Written evidence submitted by Brittany Kaiser

I want to thank the British Parliament for this opportunity to bear witness to the inquiry on Fake News. As a believer in truth, universal human rights and democracy, I understand that fake news undermines these ideals and threatens everything we hold dear, but it is just a symptom of a deeper problem. The elite have spent too many years using technology to take advantage of the people's openness and goodwill. I can no longer stand by while the privileged abuse their power, intentionally or unintentionally. I want to help shed light in dark places, and to help people be more responsible in their actions. This is why I spoke out originally, and this is why I have returned to the UK willingly and at my own expense to testify to this inquiry.

As a matter of background, I was born in Houston, Texas, and grew up in Chicago. I went to high school at Phillips Academy Andover outside of Boston, then moved to Edinburgh to study two of my lifelong passions: international relations and human rights. During my academic studies, I volunteered on the presidential campaign of Howard Dean and the senatorial campaign of Barack Obama, before becoming part of the small new media team on Obama's presidential campaign in 2007/8.

I then spent several years working on human rights projects around the world, including work for Amnesty International, lobbying at the United Nations and European Parliament to stop crimes against humanity, and contributing to human rights research projects in Asia; while pursuing further postgraduate degrees in human rights law, diplomacy and development. I began to focus on how social change projects could become more effective, for example through data-driven early warning systems against genocide. I also worked on international trade and development, and worked around the world as a freelance political consultant.

I first met Alexander Nix when I was working with Democrats Abroad in London. I think it was 2013. Friends of ours thought it would be a good joke to introduce us as he was consulting to the Republican Party. He was very interested in learning more about my experience with the Democrats. He gave me his card and said, "Let me get you drunk and steal your secrets". I didn't call him.

We met coincidentally a few times after that; and in December 2014, he offered me a job. I wanted to find a way to be more effective in campaigning and positive social change, and his firm Strategic Communications Laboratories (SCL) boasted of scientifically valid methods of measuring effectiveness. I have always wanted us to use power for good, not ill. The first project I worked on with SCL was on driving engagement for reconstruction of ebola-stricken countries.

I began at SCL Group as a part-time consultant with the title of special adviser. I became full-time in February 2015, and left in January 2018. My job title was left to me. My focus was on sales and business development, a field in which titles are often inflated. I called myself Director of Program Development initially; this then changed to Director of Business Development.

At no time was I part of the executive leadership or top management team of SCL or Cambridge Analytica - although I wanted to be, and I believe I contributed hugely to the success of the company. I was never an officer of the board of any of the companies. I was also not a data scientist or someone with access to controversial datasets. Since I left, I have been learning just how many secrets the management team were keeping me out of, and looking back with fresh eyes on emails I was copied in to and other documents.

My job at Cambridge Analytica was primarily to meet potential clients, hear what they wanted and required, and brief the operations team in order to produce a sales proposal, often under the guidance of senior managers and executives like CEO Alexander Nix, CFO/COO Julian Wheatland, and Chief Data Officer Alex Tayler. I had access to company materials on products and services, account management, and to potential and current clients.

My testimony here is informed by what I witnessed and experienced during my time at Cambridge Analytica and SCL, and materials I worked on or was copied in to. When I originally spoke to The Guardian in March 2018, I provided relevant materials from my Cambridge Analytica inbox. I was locked out of my files, but later found an offline copy of my SCL inbox with further materials.

I would now like to submit the following specific testimony and supporting packages of evidence:

Brexit, UKIP & Eldon Insurance

Cambridge Analytica was initially engaged with Arron Banks, Andy Wigmore and Matthew Richardson to design parallel proposals for Leave.EU, GoSkippy/Eldon Insurance and the UK Independence Party. I was asked by Nix and Wheatland to take the lead on contract negotiations. I believe this is because, as upper class Brits, they did not want to front up the deal with him themselves. Banks was excited to discover my background with the Obama campaign.

Over a period of five months, we undertook both meetings and work at the Bristol headquarters of Eldon Insurance, the SCL Group offices in Mayfair, and the Leave.EU London offices in Millbank Tower, as well as a press launch and media engagements. Our work for UKIP/Leave.EU was never reported to the Electoral Commission by the party, the campaign, or our company.

At the time, I didn't see anything wrong in what was being proposed. I am not a data lawyer or an expert in UK elections law; and we included caveats in our proposals about requiring legal advice before proceeding with some elements of the project. Arron Banks said, "It's my data" – it seemed natural that he would use it across his initiatives. I was also reassured by a legal opinion arranged by former UKIP party secretary Matthew Richardson from Toby Coppell QC to UKIP and Cambridge Analytica, an opinion which Richardson co-signed in a manner which seems somewhat unorthodox in retrospect. I am providing this document now to Parliament.

In hindsight, I now think that there is reason to believe that misuse of data was rife amongst the businesses and campaigns of Arron Banks. If the personal data of UK citizens who just wanted to buy car insurance was used by GoSkippy and Eldon Insurance for political purposes, as may have been the case, people clearly did not opt in for their data to be used in this way by Leave.EU. I have similar concerns about whether UKIP members consented to the use of their data.

For example, I went to Bristol with a senior data scientist to spend the day with the Leave.Eu team. We started the work day by presenting to the heads of every department (social media, call center, IT/data, creative, events) to show them how Cambridge Analytica uses data and would be supporting the Leave.Eu campaign. After the general presentation we went to work with each department to assess which kinds of data they had,

how they were being used and what kinds of capacity the team possessed. When we were with the call center team, we enquired on the databases being used for the calls, which I was told were from the insurance company. It seemed to me that the datasets and the staff were being used for Eldon/GoSkippy Insurance as well as Leave.eu in parallel.

Arron Banks refused to pay our phase 1 bill of £41,500 for work undertaken, despite what I was told by Julian Wheatland was a firm commitment by Leave.EU chief executive and Banks associate Liz Bilney to do so. I have no memory of seeing or hearing about the invoice later sent to UKIP for this work, which has recently been revealed in the media. I understand that Banks made a donation of £42,000 to UKIP a week before the referendum vote, perhaps to tidy things up. But I had and have no evidence around this; and I understand that no payment was ever made to Cambridge Analytica by UKIP. To the best of my knowledge, our work with UKIP and Leave.EU never made it into any report to the Electoral Commission.

Finally, I was recently made aware of a data company set up by Arron Banks called "Big Data Dolphins", soon after he ceased negotiations with Cambridge Analytica and declined to pay our phase 1 bill.

This company has reportedly worked with a data science team at the University of Mississippi (Ole Miss). If the Mississippi team has held or processed UK citizens' data in the US, I believe that is likely to be a criminal offence; although it is for the empowered authorities to pursue any such question and secure the associated evidence.

In retrospect, based on what I now know, I believe that Arron Banks and Andy Wigmore have serious questions to answer. They should perhaps themselves be summoned to testify before Parliament. I do not believe Banks's written evidence to this inquiry is a full account of what happened. I also hope that evidence can be preserved.

I am submitting the following supporting materials on Brexit to the inquiry:

1. GoSkippy Proposal and supporting emails
   a. GoSkippy original proposal document
   b. GoSkippy1 email thread regarding scheduling a follow up meeting at Leave.EU offices in Bristol, where I write on January 8, 2016: *"I recall before the holidays we spoke about Aaron being available in Bristol next week on Wednesday and Thursday the 13/14. Are these dates still a possibility? My team does not mind coming down to Bristol as we have pending meetings with other members of the Leave.EU teams as well as GoSkippy departments."*

2. Phase 1 & 2 Leave.EU Proposal and supporting emails
   a. See Leave.EU original proposal outlining Phase 1 & Phase 2 work streams
   b. See Leave.EU follow up proposal, following a request from Banks to combine/correlate work streams with Eldon Insurance and UKIP
   c. Email **Leave1** dated Dec 5, 2015, from Julian Wheatland to Liz Bilney, confirming Arron Banks and Leave.EU's intent to have Cambridge Analytica create a joint data program for Leave.EU, UKIP and the insurance company, as well as to initiate a fundraising program: *"Thanks for coming into see us yesterday – it was a pleasure to meet you and it sounds like we are on the right track. As we discussed, we will make sure that the Target Audience*

Analysis (TAA) suits the purposes of Leave as well as UKIP and we will try to seed some questions into the survey that will help inform future study of insurance risk profiling. Once we have completed the TAA and matched it to the Experian data we will be in a position to start microtargeting and, at that time, we would propose that we start digital outreach and a program of voter engagement and fundraising. However, following our discussion yesterday on the way you are using Facebook (and chatting it over with our Head of Digital Marketing afterwards), it occurred to me that you may like us to take over you current list-building activity in the interim. From what you've said, I'm certain we could improve the effectiveness and yield from current activities and that would give us a stronger base for the fundraising programme in the New Year."

d. Email **Leave2**, I write to confirm with Julian Wheatland that our budget is approved by Leave.EU as follows: *"In your last full chats with Liz, she said the budget was approved and we were awaiting approval for the payment schedule, etc, is that correct? Anyhow, would you like me to contact Frances, whom I've been liaising with on Aaron's schedule, to get something in the calendar for the week of January 4th?"* His response is *"Yes that's correct and yes please."*

e. Email thread **Leave3**, Pierre Shepard, Leave.EU Head of Research, writes to Cambridge Analytica on Dec 11, 2015 to ask when we will have demographic data available for their usage: *"could you give me an indication of when we we will have some demographic data. I was under the impression that it would not be for a while, but I've been informed otherwise."* After our team liaising with Leave.EU back and forth, he confirms that some access has been given to campaign materials and/or data: *"I've spoken to Andy in graphics. As far as he can tell, you have all the information/access you need. Please advise on where to go from here. Brittany and David, do you still plan to come next week?"*

f. Email thread **Leave4** from Ian Warren at Election Data, as a consultant to Leave.EU sharing election data and insights with Cambridge Analytica as part of the Leave.EU team: *"Please find attached the first of five reports on the Labour vote. As you will see the report includes detailed analysis of demographic characteristics and political behaviour. There is an Executive Summary at the beginning if the full report is too long to consume. This first report is one of five I will produce:*

> *1. Blue collar working households (attached)*
> *2. Struggling, financially strapped households*
> *3. Young, metropolitan liberals*
> *4. Current students*
> *5. Ethnic minorities*
>
> *Each of these groups have distinct demographic characteristics, personality traits and political behaviours. They will require subtly different messaging as a result. Julian and the team at Cambridge and I had a productive meeting in London before Christmas and I hope this report will start to flesh this out."*

g. Please see document titled **"Labour vote briefing 1/5"** shared with Cambridge Analytica and Leave.EU on January 6, 2016

h. Please see document titled **"Labour vote briefing 2/5"** shared with Cambridge Analytica and Leave.EU on January 8, 2016

3. UKIP rebranding proposal and supporting emails:
   a. Please see UKIP rebranding proposal
   b. Email **UKIP1** dated Nov 27 2015 - Confirmation that we have analyzed the UKIP membership dataset and are working on a proposal to include the appending of commercial data for further insights these members.
   c. Email **UKIP2**: An email exchange between myself and Leave.EU leadership confirming our time at Bristol HQ of Eldon Insurance/Leave.EU to assess data sources and campaign capacity.
   d. Email **UKIP3** dated Dec 7, 2015, reconfirming the analyzing of UKIP's membership data, and the party using the results in presentations: *"Here is a presentation that was given to UKIP's NEC about the results from the survey which David analysed. John Gill, the party's press director sent it over from a conversation we were having."*
   e. UKIP Doc1 - Please see presentation from late October 2015 by Matthew Goodwin, Paul Whiteley and Harold Clarke, forwarded by John Gill, UKIP official, based on the analysis done by Cambridge Analytica on UKIP membership and survey data.

1. **Facebook data issues**

I am not a data scientist, and I never handled Cambridge Analytica's data models or any significant datasets myself. I have been shocked by the testimony to this committee on this topic and the growing number of reports about how Facebook data was abused by Alexander Kogan, Global Science Research and Cambridge Analytica without users' consent, and even more shocked about Facebook's own failures to protect their users' data.

I only heard through the media about the specifics of the Facebook research project undertaken in 2014 by Alexander Kogan, both through an initial Guardian article in December 2015 and through the most recent revelations. The research took place before I joined SCL, and I never met Kogan. I can answer questions on this topic but have no special knowledge of the datasets or their acquisition.

I can say that I was concerned about what I read in the media in 2015, and was assured by company executives in January that they had taken appropriate action to comply with the law and contractual requirements, including deleting all Facebook data. But it's important also to emphasise that during most of my time at Cambridge Analytica, the culture and assumptions of the firm and the wider data brokerage and ad tech industries within which it operated were a bit "Wild West", with citizens' data being scraped, resold and modelled willy-nilly. I have gained further understanding and perspective on these issues in recent weeks. I do believe I have evidence of CA obtaining, retaining and using these datasets, seemingly in contravention of legal obligations.

This is why I launched the #OwnYourData campaign at the start of April, challenging Mark Zuckerberg to alter Facebook's terms of service to give users more rights over the use and

monetisation of their own data. The petition I started for the campaign on Change.org now has 147,000 signatures. We have asked Zuckerberg to respond by 30ᵗʰ April. I would encourage the Select Committee to ask Facebook's CTO Mike Schroepfer about these issues, and am happy to provide further briefing and a list of suggested questions.

I want to address a few specific details about Facebook data issues:

a) Access to Facebook data was a part of Cambridge Analytica's sales and marketing "pitch" to commercial, political and defence clients throughout my time at the company – even after the request from Facebook to delete the data.

b) I never had access to the Kogan/GSR dataset on 87 million friends, or to any other sophisticated Facebook dataset; I how it had been acquired, and I was told by company leadership that Cambridge Analytica was complying with the law and with Facebook's requirements at all times.

c) In May 2015, Cambridge Analytica's current Chief Data Officer asked for me and two other colleagues to look through a list of Facebook groups and choose 500 of them to receive data related to the people who had liked those groups. I was told this was oneof our last chances to get Facebook data. I believe now that this is later than the publicly stated date of April 2015 when the API loophole was announced to be closed.]

d) As I told *The Guardian* in March 2018, I was forwarded emails between CA's Chief Data Officer and Facebook in December 2015 and January 2016. Facebook asked if we still possessed the Kogan/GSR datasets; our CDO confirmed that we did; Facebook asked for them – and any models derived from these datasets – to be destroyed. The CDO then told Facebook that the data had been deleted. Following statements from former CA employees, I am now asking questions about whether this was the case.

e) I have since found another email dating from March 2016 in which another of our senior data scientists confirmed in writing that we were using some Facebook likes for modeling, two months after we confirmed that these data were deleted.

f) I should emphasise that the Kogan/GSR datasets and questionnaires were not the only Facebook-connected questionnaires and datasets which Cambridge Analytica used. I am aware in a general sense of a wide range of surveys which were done by CA or its partners, usually with a Facebook login – for example, the "sex compass" quiz. I do not know the specifics of these surveys or how the data was acquired or processed. But I believe it is almost certain that the number of Facebook users whose data was compromised through routes similar to that used by Kogan is much greater than 87 million; and that both Cambridge Analytica and other unconnected companies and campaigns were involved in these activities.

Documents include:

1. Email requests
2. Attachment of group lists
3. Attachment of chosen groups
4. Email correspondence in response to Facebook's notice of the need to delete data
5. Email correspondence confirming we still use facebook likes for modeling

Nigeria campaign

There have been various reports regarding a short communications project undertaken in Nigeria in 2015 in support of Goodluck Jonathan and in opposition to the candidacy of Muhamadu Bukhari. I was involved in securing this contract for the SCL Group and liaising with the client in the beginning of the engagement, and in a specific part of the project with lawyers highlighting historic human rights abuses. I never visited Nigeria during this project. I am submitting the campaign portfolio of all materials produced and used in this Cambridge Analytica campaign in Nigeria.

My only other involvement was in response to a specific and persistent request from the client, for opposition research services which I understood Cambridge Analytica did not themselves provide. At the client's request, I made additional inquiries, identified a suitable research company which might be able to deliver effective opposition research, and introduced the client to them. Contrary to some media reports, this company was not called Black Cube. There was then one meeting between Cambridge Analytica staff and representatives of that company. I should emphasise that opposition research is a fairly standard part of political campaigns in most countries, and is often conducted by people with backgrounds in government service.

Documentation:

· NIS Campaign portfolio - images, videos and press articles in full

Breitbart data

In reviewing the events around the Brexit campaign, I was recently reminded of the fact that the Breitbart media platform had a UK channel, "Breitbart London", in which UKIP-linked figures played key roles. One of Cambridge Analytica's competitive advantages in the US marketplace in 2016, and a key part of our pitch to Republican clients, was that we had secured exclusive rights to resell Breitbart engagement data. This meant that we had at least some access to what tens of millions of Americans were reading on Breitbart, and could feed this data into our campaign models to help predict resonant issues - and to influence behaviour. Breitbart became one of the biggest media platforms in the US in 2016, and its stories often went viral on Facebook.

I am not aware of any such agreement or data sharing in relation to Breitbart London, but it would be interesting to know if our US data tracking tags were in place on that UK channel, and whether any data about what stories British people were reading on Breitbart or other websites ever made their way to Leave campaigns.

Documentation:

· Breitbart data email

Conclusion

When I decided to expose abuses of data and electoral law last month, I also decided I wanted to share key pieces of information with parliamentarians and the authorities. I have returned to the UK specifically to do this, of my own free will and at my own expense, to support the work of the Fake News Inquiry and the Information Commissioner's Office. I have a busy schedule in the coming weeks, but am more than willing to answer further specific questions in the future.

Governments, private companies and wealthy individuals have long had the opportunity to buy, license and collect our datasets. The past decade has seen a rampant rise of this data collection and modelling, targeting individuals to sell products, services and political ideology. I know this all too well, as a data rights campaigner and former employee of Cambridge Analytica.

Privacy has become a myth, and tracking people's behavior has become an essential part of using social media and the internet itself; tools that were meant to free our minds and make us more connected, with faster access to information than ever before. Instead of connecting us, these tools have divided us. It's time to expose their abuses, so we can have an honest conversation about how we build a better way forward.

I appreciate the opportunity to have given this testimony to Parliament. These are little-known areas which people are only just beginning to understand. I believe that shining a light on historic abuses, whether illegal or illegitimate, can help us forge a new social contract in which we use our wealth of data for good, instead of exploitation.

That's why I am calling through the #OwnYourData campaign for individual data to be protected as property, where we each have sensible permission structures, the right to make our data portable, and to monetize it for our own basic needs and freedoms.

No longer should the powerful be allowed to monopolise control over our data, the headlines, and the power that these communications tools wield. Let us move forward together, for prosperity, truth, rights and freedom.

April 2018