

From: Mindy Landau
To: A. Lynn Silvious; Eileen Schultz; Elizabeth Shelburne; Francine Goldberg; Frederick Sturz; Gilbert Millman; Lynn Scattolini; Mabel Lee; Margie Kotzalas; Mark Delligatti; Patricia Rathbun; Richard Rosano; Wayne Burnside; William Reckley
Date: 1/31/02 5:18PM
Subject: Meeting Summary

Attached is a summary of today's meeting on the criteria for release of information and related staff guidance.

CC: Donald Hassell; Mary Pat Siemien; Patricia Norry

P-29

Summary of 1/31/02 Meeting on Criteria for Release of Information

The following attendees met to establish some next steps in response to the SRM on COMSECY-01-0030.

Dick Rosano, NRR
Bill Reckley, NRR
Fritz Sturz, NMSS
Patricia Rathbun, NMSS
Mark Delligatti, NMSS
Eileen Schultz, NMSS
Mabel Lee, RES
Betsy Shelburne, OCIO
Lynn Scattolini, OCIO
Fran Goldberg, OCIO
Wayne Burnside, ADM
Mindy Landau, OEDO

We discussed the challenges of reconciling the SRM with the Office of Homeland Security's draft definition of Sensitive Homeland Security Information (SHSI).

Action: It was agreed that Dick Rosano, in cooperation with Fritz Sturz and ADM security staff, would develop some new criteria that would incorporate the intent of both the SRM and the OHS document, along with concrete examples of such information to the staff.

It was also agreed we should try to identify those categories or types of documents that fall into three categories: those that would clearly **not** present a sensitivity risk, those that clearly **would** present a sensitivity risk (likely already either proprietary, safeguards or classified), and those that fall into the "gray" area and would need to be reviewed against the new criteria for sensitivity.

Action: By early next week, Lynn Scattolini and Fran Goldberg offered to provide offices with a list of all documents currently being processed and the corresponding responsible office. Office reps will review the list and try to reach consensus on what types of documents fall into the above categories, and which ones need to be reviewed (which is the focus of our effort).

There was discussion on the intent of the second comment in the SRM regarding "withholding information that is **already currently widely available** to the public." We agreed this should encompass three parts, (1) Documents that were withdrawn from the web and ADAMS post-9/11 -- **Should be reviewed against new criteria before being re-released** (2) Documents that are now publicly available on the web and ADAMS -- **Do not have to be reviewed against new criteria, unless documents in ADAMS are found that do meet the new criteria**; and (3) Documents from this date forward -- **Should be reviewed against the new criteria**.

Action: ALL. When the group meets again, we will collectively review the document collection list, discuss the "review" process for each office, and discuss how we are to perform a quality control of the process, including management review. The ADAMS working group will assist us in developing a viable process.

Action: ALL. At the next meeting (next week?), the group will develop a time line for follow-up actions to include a review process, licensee notifications of the criteria, staff training, etc.