

DRAFT ISSUES LIST FOR THE SPECIAL DEMONSTRATION SQUAD

MODULE 2(A)

For consultation

1. *The purpose of this document is to communicate the Inquiry's draft list of issues for its Module 2(a) investigation of the Special Demonstration Squad. Written observations on this list are invited by 12 April 2019.*
2. *The Inquiry, like many other public inquiries, intends to use issues lists to direct and focus its investigation to enable it better to discharge its terms of reference.*
3. *As the Inquiry explained in the Strategic Review published in May 2018 (page 11), for the purposes of structuring its investigations (and the evidential hearings) it will approach Module Two through three sub-sections:*
 - a. *Module 2(a) - investigation of managers, supervisors and administrators from within undercover policing units*
 - b. *Module 2(b)- investigation of senior management in the chain of command, as well as police personnel who handled intelligence provided by undercover police officers*
 - c. *Module 2(c) - will consider the remaining aspects of Module 2 and will involve other government bodies with a connection to undercover policing, including the Home Office*
4. *It follows that this draft list sets out the issues that the Inquiry intends to investigate in relation to the role of managers and administrators from within the Special Demonstration Squad. The Inquiry is presently working on the basis that this includes anyone in a management or administrative position up to and including the officer who*

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

commanded the Special Demonstration Squad, commonly at the rank of Detective Chief Inspector.

5. *When considering and/or responding to this draft list, it is important to bear in mind that*
 - a. *There is significant overlap between Module 1 and Module 2(a). A number of the issues previously included in the issues list for Module 1 - Special Demonstration Squad are also included in this draft list without any or any significant amendment. That is because they are issues that the Inquiry considers need to be explored both with undercover officers and their managers albeit in Module 2(a) the Inquiry will be focussing on the role and perspective of managers rather than the undercover officers.*
 - b. *Second, there is likely to be significant overlap between the issues to be considered in Module 2(a), and those that will be considered as part of Module 2(b) and 2(c).*
 - c. *Third, the list relates to the whole of the Special Demonstration Squad over the unit's entire 40 year history. It is necessarily drafted at a general level of detail. The Inquiry intends to conduct its Module 2(a) investigations by considering managers' involvement one-by-one, and more specific and detailed questions are likely to arise in relation to the evidence of a particular manager in that context. In particular, the Inquiry considers it likely that the evidence received from witnesses in Module 1 will raise issues that will need to be addressed with Module 2(a) witnesses, and which cannot be anticipated now. The extent and degree to which issues will be investigated in individual cases may vary, but nothing in this list will constrain the Inquiry from investigating further issues that may emerge from the documentary record and witness testimony (insofar as those issues fall within the terms of reference).*
 - d. *Fourth, use of the terms 'Justice campaigns ': "elected politicians": 'trade unions and trade union members" and "social and environmental activists" as subdivisions of the reporting sections in the draft list of issues correspond with*

categories of non-police, non-state core participants (although not limited to the core participants themselves).

e. Fifth, the issues list will not be set in stone - it may be amended as the Inquiry's investigation proceeds.

6. *The draft list of issues upon which the Inquiry is now consulting is immediately below:*

The establishment of the Special Demonstration Squad

1. Why was the Special Demonstration Squad created?
2. Who authorised its creation?
3. Who funded it?
4. How was the budget set?
5. How big was the budget?
6. What was the legal and regulatory framework within which undercover policing was conducted when it was established?
7. Who knew of its existence?
8. What, if any, provision was made for the review of its continued existence after its initial purpose or purposes were fulfilled?

The function of the Special Demonstration Squad

9. What was the function/ were the functions of the Special Demonstration Squad?
10. How, if at all, did the function/s of the Special Demonstration change over time and for what reason/s?

Size, organisation and composition of the Special Demonstration Squad

11. How big was the Special Demonstration Squad at any one time and who served in it?

Management and supervisory structure and function

12. At the time of the creation of the Special Demonstration Squad, what provision was made for the management and supervision of the officers deployed undercover?

13. How, if at all, did that provision change over time?

14. What prompted those changes?

15. Who managed, supervised and/or supported the deployment of undercover officers throughout the existence of the Special Demonstration Squad?

16. What role(s) were those individuals expected to play in relation to undercover officers?

17. What, if anything, was done to commend undercover officers who deserved commendation?

18. What, if anything, was done to discipline undercover officers who required disciplining?

19. If nothing was done in any particular case, why was it not done?

Selection and Recruitment

20. How were undercover police officers selected for the Special Demonstration Squad?

21. To what extent did an officers' perceived aptitude for forming intimate relationships whilst undercover influence the selection process?

22. Were the officers selected for the Special Demonstration Squad usually married or in long term relationships?

23. To what extent did an officers' marital or relationship status influence the selection process?

20-24. To what extent, if at all, was the fact that an officer was married or in a long term relationship / had children, treated as a positive factor by the MPS because it would keep him/her grounded whilst deployed?

24-25. How were managers selected?

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

- 22-26. To what extent was former service as an undercover officer within the Special Demonstration Squad considered to be an advantage, or disadvantage, in the selection process for managers?
- 23-27. Was that view justified?
- 24-28. How, if at all, did the selection of officers for undercover work and managers in the Special Demonstration Squad change over time, and why?
- 25-29. What, if any, assessments (including psychiatric and psychological assessments) were undertaken in relation to potential recruits?
- 26-30. When were those assessments introduced?
- 27-31. Why were those assessments introduced?
- 28-32. Who conducted the assessments?
- 29-33. When in the course of the selection and recruitment process were the assessments carried out?
- 30-34. To what extent did the outcome of those assessments influence decisions as to whether or not to recruit individuals for undercover work?
- 31-35. To what extent did the assessments fulfil the purpose for which they were introduced?
- 32-36. What involvement did managers have in meeting the families of prospective undercover officers to inform them about the role?
- 33-37. What were undercover officers ~~and their families~~ told about their prospective role?
38. Was the information given accurate and complete?
39. What were the families of undercover officers told about their prospective role in relation to:
1. The type of crimes that they would be focusing on?
 2. The permissibility of forming intimate relationships with their targets?
40. Was the information given accurate and complete?
41. If not, was it deliberately inaccurate or incomplete?
42. What, if any, assessment was carried out in relation to the families of potential recruits to ascertain the risk to them of external harm as a result of the undercover officers' recruitment into the Special Demonstration Squad?

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

43. What, if any, assessment was carried out in relation to the families of potential recruits to ascertain the risk to them of psychiatric or psychological harm as a result of the undercover officers' recruitment into the Special Demonstration Squad?

44. What, if any, vetting was done of a potential recruit's family to ascertain their suitability to be the family of an undercover officer?

34.45. Was any such vetting process adequate or inadequate?

35.46. If it was inadequate, in what way(s) was it inadequate?

36.47. What, if any, monitoring of UCO families' communications was carried out?

37.48. To what extent, if any, were records kept about UCO family members' personal information/circumstances, including any interaction between them and the Metropolitan police?

38.49. Who had access to such information?

39.50. What was it used for?

40.51. To what extent, if any, were family members monitored at social events they attended with their UCO spouse/partner?

52. What, if any, undertakings were given to potential recruits about (a) anonymity; (b) their welfare and that of their family, if appropriate; and/or (c) their future police career?

53. What, if any, undertakings were given to the families of potential recruits about (a) anonymity; (b) the families' safety; (c) the families' ability to communicate with the undercover officer when he was away from home; (d) the support that would be available to the families from the Metropolitan Police?

54. Were any such undertakings breached?

55. If so, in what way(s) and why were they breached?

41.56. What obligations, if any, of secrecy were imposed upon Special Demonstration Squad officers?

42.57. Were the selection and recruitment processes in place adequate or inadequate, and if so, in what respects?

Training and Guidance

43-58. What, if any, training did Special Demonstration Squad undercover officers receive, both before and after selection?

44-59. What, if any, training was given to managers?

45-60. What, if any, instruction and/or guidance about performance of undercover duties was given (a) by managers to undercover officers and (b) by others to managers?

46-61. What, if any, instruction and/or guidance about performance of management duties was given to managers within the Special Demonstration Squad, and by whom?

47-62. What policies and procedures were adopted and used by the Special Demonstration Squad?

48-63. Were Special Demonstration Squad officers made aware by their managers of the applicable legal and regulatory framework within which they conducted undercover operations?

49-64. Was the training, guidance and instruction provided to undercover officers adequate or inadequate, and if so, in what respects?

65. Was the training, guidance and instruction provided to the managers of undercover officers adequate or inadequate, and if so, in what respects?

66. What, if any, policies and procedures were in place for the families of undercover officers in relation to:

1. Safety measures (alarms, security etc).
2. Emotional support (networks, counselling, points of contact within the MPS).
3. Provision of information about the practicalities of being the family of an undercover officer, including for example:
 - Who, if anyone they could tell.
 - What they should say to their children about whether their parent was a police officer/undercover officer.
 - What they should do if they were with the undercover officer when there was a chance encounter with a suspect.
 - Whether their interaction with any public services would be altered

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

and if so in what way (claiming of family allowance, applications for student loans etc).

- What the procedure would be in the event that their identities were compromised (the need to move home at short notice).

67. Did those policies and procedures, if any, change over time?

68. If so, in what way(s)?

69. Were those policies and procedures, if any, adequate at all times?

70. If not, when and in what way(s) were they inadequate?

71. What, if any, guidance and instruction was provided to the families of undercover officers about the existence of those policies and procedures and their implementation?

72. Who, if anyone, was responsible for the provision of that guidance or instruction?

73. Did that guidance and instruction, if any, change over time?

74. If so, in what way(s)?

75. Was the guidance and instruction, if any, adequate at all times?

76. If not, when and in what way(s) was it inadequate?

77. To what extent, if at all, did the MPS treat the spouses/partners of undercover officers as a source of support and monitoring for the wellbeing of undercover officers?

78. What was the impact upon the spouses/partners of providing any such support and monitoring role?

79. To what extent, if at all, was any assumption by the MPS that the spouses/partners would provide support and monitoring for the officer driven by conscious or unconscious sexist attitudes on the part of the managers of the undercover officers about the role of a woman in a relationship?

Legend building

50-80. What involvement did managers have in legend building activity by prospective undercover officers, including any involvement in authorising legend building activity?

51-81. When and why did the practice of using deceased children's identities begin?

52-82. _____ Who devised and/or authorised the practice?

53-83. _____ What, if any, thought was given by managers to the impact on the surviving family of a deceased child of the use for police purposes of their identity?

54-84. _____ When and why did the practice cease?

Targeting and initial authorisation

55-85. _____ Who was responsible for selecting the groups or individuals to be targeted?

56-86. _____ 52. Who authorised such targeting?

57-87. _____ Which groups and individuals were targeted?

58-88. _____ On what ground or grounds was each targeted group or individual selected?

59-89. _____ Were undercover officers tasked to gather particular information?

60-90. _____ If so, by whom and for what purpose(s)?

61-91. _____ Was any aspect of targeting influenced by either conscious or subconscious racism?

62-92. _____ What, if any, reasons were recorded for the targeting of each group and individual?

63-93. _____ Did those reasons justify each deployment?

64-94. _____ What was the true purpose of each deployment?

65-95. _____ What conduct, if any, was each deployment intended to detect, disrupt or prevent?

66-96. _____ In relation to each deployment, did it achieve its purpose?

Role of supervisors/managers – general

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

67.97. _____ What was the primary role(s) of each manager within the unit?

68.98. _____ What was the extent and nature of the contact between deployed undercover officers and their supervisors/managers, during the period of deployment?

62. By what means and when did undercover officers report information to their managers?

65. What information did undercover officers report to their managers?

66. What record was kept of information reported by undercover officers to their supervisors/managers?

66.1. How was that record created?

66.2. What form did that record take?

66.3. What was its primary purpose?

67. What did supervisors/managers do with information reported by undercover officers?

68. In what circumstances and by what means was information gathered by undercover officers disseminated to others?

69. To whom and for what purpose(s) was it disseminated?

70. Did previous service as an undercover officer within the Special Demonstration Squad influence the role played by individual managers?

Reporting - justice campaigns

71. Was authorisation given for undercover officers to infiltrate and/or gather intelligence on social justice campaigns and/or campaigners?

71.1. If so, by whom and for what purpose were they authorised to do so?

71.2. Was that authorisation influenced by either conscious or subconscious racism?

72. If intelligence on social justice campaigns or campaigners was gathered without authorisation, which managers became aware of this, and how?

72.1. What was their response?

73. To whom and by what means was such intelligence reported and disseminated?

74. What, if any, use was made of the information so reported and disseminated and by whom?

75. Was such activity justified?

76. What impact, if any, did such activity have on the justice campaigns infiltrated and/or reported upon?

Reporting - the Stephen Lawrence campaign and Duwayne Brooks OBE

77. Which groups and individuals relevant to the Stephen Lawrence campaign and Duwayne Brooks OBE were targeted and/or reported upon?

78. For what purpose were they targeted and/or reported upon?

79. Who decided upon and/or authorised this activity?

80. Who carried it out?

81. What information was reported about any member of Stephen Lawrence's family, the Stephen Lawrence campaign, Duwayne Brooks OBE, and any of the legal representatives acting for any of them?

82. To whom was that information disseminated?

83. What use was made of it and by whom and for what purpose?

84. What, if any, role did any undercover officer play in relation to any police activity concerning Duwayne Brooks OBE?

85. Was any of the undercover policing in this subsection influenced by either conscious or subconscious racism?

86. Was the undercover policing in this subsection justified?

Reporting - elected politicians, political organisations and political activists

87. Were undercover officers authorised to target, infiltrate and/or report on elected politicians, political organisations and political activists?

87.1. If so, who authorised them to do so?

87.2. For what purpose?

88. If intelligence on elected politicians, political organisations and/or political activists was gathered without authorisation, which managers became aware of this, and how?

88.1. What was their response?

89. What information was reported about elected politicians, political organisations and political activists?

90. By what means, when and to whom was that information reported?

91. To whom was it disseminated and why?

92. What was done, when, and by whom with such information?

93. Was such targeting, infiltration and/or reporting justified?

94. What, if any, impact did such activities have on the political and democratic process?

Reporting - trade unions and trade union members

95. Were undercover officers authorised to target infiltrate and/or report on trade unions and/or trade union members?

95.1. If so, who authorised them to do so?

95.2. For what purpose?

96. If intelligence on trade unions and/or trade union members was gathered without authorisation, which managers became aware of this, and how?

96.1. What was their response?

97. What information was reported about trade unions and/or trade union members?

98. By what means, when and to whom was that information reported?

99. To whom was it disseminated and why?

100. Was it disseminated to the Special Branch industrial intelligence section?

101. If so, for what purpose?

102. Was it further disseminated to private sector organisations?

Reporting - social and environmental activists

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

103. Were undercover officers authorised to target, infiltrate and/or report on social and environmental activists?
 - 103.1. If so, who authorised them to do so?
 - 103.2. For what purpose?
104. If intelligence on social and environmental activists was gathered without authorisation, which managers became aware of this, and how?
 - 104.1. What was their response?
105. What information was reported about social and environmental activists?
106. To whom was it disseminated and why?
107. What use of the information thus disseminated was made and by whom?
108. Were such activities justified?
109. What impact, if any, did undercover policing have on social and environmental activism?

Management knowledge of and attitudes towards relationships between undercover officers and targets/those upon whom they reported

110. What, if any, policy, instruction, procedure or guidance existed concerning relationships between undercover officers and targets/those upon whom they reported?
 - 110.1. How, when and by whom was that policy, instruction, procedure or guidance communicated to undercover officers?
 - [110.2. Who authored any written policy, instruction, procedure or guidance?](#)
 - [110.3. Were the families of undercover officers informed of any policy prior to recruitment and/or deployment?](#)
111. Were such relationships authorised [and/or encouraged](#) by managers?
112. Who gave that authorisation [and/or encouragement](#)?
113. Were managers aware of relationships between undercover officers in their cover identities and those upon whom they were reporting, or with whom they came into

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

contact as a result of their undercover deployment?

113.1. If so, what were their attitudes to those relationships?

113.2. If not, should they have been?

114. Were such relationships tolerated by managers?

115. If not, what, if anything, was done to ensure that they did not occur?

116. What, if any, thought was given to the impact on those with whom relationships were formed of the deception implicit in them?

117. What, if any, thought was given to the impact on those with whom such relationships occurred about the consequences of them for them?

118. What, if any, support is currently available from the MPS for undercover officers who had engaged in sexual relationships during the course of deployment?

119. If any such support is available, is it consistent or does it differ depending on when the officer was undercover or whether the officer is still employed?

120. If any support is provided, is it adequate?

121. If not, in what way(s) is it inadequate?

122. What, if any, thought was given to the impact on the families of undercover officers who formed relationships with their targets/those upon whom they reported?

123. What, if any, steps were taken by the MPS to ensure that the families of undercover officers were informed where it was known that the relevant undercover officer had engaged in a sexual relationship in the course of their deployment either:

- at the time the relationship was first known to managers;
- at the time when it was known that there was a real risk of the information entering the public domain; or
- at the time when the information had entered the public domain?

124. What, if any, steps were taken by the MPS to ensure that support was provided to the families of undercover officers at the point they became aware that the officer had engaged in sexual relationships during the course of deployment, including:

- Emotional and psychological support;

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

- Advice on maintaining their anonymity;
- Advice on appropriate responses to the media, in so far as their identities became public.

125. What, if any, support is currently available from the MPS for the families of undercover officers who had engaged in sexual relationships during the course of deployment?

126. If any such support is available, is it consistent or does it differ depending on when the officer was undercover, whether the family is still intact, or whether the officer is still employed?

127. If any support is provided, is it adequate?

128. If not, in what way(s) is it inadequate?

129. Have the families of undercover officers been offered any apology by the MPS?

417.130. To what extent, if at all, did the procedures for and treatment of the families of undercover officers who had formed relationships differ from the procedures for and treatment of the families of those officers who had not formed relationships?

131. To what extent, if at all, was the occurrence of such relationships prompted by conscious or unconscious sexist attitudes on the part of undercover officers and their managers?

132. Is the MPS aware of any sexual relationships between an undercover officer and a target that are not in the public domain?

418.133. If so, what procedures are now in place for providing support to the family/ies?

Management knowledge of and attitudes towards participation in, or encouragement of, crime by undercover officers

419.134. What, if any, policy, instruction, procedure or guidance existed concerning participation in, facilitation or encouragement of, crime by undercover officers?

419.1.134.1. How, when and by whom was that policy, instruction, procedure or guidance communicated to undercover officers?

419.2.134.2. Who authored any written policy, instruction, procedure or guidance?

420.135. Were undercover officers authorised to commit, facilitate or encourage

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

others to commit criminal offences?

~~420.1.135.1.~~ If so, which criminal offences were they authorised to commit, facilitate or encourage others to commit, and why?

~~420.2.135.2.~~ Who gave that authorisation?

~~421.136.~~ Did undercover officers commit, facilitate or encourage others to commit criminal offences?

~~422.137.~~ Were managers aware of undercover officers participating in, facilitating, or encouraging crime?

~~422.1.137.1.~~ If so, what was their response upon learning of such events?

~~422.2.137.2.~~ If not, should they have been?

~~423.138.~~ Was unauthorised participation in, facilitation and/or encouragement of crime tolerated by managers?

~~424.139.~~ If not, what, if anything, was done to ensure that it did not occur?

~~425.140.~~ In any given case, does the participation of an undercover officer in the commission of a criminal offence, or in facilitating or encouraging its commission, require referral to the panel considering miscarriages of justice?

Management knowledge of and attitudes towards undercover officers' involvement in criminal proceedings

~~426.141.~~ What, if any, policy, instruction, procedure or guidance existed concerning an undercover officer being arrested, charged or summonsed in his or her cover identity?

~~426.1.141.1.~~ How, when and by whom was that policy, instruction, procedure or guidance communicated to undercover officers?

~~426.2.141.2.~~ Who authored any written policy, instruction, procedure or guidance?

~~427.142.~~ Were undercover officers authorised to maintain their cover identities upon arrest, charge, or in response to a summons?

~~428.143.~~ If so, who authorised this?

~~429.144.~~ What happened when undercover officers were arrested and/or charged or summonsed?

~~430.145.~~ Did undercover officers maintain their cover identities upon arrest, charge,

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

or in response to a summons?

~~131.146.~~ 146. Were managers aware of this conduct?

~~131.1.146.1.~~ 146.1. If so, what was their response?

~~131.2.146.2.~~ 146.2. If not, should they have been aware?

~~132.147.~~ 147. What, if any, policy, instruction, procedure or guidance existed concerning an undercover officer appearing in court as a defendant or defence witness in his/her cover identity?

~~132.1.147.1.~~ 147.1. How, when and by whom was that policy, instruction, procedure or guidance communicated to undercover officers?

~~132.2.147.2.~~ 147.2. Who authored any written policy, instruction, procedure or guidance?

~~133.148.~~ 148. Were undercover officers authorised to maintain their cover identities if they appeared in court as a defendant or defence witness?

~~134.149.~~ 149. What happened when undercover officers appeared in court as a defendant or defence witness?

~~135.150.~~ 150. Were managers aware of this conduct?

~~135.1.150.1.~~ 150.1. If so, what was their response?

~~135.2.150.2.~~ 150.2. If not, should they have been?

~~136.151.~~ 151. Did undercover officers ever appear in court other than as a defendant or defence witness?

~~137.152.~~ 152. If so, in what circumstances did this occur?

~~138.153.~~ 153. Were managers aware of this conduct?

~~139.154.~~ 154. If so, what was their response?

~~140.155.~~ 155. What arrangements were made to ensure that prosecuting authorities and/or courts were informed about the status of an undercover officer appearing in court in any capacity in his/her undercover identity?

~~141.156.~~ 156. Were arresting/investigating police officers, prosecutors, the courts and/or other parties to the proceedings made aware when an undercover officer was (a) arrested, (b) charged, (c) responded to a summons, (d) appeared as a defendant, (e) appeared as a defence witness and/or (f) appeared in a criminal court in any other capacity in his/her

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

cover identity, that the person concerned was an undercover officer?

~~441.1.156.1.~~ If so, who made them aware and by what means?

~~441.2.156.2.~~ If not, why not?

~~442.157.~~ Did any other circumstance arise in which the participation of an undercover officer in events which gave rise to a criminal case involving others should have been communicated to the prosecuting authorities and/or court?

~~442.1.157.1.~~ If so, was it?

~~443.158.~~ In any given case, does the participation of an undercover officer in proceedings before a court or in connection with proceedings before a court required referral to the panel considering miscarriages of justice?

Management knowledge of and attitudes towards undercover officers' involvement in civil proceedings

~~444.159.~~ What, if any, policy, instruction, procedure or guidance existed concerning an undercover officer being involved in his or her cover identity in civil proceedings?

~~444.1.159.1.~~ How, when and by whom was that policy, instruction, procedure or guidance communicated to undercover officers?

~~444.2.159.2.~~ Who authored any written policy, instruction, procedure or guidance?

~~445.160.~~ Were undercover officers authorised to maintain their cover identities if involved in civil proceedings?

~~445.1.160.1.~~ If so, who authorised this?

~~446.161.~~ Were undercover officers engaged in activities which became the subject of civil proceedings?

~~447.162.~~ If so, were managers aware?

~~447.1.162.1.~~ If so, what was their response?

~~447.2.162.2.~~ If not, should they have been?

~~448.163.~~ Should the participation of the undercover officers have been disclosed to the parties or the court?

~~449.164.~~ If it wasn't disclosed, why not and with what consequence?

Management knowledge of and attitudes to infringement of legal professional privilege by undercover officers

~~150.165.~~ What, if any, policy, instruction, procedure or guidance existed concerning an undercover officer coming into possession of legally privileged information?

~~150.1.165.1.~~ How, when and by whom was that policy, instruction, procedure or guidance communicated to undercover officers?

~~150.2.165.2.~~ Who authored any written policy, instruction, procedure or guidance?

~~151.166.~~ Were undercover officers authorised to obtain legally privileged information?

~~151.1.166.1.~~ If so, who authorised this?

~~152.167.~~ Did undercover officers acquire knowledge of information that was the subject of legal professional privilege?

~~153.168.~~ If so, what was done with it by them and by those to whom they imparted it?

~~154.169.~~ Were managers aware of undercover officers obtaining legally privileged information?

~~154.1.169.1.~~ If so, what was their response?

Whistleblowing

~~155.170.~~ What, if any whistleblowing procedures were in place to facilitate the exposure of any wrongdoing within the Special Demonstration Squad?

Withdrawal from deployment

~~156.171.~~ What, if any, policy, instruction, procedure or guidance existed concerning the withdrawal of undercover officers from their deployments?

~~156.1.171.1.~~ How, when and by whom was that policy, instruction, procedure or guidance communicated to undercover officers?

~~156.2.171.2.~~ Who authored any written policy, instruction, procedure or guidance?

~~157.172.~~ How long were Special Demonstration Squad undercover deployments?

~~158.173.~~ For what reason or reasons did deployments come to an end?

~~159~~.174. How did undercover officers withdraw from deployments?

175. What involvement did managers have in the withdrawal of undercover officers from deployments?

~~160~~.176. To what extent were the needs of their family members considered and/or assessed when an undercover officer was withdrawn from deployment?

~~161~~. What provision was made for their family members when an undercover officer was withdrawn from deployment?

Debriefing

~~162~~.177. Who debriefed undercover officers during or after their deployment and for what purpose(s)?

~~163~~.178. What did managers do with information received during debriefs?

~~164~~.179. What further steps, if any, did managers take in respect of information received during debriefs as a consequence of an undercover officer's intimate relationship, where it was known that the UCO had a family?

Management of post-deployment conduct

~~165~~.180. What, if any, steps were taken by managers and/or the Metropolitan Police Service to prevent the continued use of undercover legends and/or techniques after deployments had ended?

~~166~~.181. Did former undercover officers use their legends and/or associated material after deployments had ended?

~~167~~.182. If so, for what purpose?

~~168~~.183. Did managers and/or the Metropolitan Police Service know that they had done so?

~~169~~.184. If so, what, if anything, did they do about it?

~~170~~.185. Did former undercover officers and/or managers make use of information obtained whilst performing Special Demonstration Squad duties for private sector purposes?

~~171~~.186. If so, for what purposes and with what consequences?

~~172~~.187. Did managers and/or more senior officers know that they had done so?

~~173-188.~~ If so, what, if anything, did they do about it?

The welfare and safety of undercover officers and their families

~~174-189.~~ What management supervision did undercover officers receive from managers, back office staff and expert professionals, such as psychiatrists and psychologists, whilst deployed?

~~175-190.~~ Was the level of management and supervision of officers whilst deployed undercover adequate?

~~176-191.~~ If not, in what way(s) was it inadequate?

~~177-192.~~ What support did undercover officers and their families receive before, during and after deployment?

~~178-193.~~ Was it adequate?

~~194.~~ If not, in what way(s) was it inadequate?

~~195.~~ What, if any, policies were in place to ensure the welfare of the families of undercover officers (including but not limited to any provisions for the i) the hiding of car index numbers belonging to family members from the DVLA database; and ii) the allocation of "special customer records" to family members by the DWP)?

~~196.~~ Were those policies explained to the families?

~~197.~~ Were those policies adequate?

~~198.~~ If not, in what ways were they inadequate?

~~199.~~ Were those policies implemented?

~~200.~~ If not, why not?

~~201.~~ What monitoring did the families of undercover officers receive before, during and after deployment?

~~202.~~ Was it adequate?

~~179-203.~~ If not, in what way(s) was it inadequate?

~~180-204.~~ What support did the families of undercover officers receive before, during and after deployment?

~~181-205.~~ What support did the families of undercover officers receive before, during and after deployment?

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

~~182-206.~~ 182-206. What, if any, impact did undercover deployment have on the subsequent police careers of undercover officers?

~~183-207.~~ 183-207. To what extent were managers aware of that impact?

~~184-208.~~ 184-208. To what extent was it taken into account in relation to decisions about the withdrawal and post-deployment roles of undercover officers?

~~185-209.~~ 185-209. What, if any, impact did undercover deployment have on the health and welfare of undercover officers?

210. What, if anything, was done or is being done to alleviate the health and welfare consequences of deployment on former undercover officers?

211. What, if any, procedures were in place during deployments for undercover officers or their families to report any concerns they had about the impact of the deployment on their well-being?

212. Were those procedures adequate?

213. If not, in what way(s) were inadequate?

214. Were those procedures implemented?

215. What, if any, impact did undercover deployments have on the health and welfare of the families of undercover officers?

216. What, if anything, was done or is being done to alleviate the health and welfare consequences of deployment on the families of former undercover police officers? In particular:

- Is there a policy in place?
- If so, since when?
- How is that policy, or any informal provision, implemented?
- Who is responsible for its implementation?
- Is it consistently applied?
- Is it adequate?
- If not, in what way(s) is it inadequate?

217. What policies and procedures were and are in place to ensure the safety of the families of undercover officers in the event that their identity had been compromised?

218. In particular, what policy, if any, was/is in place in relation to relocating families in the event of their identity being compromised?

219. Were/are those policies and procedures adequate?

220. If not, in what way(s) were /are they inadequate?

221. Who within the MPS would take the decision that a family needed to be relocated?

222. To what extent, if at all, was/is the family consulted prior to such a decision being taken?

186.—Who within the MPS had and has responsibility for the safety and well-being of the families of former undercover officers?

The prevention and detection of crime

187-223. Did the activities of the Special Demonstration Squad help the prevention, detection and prosecution of crime, in particular serious crime?

188-224. Did the activities of the Special Demonstration Squad facilitate the prevention and control of public disorder?

189-225. If so, and in any event, did that consequence justify its activities?

Interaction between Special Demonstration Squad managers and those responsible for overseeing its operation

190-226. To what extent, by whom, and how were the activities of the Special Demonstration Squad overseen within the Metropolitan Police Service?

191-227. What was the extent of contact between managers within the Special Demonstration Squad, and those above them in the Special Branch chain of command?

192-228. To what extent did Special Demonstration Squad managers inform those higher in the chain of command about the day-to-day activities of undercover officers?

193-229. To what extent were the Special Demonstration Squad's procedures, targeting, operations, tactics, techniques and reporting methods directed, controlled, or in any other way influenced by the chain of command above the unit itself.

194-230. What praise or commendation did the Special Demonstration Squad and its members receive from the chain of command?

195-231. What criticism did the Special Demonstration and its members receive from the chain of command?

[196-232.](#) Was the Special Demonstration Squad visited or inspected by senior police officers?

[197-233.](#) If so, who visited, and how frequently did this occur?

[198-234.](#) On such visits, what was the extent of contact between senior officers and (a) undercover officers, (b) Special Demonstration Squad Managers.

[199-235.](#) Were the activities of the Special Demonstration Squad the subject of investigation and/or reporting by oversight bodies such as Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and/or the Independent Police Complaint's Commission or its predecessor?

Dissemination of Intelligence

[200-236.](#) How, to whom and for what purpose/s did the Special Demonstration Squad disseminate the intelligence which it gathered?

[201-237.](#) What were the respective roles of the unit's managers (including administrators) in the dissemination of the Special Demonstration Squad's intelligence?

Interaction with the Security Service

[202-238.](#) What contact did Special Demonstration Squad managers have with the Security Service and for what purpose/s?

[203-239.](#) Did the Special Demonstration Squad have a counter subversion role? If so, what was the role and how was it discharged?

[204-240.](#) Did the Special Demonstration Squad have any other role, formal or otherwise, connected, in any way, to the Security Service? If so, what was it and how was it discharged?

[205-241.](#) What influence, if any, did the Security Service have, either directly, or indirectly through the higher chain of command, on Special Demonstration squad procedures, targeting, operations, tactics, techniques and reporting methods?

26 February 2019