

**REPORT OF AN INVESTIGATION INTO SUSPICIOUS ACTIVITY OF
MARTIN HOGBIN**

17 February 2004

Four of its members were charged by the CAAT Steering Committee to investigate suspicious activity linked to Martin Hogbin's office email account while he was employed at CAAT. The following is a report of the steps taken during the investigation, the evidence gathered and the conclusions drawn.

CONTENTS OF THE REPORT

BACKGROUND.....	2
PROCESS OF THE INVESTIGATION.....	2
ANALYSIS OF THE BODY OF EVIDENCE.....	2
A – MARTIN'S EMAIL ACTIVITY.....	2
B – THE SUNDAY TIMES FILE.....	6
C – MEETING WITH PERSON Q.....	11
CONCLUSION.....	11

BACKGROUND

On 28 September 2003, *The Sunday Times* published an article alleging that between 1995 and (at least) 1997, British Aerospace had paid a firm directed by Evelyn LeChene to infiltrate CAAT and collect information about its workings and activities. In an attempt to discover who provided LeChene with this information, CAAT staff checked the office email log and discovered a record of suspicious activity in Martin Hogbin's email account.

Martin was an active volunteer with CAAT from spring 1997 before joining CAAT's staff in November 2001. Except for the period between November 2001 and September 2002 when a computer crash deleted the record, CAAT's email software has records of unusual activity in Martin's account throughout his time as a staff member. Between October 2002 and September 2003, Martin sent a large volume of email to a single email address, joseph@jofa.demon.co.uk ('the jofa address')*, about CAAT activities and internal information.

On legal advice, Martin was suspended on full pay on 3 October 2003 pending an investigation, however he resigned on 5 October before the investigation could begin. A meeting of CAAT Steering Committee on 11 October wished nonetheless to investigate and charged a team of four to carry this out.

Note: The name of the person @jofa.demon.co.uk has been changed in this published version of the report to protect the anonymity of the person alleged by Martin to have been the recipient.

PROCESS OF THE INVESTIGATION

Discussions took place with staff and volunteers, past and present, whom we thought could contribute information to the investigation or help in the interpretation.

An analysis was also carried out of Martin's email log and the procedures involved in sending emails.

Analyses were also carried out on a file supplied by *The Sunday Times*, which was the primary source of information for its article on the spying operations carried out by the LeChene organisation against CAAT. The file includes reports made about CAAT between 1995 and December 1997. Martin first became actively involved in CAAT in spring 1997. We are confident that the file is genuine because it contains detailed information about CAAT's activities that were real and could not have been invented or discovered by anyone not closely involved with CAAT. In some cases the information in the file is detailed enough to identify possible sources. For example, some information is drawn in detail from conversations held between only a few people.

CAAT's log of travel expenses claims made by volunteers during this period was also considered and their dates cross-referenced with the dated reports in *The Sunday Times* file.

We met with (details removed to protect anonymity).

The Information Commissioner was invited to investigate any data protection violations arising from the activity shown in Martin's office email account, including an investigation into the unidentifiable destination of the emails from his account. Meetings have taken place with staff from the Information Commissioner's office and relevant information given to them. We understand that The Information Commissioner intends to carry out a general investigation based on *The Sunday Times* allegations as a whole. His office is currently investigating the destination of Martin's suspicious emails and may or may not be able to provide us with details on this. At the time of writing we have not received any news about this.

ANALYSIS OF THE BODY OF EVIDENCE

A – MARTIN'S EMAIL ACTIVITY

The pattern of Martin's emails to the jofa address

The CAAT email system, Turnpike, shows that during the 12 months between 4 October 2002 and 24 September 2003, 529 messages were sent from Martin's account. Of these, 181 (34%) were sent to the jofa address. Martin had not sent more than 21 emails to any other single email address during this period.

Martin did not compose his own messages to the jofa address but rather forwarded messages he had previously received or attached existing documents. Often, Martin would first reply to an email he had

received before sending it on to the jofa address. Sometimes the forwarding would be done immediately after the original message had been received.

Martin never addressed the recipient by name in the body of the email nor did he make any enquiries of him/her. This was unusual in the context of his normal practice. Martin occasionally added his own annotations to the forwarded emails. One annotation revealed that the emails were actually reports of some kind and suggested that he also expected to speak with the recipient soon: 'Sorry report not up to usual standard email problems. Speak soon.' One was signed 'Smarts', his nickname.

Messages content

The content of the emails forwarded from Martin's account was wide-ranging. Examples are CAAT plans, CAAT National Forum Reports, nominations to CAAT Steering Committee, several notes about three legal cases, a press release, email list circulars, minutes from the Disarm DSEi network. Around half of the forwards concerned information about CAAT and half were about other organisations and networks and their actions. Some of the information sent on would be public or intended to be made public, other information was unambiguously private to CAAT and of a kind that should not be divulged to persons outside the organisation. Information sent on included a list of participants at a meeting. It is possible that this and other information forwarded was in breach of the Data Protection Act.

Martin's explanation

Martin admitted sending emails to the jofa address when they were discovered by other CAAT staff. His explanation (on 1 October 2003 to the other five members of the CAAT staff) was that he believed he had been sending them to Joseph Jones (name changed), a former volunteer. Asked explicitly later by one of the staff why he would send Joseph Jones information private to CAAT and apparently irrelevant to Joseph Jones, such as Steering Committee nominations and confidential legal opinions, Martin said that he believed that Joseph would find them interesting.

Since Joseph Jones left CAAT in xxx and returned to his home in xxx he has not been actively associated with the organisation to the present day, apart from a one-week visit in xxx. On 3 October 2003, he told a staff member by phone that he had not received any communications from Martin in the past year, nor had he made any; he 'was way out of the CAAT universe'; he could think of no reason why Martin would send messages of the kind described; he did not recognise the jofa email address. He said he might have met Martin briefly on the national demonstration in London on 15 February 2003, otherwise there had been no contact of any kind.

An indication that Joseph was not the intended recipient of the email is that Martin greeted his recipient by name in about 80% of his normal email correspondence. Joseph Jones was known to Martin, however in 181 email messages to the jofa address, Martin never once greeted the recipient by name.

It seems to us implausible that anyone except Martin sent any emails to the jofa address in light of the following:

1. Martin admitted to sending all the information that the staff member asked him about, which was included in several emails from Martin to the jofa address.
2. Martin often forwarded emails to the jofa address immediately after replying to them himself, which would not be possible for another person to do without being discovered.
3. The messages content is of a consistent kind, suggesting a single sender.
4. One of the emails was signed 'Smarts', his nickname.

The recipient of emails to the jofa address

Like most email programs, Turnpike can associate an email address with a real name in its electronic Address Book. The real name associated with joseph@jofa.demon.co.uk is listed as 'Joseph Smith'. (The first name has been changed here.) We do not know who this is or whether it is the real name of the recipient, nor do we know the significance of 'jofa' in the address. In October, one of the Steering Committee investigators sent a message to this address from the CAAT office in an attempt to establish the identity of the recipient and a reasonable explanation for the email traffic to this address. There was no reply, delivery failure message or automatic acknowledgement of receipt.

Turnpike associates a real name with an email address in one of two ways. It will make the association automatically when the program receives an email from someone who has already associated their own email address with their real name. For example, if an email were to be received from "Joseph Smith" <joseph@jofa.demon.co.uk> Turnpike would add the email address to its Address Book and associate it with

the real name 'Joseph Smith'. This would happen automatically and without informing the user. Alternatively, the user can enter the real name and email address into the Address Book manually. The Address Book retains this information indefinitely as an aid to users unable to recall the email addresses of their contacts.

This raises the question of how the jofa address came to be associated with Joseph Jones in CAAT's Turnpike Address Book. Since other staff have said that they did not receive emails from the jofa address, it appears most likely that the association was made automatically when Martin received an email from the jofa address. Alternatively, he may have entered the email address and real name into the Address Book manually. If the association was made automatically on receipt of an email from the jofa address, then Martin must have received an email from the jofa address that was not from Joseph Jones. On the other hand, if Martin had manually associated the jofa address with 'Joseph Jones', then he could not have believed it to belong to Joseph Jones. It is conceivable that the action of another CAAT computer user associated the jofa address with Joseph Jones at some point in the past, however this appears to be unlikely given that current staff have said that they do not recognise the address.

The jofa internet domain

The jofa email address is based on an internet domain— jofa.demon.co.uk – which we know has been used to collect information from campaigning groups' web sites for reasons unknown.

The domain name www.jofa.demon.co.uk can be accessed but no information is publicly available there. A web search using www.google.com for "jofa.demon.co.uk" (including the double quotes) reveals that jofa.demon.co.uk appears in the web site usage statistics of a number of organisations involved in radical peace, justice and environmental campaigning groups, some of which are nonviolent, some not. These include Peat Alert, Schnews, Brighton ABC, Leeds Earth First and two animal rights web sites.¹ From the information available, the jofa web address appears to have linked exclusively to campaigning and direct action groups.

The usage information statistics show that jofa.demon.co.uk was used frequently to access information from these campaigning groups' sites at the same time as Martin was sending information about similar campaigning groups to joseph@jofa.demon.co.uk.

Sending emails at CAAT

Martin's claim that he believed that his 181 jofa emails were being sent to Joseph Jones needs to be considered in the light of how CAAT's email software works. Two characteristics of CAAT's Turnpike system are significant.

First, like all email programs, sending an email using Turnpike involves specifying the recipient of each email. However, whereas some email programs allow the user to specify the real name (eg 'Joe Jones') in lieu of an email address, Turnpike does not allow this. That is, the user must specify the full email address of the recipient in order to send the message. For example, if the user were to specify 'Joseph' or 'Joe Jones' as the recipient of an email, the program would return an error message.

Second, if the user is not sure of the email address of the recipient, Turnpike's Address Book can be used to search for email addresses associated with real names. For example, if the Address Book were used to search for 'Joseph', Turnpike would respond by highlighting the first alphabetic match within the list of several email addresses that it knows to have been previously associated with 'Joseph'. The user can then select this entry or scroll through the list of real-name aliases and select the right one. Once selected, Turnpike then copies the email address into the recipient field of an email message.

If the user enters 'Joe', 'Joseph', 'Joe Jones' or 'Joseph Jones', CAAT's Turnpike Address Book does not offer the jofa address as the first match. For example, if 'Joe' is entered in the search box in the Address Book, the jofa address is not visible at all until the user deliberately scrolls down the list of emails associated with 'Joe' and reaches the 39th entry, which is clearly listed as 'Joseph Smith - joseph@jofa.demon.co.uk'. If 'Joseph' is searched for, the jofa address is the 23rd entry. Furthermore, in scrolling down the list, the user must pass over several addresses that are either associated in Turnpike with the real-name alias 'Joseph Jones' or apparently belong to him, such as one email address beginning 'joejones@...' (Joseph Jones used more than one email address).

¹ These sites' web usage statistics are accessible by Google because they share the same Internet Service Provider, www.knightsbridge.net, which (unusually) publishes statistics of the sites that it hosts as publicly accessible web pages. Therefore, we only have information about sites hosted by Knightsbridge. Since only a small proportion of campaigning groups would be using Knightsbridge to host their web sites, it is reasonable to assume that the range of sites that www.jofa.demon.co.uk accessed was much more extensive than those listed here.

In light of these facts, it would not be possible to use the Turnpike Address Book to retrieve the jofa address on a frequent basis without noticing that the associated alias was unambiguously 'Joseph Smith', not 'Joseph Jones' or anything similar and without ignoring several other matches that would appear more likely to be Joseph Jones' email.

If Martin used the Address Book to retrieve the jofa email address every time he forwarded an email to it, he would need to have either searched directly for 'Joseph Smith' and retrieved the jofa address immediately, or scrolled down the list of possible 'Joe' and 'Joseph' address matches, ignoring them and selecting 'Joseph Smith – joseph@jofa.demon.co.uk'.

On the other hand, if Martin did not use the Address Book but typed in the email address from memory, he must have learnt the address from someone that was not Joseph Jones.

Conclusions from the email evidence

A disproportionate number of email messages containing information of a kind not normally divulged to those not associated with CAAT have been sent by Martin to an unknown person who has not responded to our effort to identify him or her.

Martin's explanation that he believed to have been corresponding with Joseph Jones must account for the following at least if it is to be at all plausible:

1. Why Martin would send information private to CAAT to anyone outside the organisation, particularly in large volume.
2. Why Martin believed that the jofa address belonged to Joseph Jones when:
 - a. the associated alias on Turnpike for this address was unambiguously 'Joseph Smith';
 - b. the entries associated with Joseph Jones in the Turnpike Address Book were not used in preference;
 - c. Joseph Jones had not told Martin that this was his address;
 - d. there appears to be no reason why Martin would believe that the jofa address would more likely belong to Joseph Jones than any other address listed.
3. Why Martin believed that Joseph Jones in particular would want to receive information that was:
 - a. in large volume;
 - b. often private to CAAT or others;
 - c. apparently irrelevant to Joseph;
 - d. of a kind that Joseph had not requested.
 - e. For example, there appears to be no plausible explanation for sending information concerning the internal workings of CAAT (such as nominations for the Steering Committee, a list of participants at a meeting, schedules for actions that Joseph Jones would not be involved with); other organisations with which Joseph has never been associated; and actions taking place in (place given far from JJ's home) that Joseph Jones could not be involved with and did not interest him.
4. Why Martin would develop a close association with one former volunteer who had not expressed interest in such an association after his return to (JJ's home area).
5. Why Martin sent nine times as many email messages to the jofa address than to any other party, including those with which Martin was collaborating on CAAT projects.
6. Why Martin had never addressed Joseph Jones by name in the email or made any other enquiries of him, as would be a matter of course with anyone who was known well and in accordance with Martin's usual practice when sending email.
7. Why Martin should suggest in one email that they were 'reports' of some kind.
8. Why Martin should sign off one of his emails to the jofa address 'Speak soon' if there had never been any communication between himself and Joseph Jones during this period.

While these queries remain, we cannot believe that Joseph Jones was the intended or actual recipient of the jofa emails.

Emails sent to Martin's home email address

Although Turnpike shows that Martin was forwarding email to the jofa address from October 2002 to October 2003, a computer crash in 2002 deleted all email records from the period of 11 months previously. However, a record does exist for Martin's first year as a staff member at CAAT from 1 November 2000 to 7 November 2001.

During this period, Martin sent a total of 344 emails. Of these, none was sent to the jofa address, 150 were sent to Martin's personal home email account and 194 were sent to other addresses.

This is noteworthy for three reasons. First, the information sent to his home address was similar in kind to that sent later to the jofa address. Second, the proportion of Martin's email sent to his home address during this period was very high at 44%, which compares broadly with the 34% of messages sent to the jofa address in the most recent period. Third, during the more recent period of high email traffic to the jofa address, Martin stopped sending large quantities of emails to his home address, sending only two in 12 months. It could be surmised that during the earlier period, Martin was sending emails home before forwarding them to the jofa address and that once he began forwarding the emails to jofa directly from the office, he no longer needed to send the emails home. However, there may be another explanation for the emails sent home.

B – THE SUNDAY TIMES FILE

The following provides circumstantial evidence from several sections of the file obtained from *The Sunday Times* detailing reports from the LeChene firm to British Aerospace about CAAT activities. It shows how Martin may have been a source of information for the LeChene organisation.

The file covers the period between 1995 and December 1997. Martin became actively involved with CAAT as a volunteer in spring 1997.

The file as a whole

The file contains:

- information about CAAT as an organisation, such as bank details, computers files, publications, Steering Committee agendas and minutes, the email password
- information about CAAT and other anti-arms trade activists and supporters, MPs and other public figures who might be sympathetic to CAAT
- comments made by one person about another, details about partners and flatmates, a transcript of a person's diary
- information about CAAT and other anti-arms trade actions and campaign planning, mostly, but not exclusively, protests.
- a print-out of names and addresses from a database, apparently LeChene's or BAE's profile of activists. It is extensive, however it appears that possible sources for LeChene identified by CAAT and *The Sunday Times* are excluded from the listing (with one possible exception).

The recipient of the reports, according to *The Sunday Times*, was Mike McGinty, security director at BAE Systems. There are frequent references to "MM". *The Sunday Times* has also said that they went to Dick Evans, then Chief Executive and now Chair of BAE Systems.

The file shows that LeChene used more than one source to gain information about CAAT.

Throughout the file, the reference next to the index number identifies the type of information gleaned: B2 refers to information gleaned from individuals; A1 refers to information obtained from documents.

Appendices are often mentioned in the reports, however these were not included in the information that CAAT obtained from *The Sunday Times*.

Excerpts from the file

Excerpts relating to the investigation of Martin's activities based on our examination of *The Sunday Times* file and cross referenced with the above are discussed below in chronological order. We have interviewed some of those involved in the cases of interest to us in order to verify the information in the file and assist with providing further information.

We have included cases where Martin appears to be one of a small group where we can with reasonable confidence eliminate most or all other possible sources within that group or when he was one of a small number of people with access to private information reflected in LeChene's file. Where we have not been able to eliminate other possible sources with confidence, we have included a caveat to that effect. We have excluded altogether several cases in the file, in which Martin is listed as one of a small group of possible sources whom we have not been able to eliminate with any confidence.

We have sought information in the file that may exonerate Martin in ways that we believe others can be exonerated. For example, we believe that when the following kinds of information is included in the file about an individual, he or she is less likely to be a source for LeChene:

1. personal details included, such as a telephone number or address;
2. the opinions of others about the individual;
3. references to occasions when the individual was involved with an activity of interest to LeChene but unknown to her in detail;
4. clear expression of interest in a comment by LeChene about the words/activity/lifestyle of the individual;
5. listing of the individual in the print-out of activists.

We have been unable to find any of the above information in relation to Martin.

Text extracted from the report is given in italics.

1. Maidstone stall

An entry in the file reads:

1685. (B2) Person A will be in Maidstone on Monday Bank Holiday attending a Green Festival at which there is a CAAT stall. (Covered)

Person A confirms that the only other CAAT person involved with organising this stall was Martin Hogbin, however it is conceivable that another person might have watched the stall from a distance. There is no subsequent report in the file about the findings of whoever did cover this event for LeChene.

2. Farnborough trip

A detailed description of a trip to Farnborough is given in a report from the file, which is dated only one day after the event.

The file later shows that the Malcolm referred to is actually Martin Hogbin and Person B has confirmed that Martin and no Malcolm was involved in this trip. He is also later described in the file as Malcolm Hogbin, then Martin Hogbin. We do not understand why Martin is named as Malcolm, however there is no doubt that Martin Hogbin is the Malcolm referred to in the following:

1777. Special Caveat item. (B2) Farnborough Recce, Wednesday 18 June 1997. All items below relate to the caveat of source sensitivity until the end is mentioned in the text. Three people as expected went to Farnborough for a reccee concerning RN and BAEe's exhibition. They were Person B, Person E and Malcolm, this latter being recently inducted on to the RN & BAEe Action Steering Committee. Originally it had been the case that they would remain in the area overnight but this was not the case and all was done on the one day. They were met by a chap called Person C (detailed person description given but deleted here to protect personal privacy). He has been looking out for a squat that could be used as a sleeping place during the Exhibition so that protesters can rest. In the meantime, and given that he said he has not so far been successful in that, he said he would permit some of the protesters to flake out at his home which, he said, could take about ten people (sleeping on the floor). He said that he is in contact with a local band and they have an out-of-the way scout hut access.

1778 (B2) When they arrived, it was via the A325 where Person E took photographs of North Gate, Rae Road Gate and Dairy Gate.

1779 (B2) CAAT is in possession of two pieces of information. The first is a list of fifty-two companies that will be exhibiting at RN & BAEe. CAAT acquired this list directly, according to Person B, as a result of a parliamentary question. The second is they have a document emanating from the organisers of the Exhibition that states that exhibitors wishing to use smoke bombs or explosives should contact x before the occasion. More, this document said that equipment demonstrations would be carried out in Long Valley.

1780. (B2) The group walked down Long Valley passing by a tank that was on exercise. They came across Rushmoor Arena and more photographs of this area were taken. There was a sign nearby

that said Horse Show Ground. Person B said she assumed that this would be the area of the equipment demonstrations and it would be "ideal" for demonstrations. They are aware of the bridge that goes towards the golf course and all the accesses towards Rushmoor. Person B said there was no evidence that this was exactly the spot where the equipment would be on show, but if it was then it would be "heavily hit".

1781. (B2) Person C said that he would keep up his watch at Farnborough and would be able to establish "in time" where tents were going up as this would indicate the venue.

1782. (B2) They are not sure that they will have sufficient people to blockade all three "Gates" although this is their wish.

1783. (B2) CAAT has already distributed 12,000 leaflets (see Appendix I) and are underway with distributing a further 8,000. However, during the drive down to Farnborough Person E suddenly realised there was a possible Junction error in that the directions given on the large map speak of Junction 2 whereas the actual turn-off is Junction 4 (visible on the smaller map). He fears that many of the protesters following the map will go for the wrong junction. There was a brief discussion on what to do about this and Person B decided not to reveal it at CAAT and just hope for the best.

1784. (B2) There is another leaflet being produced. At the moment there are only 120 copies of this. The theme is different inasmuch as it concentrates on Turkey instead of Indonesia (see Appendix II) and on the Eurofighter.

1785. (B2) The RN & BAEe Steering Committee will be organising a vigil for the occasion and will not be openly involved in direct action or any subsequent violence but both direct action and a risk of violence are certain from "allied" groups.

1786. (B2) They have looked at the fences and are thinking of throwing carpets over the wiring in order to get in.

1787. (B2) At the southern end of the A235 (of the airfield) there is a housing estate. Person C said that a friend of his had done some research and found that the fence behind this housing estate is low and accessible. This will be one of the points of entry.

1788. (B2) The Steering Committee intend to liaise with the police but will leave this until the last possible moment.

1789. (B2) There was much talk about the court case last year when there were arrests at the Rae Road Gate area on aggravated trespass. The case fell and Person B feels that there is little impediment to trying again.

1790. (B2) The BAe complex will definitely be hit: all its installations along the road that are marked "B.Ae Research". Person B could not believe her eyes when she saw so much building without apparent security and so open that "we can chose as we go along!". These are buildings just off the round-about.

1791. (B2) Person B said that Person D will be leading the CAAT office planning session for the Steering Committee action.

Comment: It is interesting that CAAT appears to have an insider document of some kind which could indicate a leak from within the RN&BAEe exhibition system or even from the printers. Only a very few people are aware of all the above. Extra caution is requested in handling the information in order to protect excellent source.

end of RN & BAEe report.

The report's information definitely originates from one of Person B, Person E, Martin or Person C, hence the compiler's caveat of source sensitivity, which appears at the beginning and end of the report, and the frequent references to the content of private conversations, which could only be known by those directly involved.

Nothing of Martin's side of these conversations is mentioned anywhere in the report. If one of the other three were the source for this information, we think it would be strange to give detailed descriptions of three participants (including oneself) and not of Martin.

We can eliminate Person E, Person B and Person C as sources with reasonable confidence for the following reasons:

a) An earlier file entry shows that the details of a recce undertaken by Person E and Person B alone were clearly of interest to LeChene and that she would have wanted to report on them, however the details were obviously not reported to her and she is reduced to surmise:

1701. (B2) Person B and Person E (see Appendix 1) agreed to get the 05.00 hrs. train from Waterloo to Farnborough on Wednesday 28th to do a "recce"

Comment: This was transmitted although the most likely interest would have been RN & BAEE. This surmise was confirmed today, Wednesday, when both Person B and Person E returned at noon, had the office cleared of "volunteers" and held an impromptu meeting with Person F, Person G etc. The subject matter was the forthcoming RN and BAEE exhibition.

b) Other file entries report Person B's and Person E's telephone numbers as personal details about them. We know that this was usual practice for those on whom LeChene was spying.

c) Both Person B and Person E appear in the print-out of the file of people we assume the Le Chene company was holding information about (Martin does not).

d) The report says Person E 'suddenly realised' and drew attention to a mistake in the travel directions on the publicity flyer and that he 'fears' that protesters may not find the site.

e) Were Person B the source, we assume that the file would not focus as closely on her words and plans as it clearly does in this and many other entries.

f) There are further entries elsewhere in the file, the nature of which suggests that Person B was not a source. For example:

2.2 Person B has announced her retirement from CAAT and all things CAAT. She feels that she has been put upon by them and during RN & BAEE was unfairly blamed for the way the Kurds reacted etc. In the middle of the fiasco at Farnborough when most were being arrested, Person G felt that violence was a real threat and he telephoned Person B on her mobile and said that her handling of the affair would "probably cost me my job". [dated 23 September 1997]

3.1 Person B has withdrawn from the Steering Committee ballot. Person G has been trying to contact her about this but to no avail. She seems to have disappeared from the scene. Comment: In a way this is no surprise. (text here deleted to protect personal privacy). [dated 24 October 1997]

g) The source appears not to have been Person C because:

- He is referred to as Person C "first name only" SNU, which appears to mean Second Name Unknown. In the print-out of databases, FNU and SNU are used when LeChene is not aware of an activist's first or second name. If Person C were the source, LeChene would not have been ignorant of his name.
- Information about him is prefaced several times by 'Person C said [such and such about himself].' Although LeChene appeared occasionally to report the words of her sources in this way, in this case the context shows that the words were reported as if heard by another on the recce itself.
- His description is given in the report in some detail, including mention of arrests and his clothes of the day. His identity appears clearly to be set out as an important part of the subject of this report.
- His height is described as a range (5'6" to 5'8"), whereas it seems he would not use a range if he was himself the source.
- He is not mentioned elsewhere in the file and there is no evidence to implicate him as a source.

We were unable to find and contact Person C.

3. The 'two nuns'

A report in the file reads:

1841. (B2) Demo outside Germany Embassy, London, 26 June 1997. Attendees were Person H and Malcolm Hogbin plus two nuns. Pouring with rain. Stayed from 12.15 hrs. to shortly before 14.00 hrs. A similar distribution took place in Manchester at the German Consulate General where a petition was also handed in.

Person H has confirmed with us that the only participants at this event were himself, Martin and two women, whom he believed to be nuns. As it happens, of the two women, only one was a nun, however Person H had introduced both to Martin as nuns. Since neither nun was wearing a habit, the source of the notion that there were two nuns could come only from Person H's mistake. He believes he only said this to Martin but he cannot be absolutely certain. Person H is clearly not the source himself, since the file shows he is a major target of LeChene's operation.

4. Further information on RN & BAEE

A report dated 29 August 1997, includes the following paragraph:

RN & BAEE

1.1 A further tour to Farnborough took place on Thursday 28 August. In the visiting team were Person J, J's friend Person K, Person B and Martin. They did not see any stands or viewing area at all in Long Valley and Person J said she wondered if it [exhibition] had been moved, or "whether there's to be anything at all". Person J had expected to see some movement by that time. A further recce on this score will take place either Saturday or Sunday.

This very detailed report (which also, in para 1.9, includes the observation: 'There is a ladder lying on the ground at Queen's Gate, on the right (looking into Queen's Gate) where there is a wooden fence') must have been based on information provided by a source who was present on the trip.

Person B appears not to be a source for the reasons stated above in relation to the earlier Farnborough trip. Person J can be ruled out since she herself is a major target of the spying operation. If she were the source, it is unlikely that the report would have quoted her words directly. Person K is unlikely to be the source since she is not previously mentioned and there is no other evidence implicating her. LeChene has also misspelled her name.

Person K believes that there may have been one further person on this trip, Person L. Person J does not remember anyone of Person L's name at all. Person L is not mentioned elsewhere in the file and there is no evidence to implicate him. It appears that LeChene usually included her sources by name in the reports, so it would be unusual not to do so in this case, were Person L present and her source. The kind of information given here is also similar to information provided on other trips to Farnborough when Person L was definitely not present. Therefore we believe that, if Person L was present, he nonetheless was probably not the source of the information in this entry.

5. Halifax cheque

An entry in a report dated 16 September 1997 reads:

3.4 At the CAAT London office a cheque for £5,542 was banked. This was from the share handout ex Halifax account.

This was a cheque from the stockbrokers Waters Lunniss who handled the sale of the Halifax shares. The contract note shows that the sale was made on 26 August 1997 for settlement on 9 September 1997.

The cash book shows that the cheque was entered by Person F on 9 September and then banked by Martin on 12 September (according to Person F, Martin normally did the banking at the end of the week). The handwriting in the cash book indicates that no-one else made any entries that week and it is unlikely that anyone else would have needed to look at the cash book.

The exact amount of the cheque would most likely have been known only to the person who entered the cheque in the cash book and the person who banked it (a report on the ST file dated 1 September, para 2,

notes only that the sale of the shares netted approximately £6,000), although we cannot rule out the possibility that some other person found out the exact amount by surreptitiously looking at the cheque, cash book or contract note. Person F can be ruled out as a source by several references in the file about her. She says it is unlikely that she mentioned the exact amount to anyone else, but she cannot be absolutely certain. We cannot also rule out the possibility that Martin mentioned the amount to someone else.

6. AFCEA protest

The file includes the following:

Person G withdrew £250 from a 'special account' about which he said, 'no-one knew' to pay for the minibus to take volunteers to Brussels for the AFCEA action.

This entry is included in an undated report, which is filed between two other reports dated 24 October 1997 and 7 November 1997 (incorrectly dated 7 November 1998). The actual date of the AFCEA protest was 28-30 October 1997.

The file then includes a detailed report of the AFCEA protest.

Martin was one of four UK volunteers to attend the AFCEA protest and was the driver of the minibus. The other three were: Person M, Person N and Person P.

Person G has told the Steering Committee investigation he took Martin to one side when withdrawing the £250 from a cash point machine and explained to Martin that it was from a secret sum of money which had been given to fund protests of this nature. Person G says he told no-one else in CAAT about the money.

Person G can be ruled out as a source by several references in the file about him. It appears that the donor of the money can also be ruled out because, according to Person G, he would not have known how much money was withdrawn and what it was used for on this occasion.

It is possible - although unlikely given that he was told about the money in confidence - that Martin mentioned the money to one of the other three protestors, but there is no other evidence on the file to indicate that any of them was a source. Furthermore, it is unlikely that they would have been able to quote directly what Person G said to Martin, i.e. that the money was from a 'special account' about which 'no-one knew'.

7. The print-out listing the database of people held by the LeChene organisation

A print-out of names and addresses was also part of *The Sunday Times* file. We believe this is a list of the people whom LeChene kept files on. Although it includes nearly all the CAAT staff and volunteers who are referred to directly in the general file (not necessarily those who were simply attendees at meetings), it does not include Martin Hogbin. Neither does it include Alan Fossey, identified by *The Sunday Times* as one employed by LeChene.

C – MEETING WITH PERSON Q

The four Steering Committee investigators met someone who claimed to have evidence from a single source known to him of a link between LeChene and Martin. The details of this discussion are off-the-record at the request of the person involved.

CONCLUSION

This report provides evidence over a period of time and from a range of sources about the activity of Martin Hogbin while at CAAT.

On the basis of the evidence available to us, we conclude:

1. Martin provided information in large volume of a kind not normally divulged externally, including confidential information, to an unidentifiable email address ('the jofa address'). Irrespective of

whether this email was sent to Joseph Jones or another destination, this amounts to a breach of confidence and mis-use of CAAT property and can be described as serious misconduct in the context of Martin's professional duties.

2. Martin's claim that the emails were intended for Joseph Jones appears to be highly implausible for a number of reasons given in this report, connected with Joseph's lack of interest in any such material and the way in which the CAAT email system works;

3. The internet domain associated with the jofa email address has been used to access information about a number of campaign and direct action groups for reasons unknown;

4. Information in the file obtained from the *Sunday Times* appears to indicate that Martin provided information to the LeChene firm during 1997. Person Q's uncorroborated, confidential claim that he had evidence to link Martin with LeChene would support this;

5. The information passed by Martin to the jofa address in 2003 is consistent with the kind of information of interest to the LeChene firm in 1995-1997.

6. Although Martin declined to cooperate with the investigation, we have sought information in the file and the email log that might exonerate him and been unable to find any.