
SECOND PERSONAL STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF THE RESTRICTION ORDER APPLICATION (ANONYMITY APPLICATION) MADE BY EN74 PURSUANT TO SECTION 19(2) OF THE INQUIRIES ACT 2005

1. I make this statement in support of an application for a restriction order pursuant to section 19(2) of the Inquiries Rules in respect of my true and cover identities. I make this statement further to the detailed personal statement that was provided to the Inquiry on my behalf on 13 March 2017 (“my first personal statement.”)
2. In an email sent to the NCA’s legal team by the Undercover Policing Inquiry team on 11 May 2017, I was asked to answer the following questions in this personal statement:
 - (i) **Which cover or nick name(s) were used in the NPOIU deployments?**
 - (ii) **What risk arises specifically from revelation of that cover or nick name(s)?**
 - (iii) **Were those cover names the same or different from the cover names used in context of non-NPOIU criminal deployments the officer has cited?**
 - (iv) **If different, how does the revelation of the NPOIU related cover name reveal the other different cover names used in non-NPOIU criminal deployments such that the risk is created?**
3. I propose to address each question in turn during the course of this personal statement.
 - (i) **Which cover or nick name(s) were used in the NPOIU deployments?**
4. I have provided the Inquiry with details of cover names and/or nicknames used during deployment.
 - (ii) **What risk arises specifically from revelation of that cover or nick name(s)?**
5. I have already set out, in some detail, in my first personal statement, the risks that would arise from the revelation of my cover name(s).
6. I am also, as I explained in my first personal statement, particularly concerned with the risks associated with the operations set out in that statement , were my cover name to be exposed. I am very concerned that the suspects/defendants in those cases would take steps to target me, in the event my cover name was to be exposed, for the reasons I have already outlined.
7. During the course of my deployment, I believe it is possible for photographs of me to have been taken, which would make it easy for me to be identified, were my true or cover identities released during the course of the Inquiry. These photos would identify me as an undercover officer to the extremely dangerous individuals I infiltrated during the course of my later non-NPOIU deployments.

8. I also have also alerted the Inquiry to a wider risk that I believe would be associated with the exposure of my cover name.

(iii) Were those cover names the same or different from the cover names used in context of the non-NPOIU criminal deployments the officer has cited?

9. As I have explained, the cover name used during the course of the NPOIU deployment could be linked to the cover name that I used in all criminal deployments that pre-dated the NPOIU deployment. Therefore, if my cover name was to be disclosed, it would not be difficult for the deployments to be linked. Following the NPOIU deployment, I used a different cover identity

(iv) If different, how does the revelation of the NPOIU related cover name reveal the other different names used in non-NPOIU criminal deployments such that the risk is created?

10. Whilst there were not any clear links between the cover names that I have used I remain concerned that, were any to be exposed, there is a risk that the other cover names could also be exposed.

11. Were my cover names in the non-NPOIU criminal deployments to be exposed, there would also, in my view, be wider collateral damage, including the potential compromise of other undercover officers, addresses, tactics and backstopping techniques used during the course of these deployments which could also, by extension, lead to the compromise of or prejudice to similar operations in the future.

Signed: [Redacted]

Dated: