

**ANNEX A TO COUNSEL TO THE INQUIRY'S EXPLANATORY NOTE ON PRIVACY:  
ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLE OF A TRANCHE ONE INTELLIGENCE REPORT**

**EDITED TO SHOW HOW ANNEX A WOULD LOOK FOR PURPOSES OF DISCLOSURE TO THOSE NAMED IN THE DOCUMENT, IN THE EVENT OF THEM MAKING CONTACT WITH THE INQUIRY AND BEING PREPARED TO GIVE UNDERTAKINGS OF CONFIDENTIALTY**

**Sample report**

1. The following information has been received from a secret and reliable source:
  - 1.1 "A meeting of the South West London Revolutionary Campaign Movement took place in an upstairs room of the King's Head Public House, South West Street, at 8pm on Tuesday 20th February 1979.
  - 1.2 The meeting was chaired by Andrew Anderson. He was rather more than usually fired up. He suggested that, at the next demonstration, the group should take aerosol cans of red paint to spray over the uniforms of officers policing the demonstration. Barbara Bennett, the group treasurer, was concerned that paint could get into the eyes of police officers and injure them, or upset a police horse, at which point Anderson launched into a tirade to the effect that political change was not going to be achieved without action, it was politically indefensible to hold back and he was the only one who ever did anything. Since Anderson does not, typically, do much at all, it was difficult to avoid the impression that the entire outburst was motivated principally by an attempt to impress his new boyfriend. Chris Carter, (5'9, shoulder length dark hair, mole on left cheek), who had been brought along and was watching from the back of the room. Bennett diffused the situation by explaining that her real concern was the impact that any injury to an animal would have on fundraising efforts. She then presented her financial report: the coffers are empty again.
  - 1.3 The demonstration in Putney on 14th February had not been a great success in promoting the Movement's agenda .. It had been hoped that a violent overreaction by the police would attract public censure and call attention to the cause. In the event, the police presence had been limited and blood had been shed by only two attendees: Derek Dentoncole, who had become intoxicated and fallen down in the crush, bruising and grazing his left side (he was abusive to a uniformed officer who attempted to come to his assistance, was taken to sober up in a police cell, and was fined £5 for being drunk and disorderly at South Western magistrates' court the

following morning) and a uniformed police officer who sustained a cut to one corner of his eye from when he caught the edge of a placard held by Emma Evans (the officer's shoulder number, FF1234, had been noted down by Bennett). Evans, normally one of the loudest of the Movement in calling for violent revolution and the overthrow of all authority by any means, seemed shocked and rather embarrassed to have caused any actual injury, even inadvertently; she was subdued and left early.

**Commented [RB1]:** DD appears to be deceased – see below. If the Inquiry is satisfied that this is the case, on the balance of probabilities, then this information should not be redacted in the version of the document disclosed to others mentioned

- 1.4 Speakers from other groups had not been well received. Gianpreet Grewal, the Revolutionary Party candidate for Twickenham at the next election, had addressed the assembled protesters but her speech had rambled, and had confirmed doubts about her doctrinal purity, despite her assertions that standing for Parliament is a means to subverting Parliamentary democracy from the inside. Harald Hough and Ian Ives spoke on the usual lines. John Jackson, the leader of the South West London University Students' Revolutionary League was criticised all round for cancelling his attendance on grounds of inclement weather and a head cold.
- 1.5 On this depressing note, the meeting broke up. The next meeting will take place on 27 February."

2. References of persons known to have attended:

Andrew Anderson	400/33/19
Barbara Bennett	400/33/82
Chris Carter	No trace
Emma Evans	400/33/179
Gianpreet Grewal	406/15/361
Harald Hough	Mentions re RCM
John Jackson	410/75/224
Kelvin King	Mentions re RCM, USRL
Lynnette Leigh	No trace
Martin Menzies	400/33/5

**Inquiry notes**

- i. The South West London branch of the Revolutionary Campaign Movement was infiltrated between 1976 and 1980 by an undercover officer, NOOO, whose cover name was Martin Menzies.
- ii. The officer, NOOO, is deceased. He has been refused anonymity and the Inquiry has published his cover name, dates and group on its website, but has not been

contacted by any person with evidence to give about the officer and has no core participants who have any connection to the officer or the group.

- iii. The Undercover Research Group has, however, published a profile of the officer. Footnotes to the profile indicate that its researchers have received information, directly or indirectly, from Emma Evans although it is not clear on the face of the profile whether she is the only member of the group who has provided information to them.
- iv. The Inquiry wishes to examine whether the officer's deployment into the group was justified and (so far as possible consistently with the privacy rights of the individuals mentioned) to make public evidence relevant to this issue. It also wishes to publish the report and thousands of others like it (again, so far as possible consistently with the privacy rights of the individuals mentioned) so that members of the public can see what the Special Demonstration Squad did (i.e. as part of the detailed factual narrative), follow the Inquiry and understand the evidence on which its conclusions will be based.
- v. Internet searches for 'Andrew Anderson Revolutionary Campaign Movement' suggest that an individual who seems likely to be the same person was alive and politically active as recently as 2016, although the name being a common one it is not possible to reach a conclusive view that the search results relate to the same individual. There is no significant information about him online, and nothing that suggests any means of contacting him. However, the Inquiry has seen a large volume of reporting on him which suggests that he was the leader of this local group, that the group's ideas and decisions nearly all came from him, that he spoke at rallies and demonstrations on numerous occasions, and may well be remembered as the leader of the group by a large number of people who were active in the same political circles at the time. Other intelligence reports in the file also make clear that he had a wife at the time of this meeting.
- vi. Barbara Bennett went on to stand for and to be elected to Parliament, and was briefly a junior minister. Her Wikipedia page contains the information that she was treasurer of the Revolutionary Campaign Movement in the late 1970s. She is now retired.
- vii. Chris Carter went on to found a different group which was also infiltrated by the SOS. This group is of significant interest to the Inquiry, but the investigation is at a less advanced stage because evidence about the group is due to be heard in Tranche 3. The Inquiry believes that Mr Carter is still alive and that it will be able

to trace him; it is likely to do so in due course in order to ask him to provide evidence in Tranche 3.

- viii. Internet searches for the name "Derek Dentoncole" reveal a number of online obituaries for an individual who died in 2012. The deceased Derek Dentoncole was born in 1953 and the obituaries are consistent with him being in the London area in 1979. They make no reference to the Revolutionary Campaign Movement or to anything else beyond the unusual name that would definitively identify him as the person referred to. They say that he was a civil servant, and that he was survived by his wife and three children. The Inquiry has not asked the police to search for his record of convictions. A conviction resulting in a fine would normally have become spent six months after the date of the conviction, but since the rehabilitation period may be affected by subsequent convictions, it is only by obtaining the record of convictions that the Inquiry would be able to say definitively that the conviction is now spent.
- ix. The name "Emma Evans" appears to be too common for any useful result from web searches, though there is, as noted above, a possibility that she is in contact with the Undercover Research Group.
- x. The Inquiry has not asked the police to identify FF1234, but has been told that, while it would be possible for attempts to be made to identify him, these are likely to be time consuming and difficult.
- xi. Gianpreet Grewal lost her deposit in the Twickenham seat, but remained politically active. She has recently published several books, and there are numerous articles online in which she sets out her political views.
- xii. Harald Hough pursued a career in acting and became a minor celebrity. He currently presents a gardening programme on Radio 4.
- xiii. John Jackson, Kelvin King and Lynette Leigh are entirely untraceable online. The Inquiry notes from other documents that Kelvin King was in his early 60s in 1979. This means that he would now be over 100 years old if he was still alive.

## Questions

1. If the Inquiry was to redact out all private information, what (if anything) could be published? **This version of the annotated draft addresses the issue of disclosure to the non-state individuals mentioned in the document rather than publication to the wider world. The question of publication is addressed in the annotated draft focused on wider publication.**

2. In particular, to what extent is it sufficient to redact out the names of the individuals given that the individuals in question would still be identifiable at least to one another? See response to 1. above. Names should not generally be redacted in the version disclosed to individuals who are themselves named in the document. However, sensitive information which would not necessarily be known to those named in the document should be redacted - see §118(b) of submissions. In this example, this would include the comment about AA's sexuality and, unless the Inquiry is satisfied on the balance of probabilities that DD is deceased, the information about his conviction.
3. What, if anything, can be done about the fact that Andrew Anderson and Barbara Bennett can potentially be identified by members of the public by reference to their role in the organisation, even if their names are redacted? See response to 1. above.
4. If the other names (initials C - L) were redacted, would it then be permissible to publish the document without attempting to contact any of them? If not, which would need to be contacted? See response to 1. above re publication. The Inquiry should follow the steps suggested in the notification section of the NPNSCP submissions.
5. If the Inquiry concluded that there were reasons why it was necessary to publish the information in relation to any given individual in full, including their name, in order to fulfil the terms of reference, which (if any) would it be disproportionate to contact? See response to 1. above re publication. In respect of disclosure to non-state individuals named in the document, the Inquiry should take the steps set out in the "notification" section of the NPNSCP submissions. It would be disproportionate to disclose, even to other non-state individuals mentioned in the document, the information about AA and CC's alleged sexuality (and DD's conviction unless the Inquiry is satisfied he is deceased) unless they had first been contacted. It would not be disproportionate to disclose the rest of the document to the non-state individuals named in it under conditions of confidence even if the steps set out in the "notification" section of our note had not resulted in the Inquiry having contact with one or more of the individuals named in the document.
6. Privacy rights apply to living individuals. What level of assurance does the Inquiry need that a person is dead, in order to be able to publish private information in relation to the individual? See response to 1. above re publication. For the purposes of disclosure to non-state individuals named in the document, information about others also named in the document should be unredacted unless it is sensitive – see §118 of the NPNSCP submissions. Private information which falls within the categories at §118(b) of the NPNSCP submissions should be redacted when the

document is disclosed to the other non-state individuals named in the document unless the Inquiry is satisfied on the balance of probabilities that the subject of the sensitive information is dead.

7. If it wants to publish the information about her, should the Inquiry contact the Undercover Research Group and ask it to provide contact details for Emma Evans? Are there circumstances in which the Inquiry's interest in contacting an individual is itself private information which should not be communicated to (for example) the Undercover Research Group? Would the position be any different if the Inquiry wished to ask Chris Carter for contact details for Andrew Anderson, if the latter was in fact still alive? See response to 1. above re publication. As set out in the "notification" section of the NPNSCP submissions, the Inquiry should, subject to appropriate resources being provided and an agreed protocol, be making use of the URG and other NPNSCP networks/ individuals to make contact with non-state individuals whose personal data has been collected. Disclosure to the URG and/or to others who may have contact with such an individual of the name of the individual, the group or groups with whom s/he was involved and the dates, for the purposes of inviting that individual to make contact with the Inquiry, is a necessary and proportionate disclosure of personal data. This includes, in the context of this example, asking for assistance from Chris Carter in making contact with Andrew Anderson.
8. Is the shoulder number (FF1234) private information? No, shoulder numbers are required to be worn openly for the purpose of members of the public being able to identify the officer in question.
9. In relation to Gianpreet Grewal, to what extent (if at all) does it affect the position that the information recorded about her amounts to details of what she said at a public demonstration, and that she has published information about her current political beliefs? To what extent (if at all) does it affect the position that she was a parliamentary candidate? See response to 1. above re publication. For the purposes of disclosure to non-state individuals named in the document, it is relevant that the information recorded relates to comments GG made publicly, because this means it was information to which those present would have been party in any event. However, it should be noted that not all of what is recorded about GG is in fact reporting of what she said, most of it is the officer's comments upon what was said: "her speech rambled, and had confirmed doubts about her doctrinal purity". In this example, that commentary does not fall within the sensitive areas discussed at §118(b) of the NPNSCP submissions and so should not be redacted for the purposes of disclosure to the other named non-state individuals. However, there may be situations, as with the officer's comments on AA's public actions, where these are sensitive and should be redacted prior to disclosure to the other non-state individuals. The fact that GG was a parliamentary candidate is irrelevant for the purposes of determining whether the information about what she

said should be disclosed to the other named non-state individuals mentioned in the document.

10. Does the fact that Barbara Bennett, Harald Hough and possibly Gianpreet Grewal are names that might be recognised by members of the public in any way affect the position? **See response to 1. above re publication. This does not affect the position in relation to disclosure to other non-state individuals**
11. If Emma Evans was contacted, was the person at the meeting, and was prepared to assist the Inquiry, would any privacy redactions be necessary before sharing the report, in confidence, with her for the purpose of refreshing her memory before making a witness statement? If so, what redactions? **See the NPNSCP submissions and redactions to the text above – only the comments about AA and CC's sexuality would need to be redacted (unless AA and CC consented to disclosure).**
12. If Emma Evans made a witness statement and gave her evidence about the meeting in public: (a) what privacy redactions would be required; and (b) what restrictions would those redactions put on the questions which could be put to her, and the responses which she could give at a public hearing? **See response to 1. above re publication.**
13. In what ways would the answer to question 12 be different if Emma Evans was to give her evidence wholly in private? **See response to 1. above re publication.**
14. To what extent do the time and/or the financial cost of putting documents through the restrictions process for public consumption, particularly in the context of there being many thousand Special Demonstration Squad intelligence reports affect the approach which the Inquiry can and should take? **See response to 1. above re publication.**