

IN THE MATTER OF THE UNDERCOVER POLICE INQUIRY

METROPOLITAN POLICE SERVICE WRITTEN OBSERVATIONS ON DRAFT ISSUES LIST (MODULE 2A SPECIAL DEMONSTRATION SQUAD ISSUES)

Introduction

1. This document comprises the Metropolitan Police Service (herein “the MPS”)’s brief suggestions/observations regarding the Draft Module 2A Special Demonstration Squad Issues List. As with previous written observations concerning previous draft lists of issues, in offering these observations the MPS makes no concessions as to the extent to which any particular aspect of the evidence on these issues can safely be considered in public without damage to the public interest and/or to individuals, particularly in light of any anonymity decisions that have been or will be made in these proceedings.

Suggestion/Observations

2. The MPS suggests that the following additions / comments ought to be considered under the headings set out below:

Management and supervisory structure and function

3. The MPS suggests Question 17 should read “undercover officers or managers who deserved...”
4. The MPS suggests Question 18 should read “undercover officers or managers who required...”
5. The MPS suggests Question 19 should be replaced by Questions 19A, 19B and 19C:
 - a. 19A: “Were there instances where officers should have been commended, but were not? If so, why were the officers in question not commended?”
 - b. 19B: “Were there instances where officers should have been disciplined, but were not? If so, why were the officers in question not disciplined?”
 - c. 19C: “What other performance assessment and/or management responses, if any, were available to deal with the actions of undercover officers or managers where

a response was necessary but neither commendation nor discipline were warranted?”

Selection and Recruitment

6. New Question 21A: “What factors motivated individual managers to join the SDS?”
7. New Question 25A: “What, if any, assessments (including psychiatric and psychological assessments) were undertaken in relation to potential managers?”

Targeting and initial authorisation

8. The MPS suggests Question 61 should read: “What was the practical outcome of each deployment? Did it achieve its purpose?”

Reporting – justice campaigns

9. The MPS queries whether Question 71.2 is necessary given Question 56, which will cover substantially the same ground.

Reporting – social and environmental activists

10. New Question 105A: “By what means, when and to whom was that information reported?”

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

11. The MPS suggests Question 196 should read: “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 Complaints Commission or its predecessor and/or the Office of Surveillance Commissioners or its predecessor?”

12 April 2019

JONATHAN HALL QC

NICHOLAS CROPP