

COVER SHEET

Witness: 1st Witness Statement of
David Reid

Exhibits Referred to: None

Date Statement Made: 3 March 2020

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

Witness: David Glen Reid

Occupation: Contractor

Address: c/o Metropolitan Police Service, Directorate of Legal
Services, Empress State Building, London SW6 1TR

1. I have been asked to provide a witness statement to assist the Undercover Policing Inquiry regarding the risk assessment prepared in respect of [REDACTED] ¹

HN155. In preparing this statement I have sought to answer all the questions asked of me in the Rule 9 request dated 14 February 2020 and provided to me on 25 February 2020.

2. I was employed by the MPS as an Independent Risk Assessor from November 2016 until 1 May 2018. During this time, I undertook a number of risk assessments in relation to nominals involved in the Undercover Policing Inquiry.

3. Before making this witness statement, I had regard to the following documents:

(i) The underacted risk assessment prepared in respect of [REDACTED] ² **HN155** dated 23 November 2017;

- [REDACTED]
- (ii) My notes of interview with [REDACTED] HN155 [REDACTED] 2 dated 14 November 2017 (MPS-0739805);
 - (iii) My notes of the fact check with [REDACTED] HN155 [REDACTED] 2, dated 18 November 2017 (MPS-0746269);
 - (iv) Part of paragraph 115 of [REDACTED] HN155 [REDACTED] 2 witness statement dated 13 January 2020 (MPS-0746083), where paragraph 9 of his impact statement dated 29 January 2019 is quoted.

Risk assessment prepared in respect of [REDACTED] HN155 [REDACTED] 3

- 4. I was the author of the risk assessment prepared in respect of [REDACTED] HN155 [REDACTED] 4 dated 23 November 2017. The document was prepared by me and then was peer reviewed by Graham Walker. Graham would not have had input into its contents, but he could have had input into the style of writing, spelling and grammar, and the conclusions reached. Graham may have documentation indicating his particular input into the document following the peer review.

Interview of [REDACTED] HN155 [REDACTED] 5 for the risk assessment

- 5. I interviewed [REDACTED] HN155 [REDACTED] 6 in person on one occasion for the purpose of preparing the risk assessment. I attended his home address with Brian Lockie (a risk assessor at the time) on 14 November 2017 at noon, as recorded at the top of my notes of the interview (MPS-0739805, p.2). I would estimate the interview lasted for about 3 or 4 hours; it was dark when we left his address. [REDACTED] HN155 [REDACTED] 6 would have had breaks during the interview, for example to make a cup of tea.
- 6. The handwritten notes in MPS-0739805 represent my contemporaneous notes and record of comments made by [REDACTED] HN155 [REDACTED] 7 during the interview. The template

[REDACTED]

for my notes is the template for the risk assessment. Generally I would conduct research before attending an interview and type this up as a template in the form of the risk assessment. In interview, I would then ask open questions of the nominal to ascertain the relevant information required for the risk assessment and, if necessary, follow up with closed questions based on the information I had gleaned from my research. I would annotate the template risk assessment with the answers given by the nominal. If my research was confirmed as correct, I would tick it. If further information or comment was provided I would note this in handwritten comment.

7. In MPS-0739805, I have handwritten the following below paragraph 4.12, in the margin and at the foot of the page (emphasis in bold is to correct what the Inquiry understood I had written):

*“Lived a full alternative life in all aspects but cannot recall specifics. No long or medium-term relationship + there were groupies who’d want to spend **the** night with a Central Committee Member → not a member but close to it. But not going to **disclose** further. Would only give first name. Cannot recall their names. 2 or 3 + ? women. Dalliances not all ended in full sex.”*

8. The final sentence at the foot of the page, under paragraph 4.12, says:

“Probably drinking. Never purposefully gave surname but not volunteered.”



Account at paragraph 4.12 of the risk assessment

9. Paragraph 4.12 of the risk assessment dated 23 November 2017, the final version of the risk assessment, states:

“N155 admitted to having a number of liaisons, although he would not necessarily use the term ‘relationship’ as they were very short lived. He stated that he needed to live a ‘full alternative lifestyle’ in all aspects, but could not recall the specifics. None of the relationships were medium or long term. He stated there were ‘groupies’ who wanted to spend the night with someone who was close to the SWP Central Committee. He was reluctant to discuss matters further, but thought that he would only have given the women his first name. He does not recall their names. He stated that not all of the ‘dalliances’ (his word) would have led to sex. He initially stated there may have been 2 or 3 women but then said there may possibly have been a few more. N155 clarified during the ‘fact check’ that these were purely social encounters, and not done to enhance his deployment. He did not comment upon whether his supervisors were aware.”

10. The account at paragraph 4.12 is based on what I was told by 8
HN155 during the interview. It is an accurate account of the responses given by him to the question asked of him.
11. I have been asked what questions I asked to elicit the responses recorded at paragraph 4.12 of the risk assessment. Due to the passage of time, I do not remember the exact questions that were asked of 9
HN155 during the interview. I did not record the questions asked and so do not have a contemporaneous note

[REDACTED]

of the questions in order to refresh my memory. It was agreed with DLS at the beginning of the risk assessment process that we were not to treat it like a suspect interview and therefore we were not to record verbatim and in full the questions asked of nominals and the answers received.

12. I can comment in a general sense on what would have been asked based on how we approached all risk assessments and the topic of sexual relationships. I would begin by asking a very open question along the lines of "did you have any sexual or physical relationships whilst you were deployed?" What I have recorded in my handwritten notes is [REDACTED] ¹⁰ HN155's response to that initial open question. In the final risk assessment, the use of single quotation marks indicates a direct quotation of words or phrases used by [REDACTED] ¹⁰ HN155. For example, 'groupies' and 'dalliances' are words he used. Paragraph 4.12 of the final risk assessment is not a verbatim record. In response to [REDACTED] ¹⁰ HN155's initial comments, I would have asked follow up questions, for example: "how many people did you have sexual relationships with?" and "on how many occasions?". When [REDACTED] ¹⁰ HN155 said two or three people or that it could have been more, I would have tried to clarify how many people it was because the number of people was relevant to the level of risk. The interview would have been a conversation: I would have asked probing questions in response to comments made by [REDACTED] ¹⁰ HN155.
13. I have been asked whether the questions I asked included a suggestion by me that it would have been quite possible and not surprising if [REDACTED] ¹¹ HN155 had engaged in sexual activity given the length and depth of his deployment. I have no recollection of asking this question. It is not something I would have suggested because it would not have formed part of assessing the risk in relation to Mr



11

HN155 I have set out above the nature of the conversation around sexual relationships.

12

14. At no stage during the interview did HN155 state that he did not engage in sexual activity whilst he was undercover. I recorded what he said to me. Sexual activity whilst undercover was a topic covered in all risk assessments. Had Mr HN155 said he did not engage in sexual activity whilst undercover I would have recorded this in my notes. How exactly I would have phrased this would be clear from other risk assessments which I conducted where the nominal said they did not engage in sexual activity whilst undercover.

13

15. In making his remarks about the sexual activity, HN155 was definitely speaking about his own experience. He was referring to his actual experiences and not the possibility of such interactions having happened. The first thing he stated was that he had to live a full alternative life in all aspects. He also stated he had had dalliances with three or more women, not all of which ended in full sex. This was in the context of him saying that not all of the relationships he had were long or medium term. There was no other conclusion to be drawn, other than he was talking about his actual experiences.

'Fact checking' the risk assessment

16. As I have said above, generally I would conduct research before attending an interview and type this up as a template in the form of the risk assessment. Having interviewed a nominal, I would edit this document to reflect the nominals responses to questions asked in the interview. I would then take the typed risk assessment in final draft form back to the nominal to check the facts. This is the

[REDACTED]

'fact checking' part of the process. It is an opportunity for the nominal to read through the risk assessment and draw my attention to any incorrect facts so that they can be corrected in the final version. It is not for the nominal to question the risk assessor's conclusions, although they are seen by the nominal.

17. I conducted the fact check part of the process for the risk assessment prepared in respect of [REDACTED]¹⁴ HN155 I met with [REDACTED]¹⁴ HN155 on 18 November 2017 at 4pm, as recorded in my handwritten notes at the top of the fact check copy of the risk assessment (MPS-0746269). I met with him by myself. I remember it was a Saturday.

18. I have no recollection of [REDACTED]¹⁵ HN155 asking to take the draft risk assessment away to consider it. My recollection of the procedure is that if he had asked me for a copy I would not have allowed him an opportunity to take it away and I would have made clear that the fact checking meeting was his opportunity to review the risk assessment. [REDACTED]¹⁵ HN155 was being asked to fact check the closed risk assessment and the handling arrangements were such that he would not have been permitted to take it away.

19. [REDACTED]¹⁶ HN155 was specifically given the opportunity to consider the contents of paragraph 4.12 of the risk assessment and he definitely checked this part of the assessment. When he reviewed this paragraph, the only thing he asked to change was the last eight words of the final sentence: "and the encounters would have followed drink". [REDACTED]¹⁶ HN155 thought this could be interpreted in a way that suggested the sexual activity took place when the women were drunk. I had not meant for it to read in that way, but I accepted what [REDACTED]¹⁶ HN155 said. I thought it

[REDACTED]

was a fair comment regarding factual accuracy: he had never said anything to me that gave rise to an inference that he was having sex with women whilst they were drunk; it was merely that sexual activity took place in the context of social encounters where there may well have been alcohol. This is why we do the fact check. I put a line through it on the fact checking copy of the risk assessment (MPS-0746269, p.9) indicating that it should be removed in the final version. Those words were then removed in the final version of the risk assessment. It is my risk assessment, not [REDACTED]¹⁶ HN155's risk assessment, but the facts need to be accurate so I would not include matters that he did not say. If, however, during the fact checking process [REDACTED]¹⁶ HN155 denied having said something which he previously said in the interview then I would have recorded in handwritten comments on the fact checking copy of the risk assessment that at the fact checking stage this particular comment was denied.

20. My recollection is that [REDACTED]¹⁷ HN155 was shown the full draft risk assessment, however certain parts of the risk assessment may have been redacted where there was sensitive material relating to other individuals or groups, for example a PNC check. I made notes on the draft (MPS-0746269) of anything he said which required amendments to be made to the final version. At the end of the meeting, I would have taken back the copy that I provided [REDACTED]¹⁷ HN155 with.

21. I have been asked what I understood [REDACTED]¹⁸ HN155's comments about the sexual relationships being "purely social encounters" to mean. I understood it meant these were women he met whilst he was deployed and as a result of his SWP social circle, rather than being a way to further his deployment. This was exactly the opposite of a denial by [REDACTED]¹⁸ HN155 that he engaged in sexual activity whilst

[REDACTED]

deployed: it was an admission that it had happened and explanation providing context to the activity.

22. [REDACTED]¹⁹ HN155 said nothing to me during the fact checking process which was a denial or which I understood to be a denial by him that he engaged in sexual activity whilst deployed. He only made suggested changes to the facts contained within the draft risk assessment. These are all noted in my handwriting on the draft and then changed in the final risk assessment. He did not seek to change anything recorded in the draft risk assessment regarding the fact of the sexual relationships he previously told me he had engaged in; the only change he sought in paragraph 4.12 was in relation to the last eight words of that paragraph, as I have set out above.

I believe the content of this statement to be true.

Signed [REDACTED]²⁰ David Reid

Dated 03-03-2020