

Gist of issues raised by Tranche 1 SDS officers in respect of risk assessments conducted by David Reid and Brian Lockie

1. In total, 165 SDS officers have been included in the anonymity process and a further four have had their real name and cover names published without being included in the process¹.
2. It is understood by the Inquiry that, of the officers whose deployments fall within the tranche 1 period (1968 – 1982), 49 risk assessments were completed.
3. David Reid acted as lead assessor in eight of those risk assessments² and as peer reviewer in a further eight assessments³.
4. Brian Lockie acted as lead assessor in ten risk assessments of tranche one officers⁴ and peer reviewer in three⁵.
5. Of the assessments conducted by either David Reid or Brian Lockie in tranche one, five officers raised issues over the accuracy of the final assessment in their witness statements: HN80, HN126, HN155, HN340, HN347.
6. There is factual dispute in the case of HN155, to be explored in oral evidence.
7. The issues raised by the remaining four officers can be described as follows:

HN126

8. In his witness statement, HN126 states that paragraph 4.15 of his risk assessment is incorrect as it records him as a key organiser in the demonstrations against Grunwicks in Willesden. He states that he had only just gone into the field at that point and was definitely not a key organiser⁶.
9. HN126's risk assessment interview was conducted on 21 November 2017 by Brian Lockie and recorded in a handwritten note⁷. That note makes reference to HN126's role within the SWP at section 4.2 'Main Group(s) infiltrated' and includes the following: '*District Organiser for SWP paper*'.. '*Grunwicks - SWP were a big part in the protests – I helped to organise the numbers and which days were going to have a list of SWP*'.
10. The written risk assessment was completed by Brian Lockie on 23 February 2018. David Reid is recorded as peer reviewer⁸. At paragraph 4.15 'Prominent Successes', HN126 is recorded as a key SWP organiser in the demonstrations against Grunwicks in Willesden, North London who 'helped to organise the daily SWP numbers that were attending to support the dispute.

¹ Eighth update note

² HN45, HN86, HN155, HN321, HN322, HN329, HN330, HN355

³ HN68, HN126, HN135, HN296, HN304, HN344, HN347, HN353

⁴ HN80, HN96, HN126, HN241, HN294, HN298, HN301, HN336, HN340, HN341

⁵ HN297, HN333, HN348

⁶ Witness statement MPS-0740761 paragraph 240

⁷ D9420; peer reviewer recorded as Graham Walker

⁸ David Reid does not appear to have taken any part in the interview process with HN126.

As the dispute gained more prominence the MPS were getting more involved due to the potential for disorder. HN126 was in a position of trust within the SWP and had the inside knowledge to inform the police decision makers of likely numbers that would be attending Grunwicks and the plans and mood of demonstrators'. The handwritten version includes no reference to Grunwicks in the section 'prominent successes'.

11. HN126 also states that a passage in his risk assessment concerning cover accommodation is incorrect. He believes a suspected compromise of his cover identity and not his cover address lead to him moving from Queen's Park to Paddington⁹.

HN340

12. HN340's risk assessment, dated 26 April 2017, was completed by Brian Lockie.
13. In his witness statement, HN340 states that there is an error in his risk assessment concerning the location of his cover accommodation, which was in North London and not Golders Green¹⁰.
14. The risk assessment records, at paragraph 4.4, that HN340's accommodation was a bedsit in North London. It later records that HN340 lived in a bedsit run by an Irish couple in Golders Green.

HN347

15. HN347 was interviewed for his risk assessment on 15 May 2017 by Graham Walker and David Reid, both made a handwritten note.
16. The risk assessment was written and completed by Graham Walker on 6 June 2017, being peer reviewed by David Reid on the same date.
17. In his witness statement, HN347 stated that the risk assessment was 'riddled with inaccuracies'. Two examples are an error in the date he left the SDS and inaccuracy relating to a posting, prior to his SDS deployment¹¹.
18. Another relates to the statement in his risk assessment at paragraph 4.4 that he researched the identity of a deceased child with a specific name. HN347 states this to be factually incorrect and not what he told the risk assessor. The risk assessors' handwritten notes record that HN347 told them that he did not use a deceased child's identity. HN347, in his witness statement, agreed with this note¹².
19. An addendum report was completed by Adrian Baxter, dated 15 October 2018, to clarify the issue. A fact checking exercise was not able to take place prior to the first risk assessment being completed. It appears that Graham Walker's recollection was mistaken and recorded by him in his written assessment. Adrian Baxter was able to seek clarification from David Reid

⁹ Witness statement paragraph 53

¹⁰ Witness statement paragraph 28

¹¹ Witness statement paragraph 6 and 95

¹² Paragraph 18

as to his recollection, which reflected his original handwritten note. The error was not corrected by him when he completed the peer review.

HN80

20. HN80's risk assessment, dated 24 January 2018, was completed by Brian Lockie and peer reviewed by Graham Walker.
21. In his witness statement, HN80 confirms that he has made a formal complaint over his risk assessment and impact statement¹³. He asserts that the detail concerning his cover name was recorded inaccurately in the risk assessment. He states that he chose the nickname 'CC' and cover name 'Colin Clark'. He refused to use a deceased child's identity but to show willing did go out and found a death certificate in the name of 'Paul Clark'¹⁴. He made it clear to superiors that he wanted to use the name 'Colin Clark' and his own date of birth. He accepts that the date of birth for Paul Clark may have been used, without his knowledge.
22. The risk assessment records, at paragraph 4.4 'Covert Identity adopted', that HN80 went to Somerset House to find the identity of a deceased child. He did not find an identity he was comfortable with and used a hybrid version.
23. The interview notes to the risk assessment record, at paragraph 1.2, that he made up the name CC – might have been John or Paul Clark and at paragraph 4.4 next to a typed entry for DOB, handwritten note 'went to Somerset House – did not use'.

UCPI
4 May 2021

¹³ Witness statement paragraph 163

¹⁴ Paragraph 20