U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Washington, DC 20528

Homeland Security

April 18, 2008

Mr. David L. Sobel
Electronic Frontier Foundation
1875 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Suite 650
Washington, DC 20009

Re: **DHS/OS/PRIV 07-160/Sobel request**

Dear Mr. Sobel:

This is the twelfth partial release to your Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests to the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), dated November 7, 2006 and December 6, 2006, requesting DHS records concerning the Automated Targeting System (ATS). These two requests were aggregated to simplify processing. The following is a consolidated list of records requested:

1. All Privacy Impact Assessments prepared for the ATS system or any predecessor system that served the same function but bore a different name.
2. A Memorandum of Understanding executed on or about March 9, 2005 between Customs and Border Protection (CBP) and the Canada Border Services Agency to facilitate the Automated Exchange of Lookouts and the Exchange of Advance Passenger Information.
3. All records, including Privacy Act notices, which discuss or describe the use of personally-identifiable information by the CBP (or its predecessors) for purposes of screening air and sea travelers.
4. All System of Records Notices (SORNs) that discuss or describe targeting, screening, or assigning "risk assessments" of U.S. citizens by CBP or its predecessors.
5. All records that discuss or describe the redress that is available to individuals who believe that the ATS contains or utilizes inaccurate, incomplete or outdated information about them.
6. All records that discuss or describe the potential consequences that individuals might experience as a result of the agency's use of the ATS, including but not limited to arrest, physical searches, surveillance, denial of the opportunity to travel, and loss of employment opportunities.
7. All records that discuss or identify the number of individuals who have been arrested as a result of screening by the ATS and the offenses for which they were charged.
8. All complaints received from individuals concerning actions taken by the agency as a result of ATS "risk assessments" or other information contained in the ATS, and the agency's response to those complaints.
9. All records that discuss or describe Section 514 of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2007, P.L. 109-295 (H.R. 5441) and its prohibition against the development or testing of "algorithms assigning risk to passengers whose names are not on Government watch lists."
10. All records that address any of the following issues:
    a. Whether a system of due process exists whereby aviation passengers determined to pose a threat are either delayed or prohibited from boarding their scheduled flights may appeal such decision and correct erroneous information contained in the ATS;

b. Whether the underlying error rate of the government and private databases that will be used in the ATS to assign a risk level to an individual will not produce a large number of false positives that will result in a significant number of individuals being treated mistakenly or security resources being diverted;
c. Whether the agency has stress-tested and demonstrated the efficacy and accuracy of all search tools in the ATS and has demonstrated that the ATS can make an accurate predictive assessment of those individuals who may constitute a threat;
d. Whether the Secretary of Homeland Security has established an internal oversight board to monitor the manner in which the ATS is being developed and prepared;
e. Whether the agency has built in sufficient operational safeguards to reduce the opportunities for abuse;
f. Whether substantial security measures are in place to protect the ATS from unauthorized access by hackers or other intruders;
g. Whether the agency has adopted policies establishing effective oversight of the use and operation of the system;
h. Whether there are no specific privacy concerns with the technological architecture of the system;
i. Whether the agency has, pursuant to the requirements of section 44903(i)(2)(A) of Title 49, United States Code, modified the ATS with respect to intrastate transportation to accommodate states with unique air transportation needs and passengers who might otherwise regularly trigger a high risk status; and
j. Whether appropriate life-cycle estimates, expenditure and program plans exist.

A search directed to CBP has produced an additional 143 pages of records responsive to your request. We have determined that 33 pages are releasable to you in full or with certain information withheld pursuant to Exemptions 1, 2 (low) and (high), 5, 6 and 7 of the FOIA, and 110 pages are withheld in their entirety pursuant to Exemptions 2 (high), 5, 6 and 7E of the FOIA.

Enclosed are 33pages of releasable information. The withheld information, consists of names or initials, deliberative material, legal opinions, law enforcement information, and homeland security information. I am withholding this information pursuant to Exemptions 2, 5, 6, and 7E of the FOIA, 5 U.S.C. §§ 552 (b)(1), (b)(2), (b)(5), (b)(6), and (b)(7)(E).

Also enclosed are 17 blank sheets with several numbers that represent withheld documents. Each number corresponds to a page of withheld information and has the appropriate exemptions that apply to that document. In this instance, there are 110 pages of withheld information that comprise 17 documents.

Exemption 2(low) exempts from disclosure records that are related to internal matters of a relatively trivial nature, such as internal administrative tracking. Exemption 2(high) protects information disclosure of which would risk the circumvention of a statute or agency regulation. Included within such information may be operating rules, guidelines, manuals of procedures for examiners or adjudicators, and homeland security information.

Exemption 5 protects from disclosure those inter- or intra-agency documents that are normally privileged in the civil discovery context. The deliberative process privilege protects the integrity of the deliberative or decision-making processes within the agency by exempting from mandatory disclosure opinions, conclusions, and recommendations included within inter-agency or intra-agency memoranda or letters. The release of this internal information would discourage the expression of candid opinions and inhibit the free and frank exchange of information among agency personnel. The attorney-client privilege protects confidential communications between an attorney and his client relating to a legal matter for which the client has sought professional advice. It applies to facts divulged by a client to his attorney, and encompasses any

opinions given by an attorney to his client based upon, and thus reflecting, those facts, as well as communications between attorneys that reflect client-supplied information.

Exemption 6 exempts from disclosure records the release of which would cause a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

Exemption 7E protects records compiled for law enforcement purposes, the release of which would disclose techniques and/or procedures for law enforcement investigations or prosecutions, or would disclose guidelines for law enforcement investigations or prosecutions if such disclosure could reasonably be expected to risk circumvention of the law.

As stated in the February 1, 2008 Status Report for the litigation which encompasses this FOIA request, we are continuing to process your request with regard to documents located at the following CBP Offices: Office of Field Operations, National Targeting and Security; Office of the Chief Counsel; and Office of Information Technology. If you have any questions regarding this matter, please refer to **DHS/OS/PRIV 07-160/Sobel request**. This office can be reached at 866-431-0486. Thank you for your patience as we proceed with your request.

Sincerely,

Vania T. Lockett
Associate Director, Disclosure & FOIA Operations

Enclosures: 50 pages

This communication, along with any attachments, is covered by federal and state law governing electronic communications and may contain confidential and legally privileged information. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipiant, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, use or copying of this message is strictly prohibited. If you received this in error, please reply immediately to the sender and delete the message. Thank you.

From: Low (b)(2), (b)(6)
Sent: Saturday, September 16, 2006 10:04 AM
To: (b)(6)
Cc: (b)(6) Scardaville, Michael
Subject: Fw: Privacy Act matrix

Subject: Re: Privacy Act matrix
Low (b)(2), (b)(6)
ComposedDate: 09/16/2006 02:37:37 PM
PostedDate: 09/16/2006 02:37:53 PM
SendTo: "Mike Scardaville" Low (b)(2), (b)(6) Low (b)(2), (b)(6) ow (b)(2), (b)

Recipients: "Mike Scardaville" Low (b)(2), (b)(6) Low (b)(2), (b)(6) Low

(b)(5) - Delib, (b)(5) - Atty Client, High (b)(2), (b)(7)(E)

emails
(b)(6), (b)(5) - Delib, (b)(5) - Atty Client, (b)(7)(E)

----- Original Message -----
From: "Scardaville, Michael" Low (b)(2), (b)(6)
Sent: 09/16/2006 02:16 PM
To: Low (b)(2), (b)(6) ; Low (b)(2), (b)(6)
"Scardaville, Michael" Low (b)(2), (b)(6)
Subject: RE: Privacy Act matrix

A few more thoughts in the attached.

Also, Stewart just came by my cube and looked over quickly and has a couple of requests for this document.

(b)(5) - Delib & Attorney client

(b)(5) - Delib

(b)(5) - Delib

(b)(6) is going to take a first crack at this document.

Also, looking forward (but not for this weekend) we need to consider
(b)(5) - Delib

emails

Mike

Low (b)(2), (b)(6)

From Low (b)(2), (b)(6)
Sent: Saturday, September 16, 2006 12:48 PM
To: (b)(6) ; Scardaville, Michael
Cc: (b)(6)
Subject: RE: Privacy Act matrix

Attached is the revised version. It incorporates nearly all of OGC/CBP changes and added one section on retention. Please review and revise as needed without open ended questions. Thanks. Also attaching background SORN and new draft SORN and PIA that covers PNR. Call with any questions.

Home cell is Low (b)(2), (b)(6)

(b)(6)

Director of International Privacy Programs

DHS, Privacy Office

Low (b)(2), (b)(6)

Email: Low (b)(2), (b)(6)

This communication, along with any attachments, is covered by federal and state law governing electronic communications and may contain confidential and legally privileged information. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipiant, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, use or copying of this message is strictly prohibited. If you received this in error, please reply immediately to the sender and delete the message. Thank you.

emails

From: Low (b)(2), (b)(6)
Sent: Saturday, September 16, 2006 10:04 AM
To: (b)(6)
Cc (b)(6) Scardaville, Michael
Subject: Fw: Privacy Act matrix

Low (b)(2), (b)(6)

Subject: Re: Privacy Act matrix
Low (b)(2), (b)(6)
PostedDate: 09/16/2006 02:37:53 PM
SendTo: "Scardaville, Michael" Low (b)(2), (b)(6) Low (b)(2), (b)(6) ow (b)

(b)(5) - Delib, (b)(5) - Atty Client, High (b)(2), (b)(7)(E)

2782

(b)(6)

Director of InternationalPrivacy Programs

DHS, Privacy Office

Low (b)(2), (b)(6)

Email: Low (b)(2), (b)(6)v

This communication, along with any attachments,is covered by federal and state law governing electronic communications and maycontain confidential and legally privileged information. If the reader ofthis message is not the intended recipiant, you are hereby notified that anydissemination, distribution, use or copying of this message is strictlyprohibited. If you received this in error, please reply immediately tothe sender and delete the message. Thank you.

From: Low (b)(2), (b)(6)
Sent: Saturday, September 16, 200610:04 AM
To: (b)(6)
Cc: (b)(6) ;Scardaville, Michael
Subject: Fw: Privacy Act matrix

Low (b)(2), (b)(6)

emails

Low (b)(2), (b)(6)

From: "Scardaville, Michael" Low (b)(2), (b)(6)
SendTo: "(b)(6) " Low (b)(2), (b)(6)

DeliveredDate: 09/16/2006 04:54:33 PM

(b)(5) - Delib

Mike

Low (b)(2), (b)(6)

From Low (b)(2), (b)(6)
Sent: Saturday, September 16, 2006 4:46 PM
To: (b)(6) ; Scardaville, Michael; (b)(6) ; (b)(6)
Cc: (b)(6)
Subject: RE: Talkers Best Efforts now "in a manner consistent"

Agree—can I also take out of matrix?

(b)(6)

278

Director of International Privacy Programs

DHS, Privacy Office

Low (b)(2), (b)(6)

[redacted]

Email: Low (b)(2), (b)(6)

This communication, along with any attachments, is covered by federal and state law governing electronic communications and may contain confidential and legally privileged information. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipiant, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, use or copying of this message is strictly prohibited. If you received this in error, please reply immediately to the sender and delete the message. Thank you.

From: Low (b)(2), (b)(6) [redacted]
Sent: Saturday, September 16, 2006 4:43 PM
To: (b)(6) [redacted]; Scardaville, Michael; (b)(6) [redacted]; (b)(6) [redacted]
Cc: (b)(6) [redacted]
Subject: RE: Talkers Best Efforts now "In a manner consistent"

(b)(5) - Delib, (b)(5) - Atty Client, (b)(6) [redacted]

(b)(6) [redacted]

Senior Counsel

Department of Homeland Security

Office of the General Counsel

Low (b)(2) Washington, D.C. 20528

Low (b)(2), (b)(6) [redacted]

Low (b)(2), (b)(6)

This communication, along with any attachments, is covered by federal and state law governing electronic communications and may contain confidential and legally privileged information. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, use or copying of this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this in error, please reply immediately to the sender and delete the message. Thank you.

From: Low (b)(2), (b)(6)
Sent: Saturday, September 16, 2006 4:37 PM
To: Scardaville, Michael; (b)(6); (b)(6); (b)(6)
Cc: (b)(6)
Subject: RE: Talkers Best Efforts now "in a manner consistent"

Mostly fiddles.

(b)(6)

Senior Counsel

Department of Homeland Security

Office of the General Counsel

Low (b)(2) Washington, D.C. 20528

Low (b)(2), (b)(6)

This communication, along with any attachments, is covered by federal and state law governing electronic communications and may contain confidential and legally privileged information. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, use or copying of this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this in error, please reply immediately to the sender and delete the message. Thank you.

emails

From: Low (b)(2), (b)(6)
Sent: Saturday, September 16, 2006 4:29 PM
To: (b)(6) ; (b)(6) ; (b)(6) ; Scardaville, Michael
Cc: (b)(6)
Subject: RE: Talkers Best Efforts now "in a manner consistent"

I'm still working on mine. Don't worry.

Mike

Low (b)(2), (b)(6)

From: Low (b)(2), (b)(6)
Sent: Saturday, September 16, 2006 4:28 PM
To: (b)(6) (b)(6) ; Scardaville, Michael
Cc: (b)(6)
Subject: RE: Talkers Best Efforts now "in a manner consistent"

Two more seconds pls?

(b)(6)

Senior Counsel

Department of Homeland Security

Office of the General Counsel

Low (b)(2) Washington, D.C. 20528

Low (b)(2), (b)(6)

This communication, along with any attachments, is covered by federal and state law governing electronic communications and may contain confidential and legally privileged information. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, use or copying of this message is strictly prohibited. if you have received this in error, please reply immediately to the sender and delete the message. Thank you.

From: Low (b)(2), (b)(6)
Sent: Saturday, September 16, 2006 4:27 PM
To: (b)(6) ; (b)(6) Scardaville, Michael
Cc: (b)(6) (b)(6)
Subject: RE: Talkers Best Efforts now "in a manner consistent"

Mike,

Can you run with (b)(6) edits? I'm fine with them. (b)(5) - Delib . Don't feel strongly about this sentence and it can come out if you want. Turning to version 3 of the matrix.

(b)(6)

Director of International Privacy Programs

DHS, Privacy Office

Low (b)(2), (b)(6)

Email: Low (b)(2), (b)(6)

This communication, along with any attachments, is covered by federal and state law governing electronic communications and may contain confidential and legally privileged information. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, use or copying of this message is strictly prohibited. If you received this in error, please reply immediately to the sender and delete the message. Thank you.

emails

From [redacted]
Sent:
To: [redacted]
Cc: Scardaville, Michael; [redacted]
Subject: Re: Talkers Best Efforts now "in a manner consistent"

Thanks [redacted] here are my comments. [redacted]

[redacted]
Office of Chief Counsel
U.S. Customs and Border Protection
[redacted]

This document, and any attachment(s) hereto, may contain confidential and/o r sensitive attorney-client privileged, attorney work-product, and/or U. S. Government information, and is not for release, review, retransmission, dissemination or use by anyone other than the intended recipient. Please c onsult with the CBP Office of Chief Counsel before disclosing any informati on contained in this e-mail.

[redacted] wrote: -----

To: "Scardaville, Michael" [redacted]
From [redacted]
Date: 09/16/2006 03:47PM
cc: [redacted]
Subject: Talkers Best Efforts now "in a manner consistent"

Mike, and all

Attached is a first draft of Talkers (muchof it based on the matrix with legalese removed). It could be more talkerfriendly, but I?ll leave it to Policy to massage.

emails
On matrix, I will incorporate Mike and (b)(6) latest comments and send out shortly.

(b)(6)

Director of InternationalPrivacy ProgramsDHS, Privacy Office

Low (b)(2), (b)(6)

Email: Low (b)(2), (b)(6)

This communication, along with any attachments,is covered by federal and state law governing electronic communications and maycontain confidential and legally privileged information. If the reader ofthis message is not the intended recipiant, you are hereby notified that anydissemination, distribution, use or copying of this message is strictlyprohibited. If you received this in error, please reply immediately tothe sender and delete the message. Thank you.

From:Scardaville, Michael Low (b)(2), (b)(6)
Sent: Saturday, September 16, 20062:17 PM
To: (b)(6) (b)(6) ; Scardaville, Michael
Cc: (b)(6)
Subject: RE: Privacy Act matrix

A few more thoughts in the attached.

Also, Stewart just came by my cube andlooked over quickly and has a couple of requests for this document.

(b)(5) - Delib & Attorney client

(b)(5) - Delib

(b)(5) - Delib

2790

Also, looking forward (but not for thisweekend) we need to consider
(b)(5) - Delib

Mike

Low (b)(2), (b)(6)

Low (b)(2), (b)(6)
Sent: Saturday, September 16, 200612:48 PM
To: (b)(6) ;Scardaville, Michael
Cc (b)(6)
Subject: RE: Privacy Act matrix

Attached is the revised version. Itincorporates nearly all of OGC/CBP changes and added one section on retention. Please review and revise as needed without open ended questions. Thanks. Also attaching background SORN and new draft SORN and PIAthat covers PNR. Call with any questions.

Home cell is Low (b)(2), (b)(6)

(b)(6)

Director of InternationalPrivacy Programs

DHS, Privacy Office

Low (b)(2), (b)(6)

Email: Low (b)(2), (b)(6)

This communication, along with any attachments,is covered by federal and state law governing electronic communications and maycontain confidential and legally privileged information. If the reader ofthis message is not the intended recipiant, you are hereby notified that anydissemination,

(B)(6)

08/04/2004 02:10 PM

To: Low (b)(2), (b)(6)

cc:

Subject: 3 Month access review

(B)(6)

We need to start terminating rights to all of the ATS modules if the user has not signed into the system within the last 90 days. We only need to terminate access to the system that has not been logged into by the user. This would be for all ATS systems and for all users. Here is an example of what I'm referring to.

	last login
ATS-AT	20 day ago
ATS-N	1 day ago
ATS-P	91 days ago

In this case the P access would be removed.

If you have any questions, please call.

(B)(6)

Office of Field Operations
Border Security and Facilitation
Border Targeting and Analysis
Low (b)(2)

(b)(6) To: Low (b)(2), (b)(6)

05/17/2004 04:26 PM

cc:

Subject: Re: Air Passenger & ATS-P

(b)(6) am not aware of any such memorandum. It may be that the screen prints is a local policy. I will check with my program people.(b)(6)

(b)(6)

(b)(6) To: Low (b)(2), (b)(6)

05/17/04 07:30 AM

cc:

Subject: Air Passenger & ATS-P

(b)(6)

Do you know of such a memo?

---- Forwarded by Low (b)(2), (b)(6) on 05/17/2004 07:30 AM ----

(b)(6) To: Low (b)(2), (b)(6)

05/10/2004 11:22 AM

cc:

Subject: Air Passenger & ATS-P

(b)(6)

I got your name from (b)(6) He said that you were over the air passenger process. I had a question about air passengers & the use of ATS-P. In particular it is reference the 24 hour list of known LE High (b)(2), (b)(7)(E) that appears in ATS-P. When MID was in Newark for a mock inspection of that port, LE High (b)(2), (b)(7)(E) LE Newark PAU had stated that there was a memo issued by OFO reference this procedure, but could not locate it. Is there such a memo? If there is, could I have a copy for future reference?

Thanks.

If you have any questions, I can be reached at Low (b)(2)

(b)(6)

(b)(6) To Low (b)(2), (b)(6)
cc:
05/27/2004 08:07 AM Subject: Re: ATS Access Processing

Any thoughts on this?

-----Forwarded by Low (b)(2), (b)(6) on 05/27/2004 08:07 AM -----

Low (b)(2), (b)(6)

Date: 05/26/2004 03:07PM
Subject: Re: ATS Access Processing

Opps forgot to note that also attached are some early discussions with ATS/system security about the current process.

Also, an issue paper that I wrote awhile back...

----- Forwarded by Low (b)(2), (b)(6) 05/26/04 03:05 PM -----

IMAGE IMAGE
(b)(6) Low (b)(2), (b)(6)

05/26/04
03:05 PM
cc:
Subject: Re: ATS Access Processing

Hi Guys,.

(b)(6) asked me to re-raise the issue of ATS access In addition to the question of who should review and approve access requests, there's also the question of the user profile. Speaking for myself, I'm pretty much reviewing the same way as before the merger, and the user profile has kind of expanded informally.

It seems like a good time to assess
(b)(5) - Delib

What do you all think?

P.S. (b)(6) n you're brief sojourn with Ops, I was made the point of contact for both ATS-N and ATS-AT. You still receive requests if people are in the habit of sending them to you, but the ATS Helpline is only giving out my name to new users.

Regards,

(b)(6)
Customs and Border Protection
Department of Homeland Security
Low (b)(2)

----- Forwarded by Low (b)(2), (b)(6) on 05/26/04 02:50 PM -----

(b)(6)
04/27/04
01:30 PM

To: Low (b)(2), (b)(6)
cc:
Subject: Re: ATS Access Processing

(b)(6)

I have to admit to not reading the following answers in great detail to date; but, I thought you would be looking for the responses sooner than later.

Low (b)(2), (b)(6)
Low (b)(2), (b)(6)

----- Forwarded by Low (b)(2), (b)(6) on 04/27/2004 01:29 PM -----

(b)(6)
04/21/2004
03:04 PM

Low (b)(2), (b)(6)
cc:
Subject: Re: ATS Access Processing

(b)(6)

(b)(6) has responded to most questions. I've included the answers to questions 1 and 2. Please see below.

Thank-you,

(b)(6)

---- Forwarded by Low (b)(2), (b)(6) 04/21/2004 02:57 PM -----

(b)(6)

To: Low (b)(2), (b)(6)
cc:
Subject: Re: ATS Access Processing

04/20/2004
08:13 AM

(b)(6)

I have forwarded two e-mails below. The first, from (b)(6) includes several questions that OFO is requesting detail information on so that they can modify if necessary, (b)(5) - Delib The second message, from (b)(6) is his first cut on the answers. In his response, he indicated that the people managing the help desk would be better prepared to provide the answer(s).

Could you review the e-mails below and provide feedback to (b)(6) and me by cob tomorrow (Wednesday); or, advise as to when you could provide feedback? Thank you in advance. Please call or stop by if you have any questions.

Low (b)(2), (b)(6)

Low (b)(2), (b)(6)

---- Forwarded by Low (b)(2), (b)(6) on 04/20/2004 08:08 AM ----

(b)(6)

To: Low (b)(2), (b)(6)
cc:
Subject: Re: ATS Access Processing

04/19/2004
10:30 AM

To All,

First ATS Security does not do the user requests anymore. The ATS Helpdesk does this function. Historically I can answer some of these questions.

(b)(5) - Delib

Hgih (b)(2), (b)(7)(E)

(b)(5) - Delib

[redacted]

(b)(5) - Delib

Low (b)(2)

[redacted]

(b)(5)- Delib

[redacted]

Thats my 2cents, if you have any additional questions please let me know.

(b)(6)

Low (b)(2), (b)(6)

ATS/FAST Security Team
Department of Homeland Security
SAIC (Senior IT Security Analyst)

Low (b)(2) (b)(6)

(b)(6)

To: Low (b)(2), (b)(6)
cc:
Subject: ATS Access Processing

04/19/2004
09:41 AM

(b)(6)

I am not sure (b)(6) has already passed this on or not. Disregard if this is a duplicate.

Low (b)(2), (b)(6)

Low (b)(2), (b)(6)

----- Forwarded by Low (b)(2), (b)(6) 04/19/2004 09:40 AM -----

(b)(6)

04/15/2004
02:28 PM

Low (b)(2), (b)(6)

Subject: ATS Access Processing

(b)(6)

Thank you for meeting Monday about streamlining the ATS-Access process.

I think we made good progess on some of the basic issues.

(b)(5) - Delib
Low (b)(2)

Could you pass the following questions to ATS Security?

(b)(5) - Delib

Answers to these questions will help me draft a new process flow for later review by the different parties.

Regards,

(b)(6)

Issue: Streamlining Automated Targeting System Access Requests

Background:
Automated Targeting System (ATS) access requests are reviewed by Headquarters (HQ) program staff. [redacted]
High (b)(2), (b)(7)(E)

HQ Program staff approve access when the prospective user:

- Has a current Background Investigation (BI).
- Has TECS and NCIC certification.
- Provides full name, Social Security Number, and Hash Identification.
- Submits a brief justification as to why the access is needed.

Current Status:
The current process has the following inefficiencies:

- **Diffuse** – Field users must send access requests to multiple HQ points of contact (POCs) when access to more than one ATS module is needed.
- **Inconsistent** – HQ ATS POCs change frequently, increasing the handling of messages to reach the current POC.
- **Redundant** – ATS Security receives multiple messages from HQ POCs to approve the same user for multiple modules.

Recommendation:
The following adjustments to the process are recommended:

(b)(5) - Delib [redacted]

(b)(5) - Delib [redacted]

Prepared by: (b)(6) [redacted]
Office: Border Targeting and Analysis
Contact: Border Security and Facilitation
Date: Low (b)(2) [redacted]
March 16, 2004

(b)(6)

06/04/2004 01:11 PM

To: Low (b)(2), (b)(6)

cc:

Subject: Re: ATS/P & Misc Items

(b)(6) thanks for the update.

FYI - go with the Sears Craftsman.

We are getting people together for the rules but it looks like the data analysis will be next week and rules the week of June 14 to June 18 (possibly into June 25).

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

06/04/04 11:38 AM

To: Low (b)(2), (b)(6)

cc:

Subject: ATS/P & Misc Items

Hello Gentlemen of HQ/OFO,

Heads up. Four items and a Misc Section.

Further analysis to improve [redacted]
(b)(6), High (b)(2), (b)(7)(E), (b)(5) Delib

[redacted]

US EDIFACT vs UN EDIFACT
Some carriers have begun voluntarily transmitting APIS on some flights using UN EDIFACT. There is a potential high impact to ATS with the use of 3 char country and airline carrier codes and transmitting 2 document types and numbers. Our database design is ready to handle UN EDIFACT, some of our processing needs to change. During this transition period of ?? months/years, we are making changes in our APIS processing to handle this (use of translation tables). This will be coded and implemented soon.

However, (b)(5) Delib, High (b)(2), (b)(7)(E) LE

[redacted]

More stringent High (b)(2), (b)(7)(E) **requirements for all ATS users**
(b)(6) asked me to turn on [redacted] for ATS users but to have different expiration dates, ie for ResMon users, force a change every 3 months; for /P users, force a change every 6 months. Our current architecture cannot support this requirement. (b)(5) Delib, High (b)(2), (b)(7)(E) LE

[redacted]

New Lawn Mower
What kind of lawn mower do you all own? Mine old one scrapped and I need to buy a new one. People here have Craftsman, Toro and Honda.

Misc Items
High (b)(2), (b)(7)(E)

[redacted]

(b)(6), (b)(5) Delib

High (b)(2), (b)(7)(E), (b)(5) Delib

[redacted] We are scheduling another requirements mtg in the next two weeks.
-Is there a Rules Conference next week to discuss High (b)(2), (b)(7)(E) [redacted] need to plan for this.
We are real close to getting [redacted]

-I plan on attending the cocktail party in the Commish's SIT room and the big TSA shin-dig on Tue 8 June 2004. I'm wearing Kevlar boots.
-The big US-VISIT contract was awarded to Accenture just recently. It will track entry/exit of all NIVs everywhere. This contract and scope of work is ACE size. (b)(6) is in charge of all business requirements. (b)(6) said at this time there are no targeting requirements. We need to be much more involved for the future.

Any questions, please call me, Low (b)(2)

Thanks,
(b)(6)

(b)(6)

07/01/2004 04:36 PM

To: Low (b)(2), (b)(6)

cc:

Subject: Ability to Add Flights to High (b)(2), (b)(7)(E)

I've had (b)(6) remove the ability of general users to High (b)(2), (b)(7)(E) This will temporarily solve the problem of non-US flights being added to High (b)(2), (b)(7)(E) The real solution will be (b)(5) Delib, High (b)(2), (b)(7)(E)

LE

(b)(6)
Office of Field Operations
Border Security and Facilitation
Border Targeting and Analysis
Low (b)(2)

MEMORANDUM FOR: DIRECTOR, ICE
OFFICE OF INTELLIGENCE

FROM: Executive Director
Border Security and Facilitation

SUBJECT: Access to Resmon for ICE Analysts

(b)(5) - Delib [redacted] We have decided to immediately reinstate access to those ICE personnel permanently assigned to and working at the National Targeting Center (NTC). These employees will be able to provide the research assistance necessary for other ICE employees High (b)(2), (b)(7)(E) [redacted] LE We would request that the ICE employees assigned to the NTC act as the main point of contact for Resmon research requested by other ICE employees. This would not limit nor eliminate any contact or relationships between ICE Field Intelligence Units and the local Passenger Analytical Units, but it would allow for a centralized contact for all necessary Resmon research.

[redacted] LE

High (b)(2), (b)(7)(E) LE, (b)(5) Delib [redacted] LE

All ICE employees that will be reinstated or granted initial access will be required to attend a one-hour training session on the proper use and procedures for the disclosure of PNR information prior to the reinstatement of their Resmon access. Additionally, CBP will provide training on ATS-P and Resmon, as needed. All ICE employees with access to Resmon will be required to follow the same rules as CBP employees for use and disclosure of any PNR information. The use of PNR information must follow along the guidelines listed in the Undertaking that have been negotiated with the European Commission. Access to PNR information will also be limited to only those flights arriving and departing the United

Low (b)(2) [redacted]

States. Any disclosure of PNR information by an ICE employee to other than CBP employees will require the completion of all disclosure forms and maintaining a current file of these completed forms. All of these requirements will be explained during the initial training done by CBP.

Please have your staff provide [redacted] with the recommended names of your employees that will be permanently assigned to and located at the NTC, so that the necessary training can be scheduled and access can be granted.

[redacted]

(b)(6)
06/01/2004 07:39 AM

To: Low (b)(2), (b)(6)
cc:
Subject: Re: High (b)(2), (b)(7)(E)

Yes. We should meet again.

LE LE

I've written a query to find High (b)(2), (b)(7)(E)

LE matches.

LE

High (b)(2), (b)(7)(E)

LE

High (b)(2), (b)(7)(E), (b)(5) - Delib LE

though.

LE

(b)(6)

----Low (b)(2), (b)(6) wrote: ----

Low (b)(2), (b)(6)

From: Low (b)(2), (b)(6)
Date: 05/28/2004 10:02PM
Subject: High (b)(2), (b)

(b)(6) do we need to regroup to implement some rules related to our discussion on Thursday with (b)(6) Please advise as to what type of support you need from OPO. Thanks for all the great work you guys do!!!!(b)(6)

(b)(6)
06/01/2004 04:41 PM

To: Low (b)(2), (b)(6)
cc:
Subject: Re: ATS-P minimum targeting threshold

(b)(6)

Currently, High (b)(2), (b)(7)(E), (b)(5) - Delib

LE deliberative

(b)(6)
Office of Field Operations
Customs and Border Protection
Low (b)(2)
(b)(6)

(b)(6)
06/01/04 04:27 PM

To: Low (b)(2), (b)(6)
cc:
Subject: ATS-P minimum targeting threshold

(b)(6) Does a minimum targeting threshold score for ATS-P exist? If so what is it?
High (b)(2), (b)(7)(E), (b)(5) Delib

LE

(b)(6)
06/04/2004 03:25 PM

To: Low (b)(2), (b)(6)
cc:

Subject: Re: Intell Driven Spec Ops High (b)(2), (b)(7)(E)

Once we get some rules we will apply a name to the rules for tracking capability.

(b)(6)

(b)(6)
06/04/04 02:33 PM

To: Low (b)(2), (b)(6)
cc:

Subject: Re: Intell Driven Spec Ops High (b)(2), (b)(7)(E)

Simply outstanding. Hopefully we can move into this quickly. Can we give operation names to these things or somehow otherwise identify this as a project? Helps me keep track.

(b)(6)
Director, Office of Intelligence
U.S. Customs and Border Protection
Low (b)(2)

(b)(6)

(b)(6)
06/04/2004 02:10 PM

To: Low (b)(2), (b)(6)
cc:

Subject: Re: Intell Driven Spec Ops High (b)(2), (b)(7)(E)

All,

We are testing an ATS-P query High (b)(2), (b)(7)(E), (b)(5) Delib

We will continue testing the query for the next few days.

Yesterday (b)(6) developed ideas for new queries. Among these were:

- High (b)(2), (b)(7)(E), (b)(5) Delib

- High (b)(2), (b)(7)(E), (b)(5) Delib LE
- High (b)(2), (b)(7)(E), (b)(5) Delib LE
- High (b)(2), (b)(7)(E), (b)(5) Delib LE

We are beginning to test these queries to determine if the results are feasible to work with. Again, we will continue to test these for the next few days.

(b)(6)
Office of Field Operations
Customs and Border Protection
Low (b)(2)

(b)(6)

(b)(6)
08/04/04 01:27 PM

To: Low (b)(2), (b)(6)
cc:

Subject: Re: Intell Driven Spec Ops High (b)(2), (b)(7)(E) LE

(b)(6) met with (b)(6) yesterday to discuss rules for High (b)(2), (b)(7)(E) LE I am going to have (b)(6) report what they discussed and when we could implement rules. (b)(6)

(b)(6)

(b)(6)
08/04/04 01:07 PM

To: Low (b)(2), (b)(6)
cc:

Subject: Intell Driven Spec Ops High (b)(2), (b)(7)(E)

(b)(6) I know that we have discussed this a bit in the past but I would really like to see us get something in place fo High (b)(2), (b)(7)(E) Here is how I would succinctly describe the issue: LE LE

High (b)(2), (b)(7)(E), (b)(5) Delib (b)(6)

High (b)(2), (b)(7)(E), (b)(5) Delib

High (b)(2), (b)(7)(E), (b)(5) Delib LE

LE

D) In fact High (b)(2), (b)(7)(E), (b)(5) Delib [redacted]

LE

E) The same may also be the case with High (b)(2), (b)(7)(E), (b)(5) Delib [redacted]

LE

What can we do?

Can we target an [redacted] LE that emphasizes the above?

- As a side note, [redacted] High (b)(2), (b)(7)(E), (b)(5) Delib

LE

- Also, [redacted] High (b)(2), (b)(7)(E), (b)(5) Delib

LE

LE

I would like to get at least some type of [redacted] moving on this soon. Can you guys help me out with this?

LE

Thanks.

(b)(6) [redacted]
Director, Office of Intelligence
U.S. Customs and Border Protection
Low (b)(2) [redacted]

(b)(6) To: Low (b)(2), (b)(6)
cc:
07/28/2004 03:47 PM Subject: Re: Two Threshold issues

The second issue involves LE function in TECS. We had talked about sending out a memo to have the ports clean up the function, but there are some secondary issues that have come up. We will need to look back into doing this memo. There's been problems with the display today and it has created some confusion here (b)(6) says the bug is fixed, but I think we won't see any real changes until tomorrow.

(b)(6)
Office of Field Operations
Border Security and Facilitation
Border Targeting and Analysis
Low (b)(2)

----- Low (b)(2), (b)(6) wrote: -----

To: Low (b)(2), (b)(6)
Fro
Date: 07/28/2004 02:43PM
Subject: Two Threshold issues

I had a comment from Newark. One of the LE High (b)(2), (b)(7)(E), (b)(6) appears to have set off LE But the summary comments High (b)(2), (b)(7)(E), (b)(6) I told to LE choose questions for and if they encounter something similar, to read the High (b)(2), (b)(7)(E) LE Already notified (b)(6) about this; he was using one of your early powerpoints to label the rules.

Also, a problem with the flight LE High (b)(2), (b)(7)(E), (b)(6) LE files from High (b)(2), (b)(7)(E) On the High (b)(2), (b)(7)(E) he appears to be destined for High (b)(2), (b)(7)(E) were already aware of the flight's routing, so no harm done. Informed (b)(6) this one, too. I will reach out to APIS account managers to hopefully rectify. LE

The day's quieting down; but I'm waiting for the end-of-the-day hurricane.

(b)(6)
Office of Field Operations
Customs and Border Protection
Low (b)(2)

NOTE: New prefix number

2812

2813

2814

2815

2816

2817

2818

2819

2820

2821

2822

2823

2824

2825

2826

2827

2828

2829

2830

2831

2832

2833

2834

2835

2836

2837

2838

2839

2840

2841

2842

2843

2844

2846

2847

2848

2849

2850

2851

2852

2853

2854

2855

2856

2857

2858

2859

2860

2861

2862

2863

2864

2865

2866

2867

2868

2869

2870

2871

2872

2873

2874

2875

2876

2877

2878

2879

2880

2881

2882

2883

2884

2885

2886

2887

2888

2889

2890

2891

2892

2893

2894

2895

2896

2897

2898

2899

2900

2901

2902

2903

2904

2905

2906

2907

2908

2909

2910

2911

2912

2913

2914

2915

2916

2917

2918

2919

2920

2921