

Policy File

Copied to: [REDACTED]

NOTE FOR FILE

A4 liaison with MPSB

Director A and I discussed [REDACTED] on 19 and 30 January. We decided that we should have a meeting with Bryan, and any of his officers he decided to bring with him. Director A cleared with Director F that we should go ahead on our own on this, keeping him informed of the outcome.

2. In considering the line that we should take at the meeting, we agreed that it would not be politic to give the police officers the rather harsh conclusions set out at [REDACTED]. It would be better to limit ourselves to discussion of the operational overlap, the training possibilities and communications security.

3. The meeting took place on 31 January: Director A and myself, and Bryan accompanied by Nicholls, the head of 'S' Squad. Bryan made it clear that he was determined to improve the professionalism of the Branch's surveillance unit, and said that he proposed to increase the size of the unit by at least 4 men. The increase would be larger if he found himself with more slack to play with as a result of the closing down of the Branch's ports offices in the provinces. Nicholls said that he proposed to use this increase in numbers to create a training capacity, a sorely felt need at the moment.

4. Director A raised the matter of the operational overlap. We noted that this concerned the 3 operational squads as much as the surveillance unit in 'S' Squad. A superficially attractive solution to the problems this caused was [REDACTED]

ruled out because it was impractical.

5. Bryan thought that most of the problems could be met by good liaison between the officers in the operational squads and the desk officers in F Branch ensuring that each side knew when the other was contemplating an operation against a target in which there was a common

/zont

[REDACTED]

interest. We agreed, however, that a similar liaison between A4 and 'S' Squad would be a useful back-up to this.

6. Where a common interest threatened an operational overlap, the arrangements which would have then to be made would depend on the circumstances of particular cases. The objective of discussion should be that one side would leave it to the other to carry out the operation, serving the intelligence requirement of both organisations, and sharing the product of the operation. This might not always be possible, however, particularly where there was a prospect of an arrest, or of A4 needing to call upon the police were an operation to develop in a particular way. In such cases there would have to be a communications link between the A4 operational team, and the MPSB, with police standing by at a greater or lesser distance depending on the circumstances.

7. On the training which A4 might give the MPSB unit, we agreed that before anything could be worked out it was necessary for each side to know more than they did at the moment about the other. It was decided that a start should be made by A4 giving a presentation to MPSB and I undertook to let Nicholls have a choice of dates for this. The MPSB audience for the presentation would include people from the operational squads. A similar presentation by MPSB would take place later and the two presentations would be followed by discussions to work out training details.

8. Turning to communications security, we noted [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] there are strong grounds to suspect the Workers Revolutionary Party were seeking to monitor communications. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] This underlined the need for communications security against all varieties of targets. Director A and I explained [REDACTED] to the police officers but suggested that the MPSB surveillance unit would find it difficult to administer. [REDACTED], which, though it would not withstand determined analysis, gave a good degree of security, was perhaps a more realistic possibility. We agreed to look at this with the training.

9. Director A asked about frequency allocations, and whether there was any possibility that the MPSB surveillance unit might get its own frequency, and move away from the CID's. Bryan said that all Metropolitan Police radio frequencies were being examined as part of a study of a new command system. It might be possible for the surveillance need to be taken into account with that. Director A said that if there was anything we could do to help by means of our own links to the Home Office people responsible for frequency allocation, we would be very ready to do all that we could.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

9 February 1978

UCPI0000030774/2