341 gives evidence as the content of N341's evidence would expose N341.

Use of a screen is considered essential if N341 gives evidence.

Voice modulation would be something that would be of benefit to N341 should N341 be required to give live evidence. Publication of any material is felt would lead to opportunities for interested parties to seek to identify former UCOs.

It is felt that evidence in private would be the most effective measure and should be considered.

Section 19: In terms of general comments, the risk assessor made 17 points, including:

- A discussion of key individuals identified by N341.
- N341 has never been subject to any misconduct investigation nor is there any suspicion that N341 had any inappropriate relationships during the deployment.
- There are several people within N341's family and friends with knowledge of N341's SDS deployment. As such, there is a potential risk to N341 of being identified in N341's real name as a result of this Inquiry.
- N341 fully understands the importance of this Inquiry; and would prefer to give evidence in private but understands this is a public Inquiry. If N341 had a choice N341 would prefer to give evidence utilising N341's cipher and behind a screen with voice modulation. N341 is very concerned regarding N341 and N341's family's safety.

The risk assessor assessed the current threat to N341 as being very low at this current time in terms of N341's SDS deployment.

N341 – Increase in risk of physical attack if pseudonym officially confirmed.

The risk assessor cited six key factors taken into consideration.

The risk assessor assessed the probability in this category as 'high' (4) - the perceived risk is assessed as probable to occur at some stage.

The risk assessor considered the impact as 'critical' (5) – In physical terms would result in a life threatening injury. The risk assessor also commented that the effect on N341's partner of any attack on N341 would be severe.

The overall score in this category would therefore be 20 (High Risk).

N341 - Increase in risk of interference with family and private life if pseudonym is officially confirmed

The risk assessor cited three key factors taken into consideration.

The risk assessor assessed the probability in this category as 'medium' (3) - the probability of the risk occurring could be reasonably foreseen.

The risk assessor considered the impact as 'serious' (4) – this would significantly impact on the welfare of the officer and the officer's family. The risk assessor commented that the effect on N341's partner of any interference as a result of the Inquiry would be significant.

The overall score in this category would therefore be 12 (Medium Risk).

N341 – Increase in risk of physical attack if real identity officially confirmed

The risk assessor cited three key factors taken into consideration.

The risk assessor assessed the probability in this category as 'high' (4) - the perceived risk is assessed as probable to occur at some stage.

The risk assessor considered the impact as 'critical' (5) – In physical terms would result in a life threatening injury. The risk assessor also commented that the effect on N341's partner of any attack on N341 would be severe.

The overall score in this category would therefore be 20 (High Risk).

N341 - Increase in risk of interference with family and private life if real identity is officially confirmed

The risk assessor cited three key factors taken into consideration.

The risk assessor assessed the probability in this category as 'medium' (3) - the probability of the risk occurring could be reasonably foreseen.

The risk assessor considered the impact as 'serious' (4) – this would significantly impact on the welfare of the officer and family.

The overall score in this category would therefore be 12 (Medium Risk).

Signature of author:

Date: 15/12/2017

Signature of peer reviewer:

Date:

MPSS DLS
OFFICIAL
LOG D8236

20. Appendices – see below:

References are displayed as follows:

Pitchford references contain numbers only – e.g. 0003051

Pitchford HC references are preceded by the letters HC in the following format – e.g. HC-0000818
 Holmes references are always preceded by the letter D in the following format – e.g. D8471

Appendix 'A' - Index of documents that have been referred to and footnoted and can be made available

| Pitchford / Holmes Reference | Description | Page no. |
|--|---|-------------|
| | Brian Lockie – CV at D3713 and Conflict Statement at S35 | |
| Reference | Graham Walker – CV at D3710 and Conflict Statement at S36 | |
| Reference | Process adopted | |
| Reference | Terms Of Reference | |
| Reference | Limitations | |
| Reference | Central record of Service for N341 | |
| | | |

References are displayed as follows:

Pitchford references contain numbers only – e.g. 0003051

Pitchford HC references are preceded by the letters HC in the following format – e.g. HC-0000818

Holmes references are always preceded by the letter D in the following format – e.g. D8471

Appendix 'B'- Index of documents – General

| Pitchford / Holmes | Description | Page no. |
|--------------------|--|-------------|
| Reference | Meeting with the Risk Assessor 23/06/2017 | All |
| Reference | Fact finding meeting with the Risk Assessor 30/08/2017 | All |
| Reference | SDS targeting document | Pages 64-67 |
| Reference | Operation Herne profile of N341 | All |
| Reference | DLS profile | All |

References are displayed as follows:

Pitchford references contain numbers only – e.g. 0003051

Pitchford HC references are preceded by the letters HC in the following format – e.g. HC.0000818

Holmes references are always preceded by the letter D in the following format – e.g. D8471

Appendix 'C'- Index of documents – People

| Pitchford / Holmes | Description | Page no. |
|--------------------|--|----------|
| Reference | Open source regarding <i>an individual</i> | All |
| Reference | Open source regarding <i>an individual</i> | All |
| Reference | Open source research on N341 | All |
| Reference | SO15 research on <i>an individual</i> | All |
| Reference | SO15 research on <i>an individual</i> | All |
| Reference | SO15 research on <i>an individual</i> | All |
| | | |

References are displayed as follows:
Pitchford references contain numbers only – e.g. 0003051

Pitchford HC references are preceded by the letters HC in the following format – e.g. HC-0000818
Holmes references are always preceded by the letter D in the following format – e.g. D8471

Appendix 'D'- Index of documents – Groups

| Pitchford / Holmes | Description | Page no. |
|--------------------------------|--|---------------------|
| Reference | <u>History of Group(s)</u> | All |
| Reference- Group(s) | <u>Group(s)</u> | All |
| Reference | <u>Open source history of Group(s)</u> | All |
| Reference | <u>BBC news article re Subject</u> | All |
| Reference | <u>Open source research re Subject</u> | All |