Dear Mr. Cardozo:

This is a supplemental response to your Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request of 19 June 2009, which was received by this office on 22 June 2009 for the following:

1. All reports submitted to the Intelligence Oversight Board (IOB) pursuant to Section 2.4 of Executive Order 12863 from [FY08 to the present];
2. All reports submitted to the IOB [through NSA’s designated contact] pursuant to Section 1.7(d) of Executive Order 12333 from 29 February 2008 to the present;
3. All reports of any assessments or reviews of intelligence activities by the President’s Intelligence Advisory Board (PIAB) to the NSA pursuant to Section 4(a)(ii) of Executive Order 13462 from 29 February 2008 to the present;
4. All recommendations concerning intelligence matters identified by the PIAB to the NSA pursuant to Section 4(b) of Executive Order 13462 from 29 February 2008 to the present;
5. All reports and recommendations by the IOB to the NSA pursuant to Section 6(c) of Executive Order 13462 concerning the performance of the NSA under Executive Order 13462 from 29 February 2008 to the present;
6. All records containing information and all recommendations for corrective action submitted by the IOB to the NSA of the results of those investigations pursuant to Section 6(d) of Executive Order 13462 from 29 February 2008 to the present;
7. All requests for investigations of intelligence activities by the IOB to the NSA and reports by the NSA to the IOB of the results of those investigations pursuant to Section 6(e) of Executive Order 13462 from 29 February 2008 to the present; and
8. All reports made by the NSA to the IOB or PIAB pursuant to Section 8(c) of Executive Order 13462, concerning the reasons for not implementing a PIAB or IOB recommendation from 29 February 2008 to the present.

A copy of your request is enclosed. On 23 June 2009, you spoke with me to clarify request items 1 and 2. The clarification information has been incorporated and is shown in brackets in the numbered items above. Also, we informed you by letter dated 7 July 2009 that no records responsive to items 3-8 of your request were located, and you were provided appeal rights at that time for that portion of your request. A final response to your request was sent to you on 25 February 2010, providing you with seven redacted documents.

Upon further review of the documents provided to you with our 25 February 2010 response, we determined that additional information could be released to you. Enclosed please find copies of three of those documents with some additional information released. The exemptions applied to the withheld information were explained to you in our 25 February letter.

Sincerely,

PAMELA N. PHILLIPS
Chief
FOIA/PA Office

Encls:
a/s
June 19, 2009

BY FACSIMILE — (301) 688-4762

National Security Agency
Pamela N. Phillips
Chief, FOIA/PA Office (DJP4)
9800 Savage Road, Ste 6248
Fort George G. Meade, MD 20755-6248

RE: Freedom of Information Act Request

Dear Ms. Phillips:

This letter constitutes a request under the Freedom of Information Act ("FOIA"), 5 U.S.C. § 552, and is submitted to the National Security Agency ("NSA") on behalf of the Electronic Frontier Foundation ("EFF"). We make this request as part of EFF's FOIA Litigation for Accountable Government ("FLAG") Project, which works to obtain government documents and make them widely available to the public.

We are seeking copies of all NSA records, including but not limited to electronic records, as follows:

1.) All reports submitted to the Intelligence Oversight Board ("IOB") pursuant to Section 2.4 of Executive Order 12863 from February 25, 2008 to February 29, 2008. That section provides, in pertinent part, as follows:

   Inspectors General and General Counsel of the Intelligence Community, to the extent permitted by law, shall report to the IOB at least on a quarterly basis and from time to time as necessary or appropriate, concerning intelligence activities that they have reason to believe may be unlawful or contrary to Executive order or Presidential directive.

2.) All reports submitted to the IOB or the Director of National Intelligence ("DNI") pursuant to Section 1.7(d) of Executive Order 12333 from February 29, 2008 to the present. That section, incorporated by reference by Section 8(b)(i)(A) of Executive Order 13462, provides that heads of departments shall "[r]eport to the Intelligence Oversight Board, and keep the Director of Central Intelligence appropriately informed, concerning...

---

1 On February 25, 2008, EFF requested all reports submitted to the IOB from January 1, 2001 through the date of the request. On June 8, 2009, the NSA issued a partial response to that request, FOIA case number 54854A. EFF today appeals that response under separate cover.

2 Executive Order 12863 was explicitly revoked by Executive Order 13462 on February 29, 2008.

3 The NSA is a member of the "Intelligence Community." See http://www.intelligence.gov/1-members.shtml.

4 Executive Order 13462, Section 8(b)(i)(A) provides that all heads of department shall ensure that the DNI receives "copies of the reports submitted to the IOB pursuant to section 1.7(d) of Executive Order 12333[.]"
any intelligence activities of their organizations that they have reason to believe may be unlawful or contrary to Executive order or Presidential directive.”

3.) All reports of any assessments or reviews of intelligence activities by the President’s Intelligence Advisory Board (“PIAB”) to the NSA pursuant to Sec. 4(a)(ii) of Executive Order 13462 from February 29, 2008 to the present.

4.) All recommendations concerning intelligence matters identified by the PIAB to the NSA pursuant to Sec. 4(b) of Executive Order 13462 from February 29, 2008 to the present.

5.) All reports and recommendations by the IOB to the NSA pursuant to Sec. 6(c) of Executive Order 13462 concerning the performance of the NSA under Executive Order 13462 from February 29, 2008 to the present.

6.) All records containing information and all recommendations for corrective action submitted by the IOB to the NSA pursuant to Sec. 6(d) of Executive Order 13462 from February 29, 2008 to the present.

7.) All requests for investigations of intelligence activities by the IOB to the NSA and reports by the NSA to the IOB of the results of those investigations pursuant to Sec. 6(e) of Executive Order 13462 from February 29, 2008 to the present.

8.) All reports made by the NSA to the IOB or PIAB pursuant to Sec. 8(c) of Executive Order 13462, concerning the reasons for not implementing a PIAB or IOB recommendation from February 29, 2008 to the present.

Request for News Media Fee Status

EFF asks that it not be charged search or review fees for this request because EFF qualifies as a representative of the news media pursuant to the FOIA and 32 C.F.R. § 286.28(e)(7). In requesting this classification, we note that the National Security Agency, Department of Justice, Department of Homeland Security, and Department of State have recognized that EFF qualifies as a “news media” requester, based upon the publication activities set forth below (see NSA letter, DOJ letter, DHS stipulation, and same Department letter attached hereto). We further note that the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit has stressed that “different agencies [must] not adopt inconsistent interpretations of the FOIA.” Al-Fayed v. CIA, 254 F.3d 300, 307 (D.C. Cir. 2001), quoting Pub. Citizen Health Research Group v. FDA, 704 F.2d 1280, 1287 (D.C. Cir. 1983).

EFF is a non-profit public interest organization that works “to protect and enhance our core civil liberties in the digital age.” One of EFF’s primary objectives is “to educate

---
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the press, policymakers and the general public about online civil liberties. To accomplish this goal, EFF routinely and systematically disseminates information in several ways.

First, EFF maintains a frequently visited web site, http://www.eff.org, which reports the latest developments and contains in-depth information about a variety of civil liberties and intellectual property issues.

EFF has regularly published an online newsletter, the EFFector, since 1990. The EFFector currently has more than 77,000 subscribers. A complete archive of past EFFectors is available at http://www.eff.org/effector/.

Furthermore, EFF publishes a blog that highlights the latest news from around the Internet. DeepLinks (http://www.eff.org/deeplinks/) reports and analyzes newsworthy developments in technology. It also provides miniLinks, which direct readers to other news articles and commentary on these issues.

In addition to reporting hi-tech developments, EFF staff members have presented research and in-depth analysis on technology issues in no fewer than eighteen white papers published since 2002. These papers, available at http://www.eff.org/wp/, provide information and commentary on such diverse issues as electronic voting, free speech, privacy and intellectual property.


Most recently, EFF has begun broadcasting podcasts of interviews with EFF staff and outside experts. Line Noise is a five-minute audio broadcast on EFF’s current work, pending legislation, and technology-related issues. A listing of Line Noise podcasts is available at feed://www.eff.org/rss/linenoisecomp3.xml and feed://www.eff.org/rss/linenoiseogg.xml.

Request for a Public Interest Fee Waiver

EFF is entitled to a waiver of duplication fees because disclosure of the requested information is in the public interest within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(ii) and

\*Id.
32 C.F.R. § 286.28(d). To determine whether a request meets this standard, Department of Defense components determine whether disclosure of the requested information “is in the public interest because it is likely to contribute significantly to public understanding of the operations or activities of the government,” and whether such disclosure “is not primarily in the commercial interest of the requester,” 32 C.F.R. §§ 286.28(d)(3)(i), (ii). This request clearly satisfies these criteria.

First, disclosure of the requested information will “will significantly contribute to the public understanding of the operations or activities of the Department of Defense.” 32 C.F.R. § 286.28(d)(3)(i)(A). EFF has requested information that will shed light on the agency’s interpretation of laws governing intelligence activities, and how well it conforms to those laws.

Second, the “informative value” of the records EFF has requested is likely to be meaningful. 32 C.F.R. § 286.28(d)(3)(i)(B). EFF has requested information that will shed light on the manner in which the agency reviews and reports intelligence matters to the IOB. This information is unlikely to be duplicative of information about the Army’s operations and activities already in the public domain.

Third, the requested material will contribute to the general public’s understanding of how the agency interprets applicable laws and monitors internal compliance. 32 C.F.R. § 286.28(d)(3)(i)(C). This information will contribute not only to EFF’s understanding of the agency’s interpretation and use of legal authority, but to the understanding of a reasonably broad audience of persons interested in the subject. EFF will make the information it obtains under the FOIA available to the public and the media through its web site and newsletter, which highlight developments concerning privacy and civil liberties issues, and/or other channels discussed more fully above.

Fourth, the disclosure will contribute significantly to the public’s knowledge and understanding of how the agency seeks compliance with laws governing intelligence activities. 32 C.F.R. § 286.28(d)(3)(i)(D). Disclosure of the requested information will help inform the public about the agency’s actions, as well as contribute to the public debate about how intelligence activities should be conducted.

Furthermore, a fee waiver is appropriate here because EFF has no commercial interest in the disclosure of the requested records. 32 C.F.R. § 286.28(d)(3)(ii). EFF is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization, and will derive no commercial benefit from the information at issue here.
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Thank you for your consideration of this request. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at (415) 436-9333 x. 136. As the FOIA provides, I will anticipate a determination on this request from your office within 20 working days.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Nathan Cardozo
Open Government Legal Fellow

Enclosures
Ms. Marcia Hofmann  
Electronic Frontier Foundation  
1875 Connecticut Avenue, NW  
Suite 650  
Washington, DC 20009  

Dear Ms. Hofmann:  

This is an initial response to your Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request submitted via facsimile on 23 January 2007, which was received by this office on 24 January 2007, for all agency records (including, but not limited to, electronic records) related to the NSA's review of and input on the configuration of the Microsoft Windows Vista operating system ("Vista"). Your request has been assigned Case Number 52276.

As we began to process your request, we realized that the first page of the actual request was missing from your 18-page facsimile package. On 1 February 2007, a member of my staff contacted you to advise you of this fact. As a result, you submitted another facsimile of your original five-page request, which we received and have begun to process. There is certain information relating to this processing about which the FOIA and applicable Department of Defense (DoD) and NSA/CSS regulations require we inform you.

For purposes of this request and based on the information you provided in your letter, you are considered a representative of the media. Unless you qualify for a fee waiver or reduction, you must pay for duplication in excess of the first 100 pages. Your request for a fee waiver has been granted. In addition, please be advised your request for expedited treatment has been accepted. We are currently in the process of searching for responsive documents and will notify you of the status of your request as soon as that search has been completed.

Correspondence related to your request should include the case number assigned to your request, which is included in the first paragraph of this letter. Your letter should be addressed to National Security Agency, FOIA Office.
FOIA Case: 52276

(DC34), 9800 Savage Road STE 6248, Ft. George G. Meade, MD 20755-6248 or may be sent by facsimile to 443-479-3612. If sent by fax, it should be marked for the attention of the FOIA office. The telephone number of the FOIA office is 301-688-6527.

Sincerely,

\[\text{[Signature]}\]

PAMELA N. PHILLIPS
Chief
FOIA/PA Office
July 22, 2008

Marcia Hoffman
Staff Attorney
Electronic Frontier Foundation
454 Shotwell Street
San Francisco, California 94110

Subject: Freedom of Information/Privacy Act Request [08-OIG-164]

Dear Ms. Hoffman:

Your Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request seeking records relating to the Federal Bureau of Investigation's use of National Security Letters was received in this office on July 21, 2008. We have assigned your request control number 08-010-164. Please cite this number in any future inquiry relating to your request.

You requested that we expedite your request pursuant to 28 C.F.R. § 16.5(d)(1)(6), which provides that a request will be given expedited treatment if it is "made by a person primarily engaged in disseminating information" and the responding component determines that there is "[a]n urgency to inform the public about an actual or alleged federal government activity." The regulations further provide that in order to satisfy this provision a requestor must "establish a particular urgency beyond the public's right to know about government activity generally." Id. § 16.5(d)(3).

As support for your expedition request you state that "there is an urgency to inform the public about the information you seek." However, you have not explained the nature of this urgency beyond the public's general right to know. Accordingly, we are denying your request for expedition.

You have also requested a fee waiver on the basis of §16.11(b)(6) (representative of the news media) and §16.11(k) (public interest). We are granting your request for news media status and accordingly, you will not incur search fees in connection with your request. We will make
a determination regarding your request under §16.11(k) once we have completed our search for responsive documents and are in a better position to determine whether disclosure of the requested information is likely to contribute significantly to public understanding of the operations or activities of the government. We will inform you regarding our decision on this aspect of your fee waiver prior to incurring any expense that could be attributed to you.

If you are dissatisfied with my action regarding your request for expedited processing, you may appeal by writing to the Director, Office of Information and Privacy, U.S. Department of Justice, 1425 New York Avenue, Suite 11050, Washington, D.C. 20530, within 60 days of the date of this letter. Both the letter and the envelope should be clearly marked "Freedom of Information Act Appeal." In the event you are dissatisfied with the results of any such appeal, judicial review will thereafter be available to you in the United States District Court for the judicial district in which you reside or have your principal place of business, or in the District of Columbia.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Deborah M. Waller
FOI/PA Specialist
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

ELECTRONIC FRONTIER
FOUNDATION

v.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND
SECURITY,

Plaintiff,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 06-1988 (ESH)

STIPULATED DISMISSAL OF PLAINTIFF'S SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

Plaintiff Electronic Frontier Foundation (EFF) and Defendant Department of Homeland Security (DHS), by counsel, hereby stipulate and agree as follows:

1. Defendant DHS has granted news media status to Plaintiff EFF based on the representations contained in EFF's FOIA requests, which demonstrate that EFF is an "entity that is organized and operated to publish or broadcast news to the public." 6 C.F.R. § 5.11(b)(6).

Defendant DHS will continue to regard Plaintiff EFF as a "representative of the news media" absent a change in circumstances that indicates that EFF is no longer an "entity that is organized and operated to publish or broadcast news to the public." 6 C.F.R. § 5.11(b)(6).

2. Accordingly, the parties herewith agree to the dismissal of Plaintiff EFF's Second Cause of Action, related to EFF's status as a "representative of the news media."

3. The parties further agree that each will pay its own fees and costs for work on the dismissed claim.

SO STIPULATED AND AGREED this 27th day of February, 2007.
DAVID L. SOBOL  
D.C. Bar 360418  

MARCIA HOFMANN  
D.C. Bar 484136  

ELECTRONIC FRONTIER FOUNDATION  
1875 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.  
Suite 630  
Washington, D.C. 20009  
(202) 797-9009  

Counsel for Plaintiff  

PETER D. KEISLER  
Assistant Attorney General  

JEFFREY A. TAYLOR  
United States Attorney  

BLIZABETH J. SHAPIRO  
D.C. Bar 418925  
Assistant Branch Director  
U.S. Department of Justice  
Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch  

JOHN R. COLEMAN  
Trial Attorney  
U.S. Department of Justice  
Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch  
20 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Room 6118  
Washington, D.C. 20530  
(202) 514-4505  

Counsel for Defendant
Ms. Marcia Hofmann  
Electronic Frontier Foundation  
1875 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 650  
Washington, DC 20009  

Dear Ms. Hofmann:  

This is in response to your Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request, dated March 19, 2007 for copies of documents concerning copyright matters between the U.S. and Canada.  

We will begin the processing of your request based upon the information provided in your communication. We will notify you as soon as responsive material has been retrieved and reviewed.  

We wish to advise you that the cut-off date for retrieving records is either the date you have given the Department by specifying a particular time frame or the date the search is initiated.  

**Fees:** The Freedom of Information Act requires agencies to assess fees to recover the direct costs of processing requests, unless a fee waiver has been granted.  

By making a FOIA request, you have agreed to pay all applicable fees up to $25.00 unless a fee waiver has been granted. You may
specify a willingness to pay a greater or lesser amount. If the estimated fees exceed this limit, you will be notified.

Based upon the information that you have provided, we have placed you in the “news media” requester category. This category requires us to assess:

• duplication costs after first 100 pages. (see 22 CFR 171, enclosed)

Therefore, without an agreement to pay fees please be advised that your request will be processed without cost up to the required duplication of the first 100 pages.

Please let us know if you are willing to pay the fees that will incurred in the processing of your request. You may set a limit of the maximum amount that you wish to pay.

Based upon the information provided in your letter, your request for a fee waiver has been denied. If you wish to appeal this decision, you may write to the Chief, Requester Liaison Division, at the address given on the bottom of this page. Your appeal should address the points listed in the enclosed sheet entitled “Requests for Fee Waivers.” Your appeal must be sent to us within 30 days from the date that you receive this letter.

While we will make every effort to meet the time limits cited in the Freedom of Information Act (5 USC § 552), unusual circumstances
may arise for extending the time limit (see enclosure). We appreciate your patience in this matter.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact us. We can provide faster service if you include the case number of your request in your communications with us.

We are pleased to be of service to you.

Sincerely,

Katrina M. Wood  
Requester Communications Branch

Enclosure: As stated.
MEMORANDUM FOR STAFF DIRECTOR, SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

SUBJECT: (U//FOUO) Congressional Notification – News Media to Raise Serious Allegations Concerning NSA Operations – INFORMATION MEMORANDUM

(S) This is to inform you of an upcoming televised interview of James Bamford by ABC News Chief Investigative Correspondent Brian Ross, which is expected to soon air allegations that, after 9/11, the National Security Agency (NSA) engaged in improper intelligence activities.

(S//SI//NF) In 2007, NSA's Inspector General (IG) concluded an inquiry into SGT Kinne's allegations that NSA personnel had engaged in improper intelligence activities. The inquiry was unable to substantiate her allegations. The attached NSA IG Memorandum to the Assistant to the Secretary of Defense (Intelligence Oversight) dated 14 December 2007 (Encl. 2) summarizes the findings of the NSA IG inquiry. The IG for the U.S. Army Intelligence & Security Command (INSCOM) has completed its own investigation of several of the same allegations by SGT Kinne. The INSCOM investigation also concludes that there is insufficient evidence to support SGT Kinne's allegations of improper intelligence activities.
ABC News requested an NSA official appear on camera to comment on the allegations made by Mr. Bamford. We have declined an on camera interview and responded with a very brief statement, "The civilian and military members of the National Security Agency/Central Security Service take an oath to support and uphold the Constitution of the United States. We have been entrusted to protect and defend the nation with integrity, accountability, and respect for the law. As Americans, we take this obligation seriously. Our employees work tirelessly for the good of the nation, and serve this country proudly."

Should you have any questions, please contact...

JONATHAN E. MILLER
Associate Director
Legislative Affairs Office

2 encls. a/s

Copy Furnished:
Minority Staff Director, Senate
Select Committee on Intelligence
MEMORANDUM FOR ASSISTANT TO THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
(INTELLIGENCE OVERSIGHT)

(U/FOUO)
SUBJECT: *(b)(3)-P.L. 86-36
Inquiry from Senator Leahy Concerning Possible USSID SP0018 Violations *(b)(3)-P.L. 86-36

REFERENCE: (U) ATSD(IO) Memorandum subject: Same, received on 5 December 2007, Classified SECRET/SI//NOFORN

*(S//SI//NF)* Per your request in Reference above, we reviewed the allegations of improper intelligence activities and possible USSID SP0018 violations made by SGT Adrienne T. Kinne, US Army Reserve deployed to Fort Gordon, GA, on 3 October 2001.

we were unable to substantiate her claims of improper intelligence activities.

*(S//SI)*

*(S//SI)*

Approved for Supplemental Release by NSA on 04-14-2010, FOIA Case # 58957

Derived From: NSA/CSSM 1-52
Dated: 20070103
Declassify On: 20320108
Assigned personnel were surveyed to determine their level of knowledge of intelligence oversight regulations and associated responsibilities. Personnel within the operational areas were well versed in the authorities.

(U//FOUO) Our review revealed no unauthorized or inappropriate intelligence activities from October 2001 to 2004, and we see no reason to continue the inquiry. We provide you with this notification for your review and further action, as you deem necessary. If you need additional information or clarification, please contact Assistant Inspector General for Intelligence Oversight, on

GEORGE ELLARD
Inspector General

cc:
The Inspector General, Department of Defense
The Inspector General, Department of the Army
The Inspector General, U.S. Army Intelligence and Security Command
MEMORANDUM FOR THE CHAIRMAN, INTELLIGENCE OVERSIGHT BOARD

THRU: Assistant to the Secretary of Defense (Intelligence Oversight)

SUBJECT: (U/FOUO) Report to the Intelligence Oversight Board on NSA Activities - INFORMATION MEMORANDUM

(U/FOUO) Except as previously reported to you or the President, or otherwise stated in the enclosure, we have no reason to believe that any intelligence activities of the National Security Agency during the quarter ending 30 September 2008 were unlawful or contrary to Executive Order or Presidential Directive and thus should have been reported pursuant to Section 1.7.(d) of Executive Order 12333.

(U/FOUO) The Inspector General and the General Counsel continue to exercise oversight of Agency activities by inspections, surveys, training, review of directives and guidelines, and advice and counsel. These activities and other data requested by the Board or members of the staff of the Assistant to the Secretary of Defense (Intelligence Oversight) are described in the enclosure.

George Ellard
GEORGE ELLARD
Inspector General

VITO T. POTENZA
General Counsel

(U/FOUO) I concur in the report of the Inspector General and the General Counsel and hereby make it our combined report.

KEITH B. ALEXANDER
Lieutenant General, U. S. Army
Director, NSA/Chief, CSS

Encl:
Quarterly Report

This document may be declassified and marked "UNCLASSIFIED//For Official Use Only" upon removal of enclosure(s)

Approved for Supplemental Release by NSA on 04-14-2010, FOIA Case # 58957

Derived From: NSA/CSSM 1-52
Dated: 20070108
Declassify On: 20326108

TOP SECRET//COMINT//NDFORN
1. (U//FOUO) Intelligence, counterintelligence, and intelligence-related activities that violate law, regulation, or policy substantiated during the quarter, as well as actions taken as a result of the violations.

(U) Intelligence Activities

(b)(3)-P.L. 86-36

(b)(1)

(b)(3)-P.L. 86-36

(b)(1)

(b)(3)-P.L. 86-36

18 USC 798

50 USC 403

86-36

Derived From: NSA/CSSM 1-52
Dated: 20070108
Declassify On: 20320108
(U) Nothing to report.

(U) Intelligence-related Activities
2. (U//FOUO) NSA/CSS OIG Intelligence Oversight Inspections, Investigations, and Special Studies.

(U//FOUO) During this quarter, the OIG reviewed various intelligence activities of the NSA/CSS to determine whether they had been conducted in accordance with applicable statutes, Executive Orders, AG procedures, and Department of Defense and internal directives. With few exceptions, the problems uncovered were routine and showed that operating elements understand the restrictions on NSA/CSS activities.

(U//FOUO) The joint inspection found that I/O roles and responsibilities were not clearly defined and I/O processes and procedures were not developed and documented. Two percent of the workforce had not completed initial I/O training as required by NSA/CSS Policy 1-23. The NSA/CSS OIG will track corrective action through completion.
(U) Congressional, IOB, and DNI Notifications

(S//SI//NF) On 6 October 2008, NSA notified the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence (SSCI) of an impending televised interview of James Bamford by ABC News. The subject of the interview was the allegation that NSA had engaged in improper intelligence activities. The allegation was based in part on allegations made last year by retired SGT Adrienne J. Kinne, a U.S. Army Reservist, who had been assigned to the Army Intelligence and Security Command at Fort Gordon, Georgia. Representatives from the NSA/CSS OIG, OGC, and Office of Legislative Affairs have since met with SSCI and HPSCI staffs to discuss the recent allegations of NSA misconduct by Ms. Kinne and former Navy Cryptologic Technician (Interpretive) Second Class Petty Officer David M. Faulk. NSA is investigating the claims of Mr. Faulk. The Department of the Army is investigating Ms. Kinne's claims.

3. (U) Substantive Changes to the NSA/CSS Intelligence Oversight Program.

(U) Nothing to report.
4. (U) Changes to NSA/CSS published directives or policies concerning intelligence, counterintelligence, or intelligence-related activities and the reason for the changes.

(U) Nothing to report.

5. (U) Procedures governing the activities of Department of Defense (DoD) Intelligence components that affect U.S. persons (DoD Directive 5240.1-R, Procedure 15) Inquiries or Matters Related to Intelligence Oversight Programs.

(U) Nothing to report.