

From: [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, April 29, 2010 8:51 AM
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: FW: CORRECTION: From Dave Venturella: Notification of Organized Events Opposing ICE Police Collaboration
Attachments: SC FAQ_April 2010.doc
Importance: High

Please review the attached revised SC FAQ and provide comments to me by COB Friday, April 30th. SC revised this version with comments from Scott on Section 6 only, however, CJIS needs to review and provide comments on the entire document for clarification. Please see the previous email I sent on Monday as to the original documents and let me know if you have any questions.

b2
b6
b7C

Thanks

[redacted]
FBI CJIS Division
Interoperability Initiatives Unit
[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, April 28, 2010 4:59 PM
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]; Greenberg, Randi L; [redacted] Canty, Rachel E
Subject: CORRECTION: From Dave Venturella: Notification of Organized Events Opposing ICE Police Collaboration

b2
b6
b7C

All,

The correction has been made to the SC FAQ document (attached). The section 6 now states:

6. Is IDENT/IAFIS interoperability mandatory for all jurisdictions? Can a jurisdiction choose to "opt out"?
By 2013, IDENT/IAFIS interoperability is expected to be available to all jurisdictions, which means that all fingerprints checked against federal criminal records in IAFIS will also be checked against IDENT, and ICE will be automatically notified of matches to IDENT data.

IDENT/IAFIS interoperability is mandated by Congress and in line with the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission. Future requirements call for all criminal submissions to IAFIS to be searched against IDENT.

ICE is also working closely with each state and jurisdiction to ensure that law enforcement agencies understand how IDENT/IAFIS interoperability works and why it is a top priority for DHS.

A jurisdiction can "opt out" of one part of the information-sharing capability—the response message from IDENT that includes identity information. This message is automatically generated by IDENT and sent to ICE. If the requesting agency has the technological capability to receive such messages, it may elect not to receive the response.

This corrected version should replace all copies of the previously sent file and resend to anyone that received the original version. Thanks!!

[Redacted]
Secure Communities
Desk [Redacted]
BB [Redacted]
[Redacted]

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, April 28, 2010 3:21 PM
To: [Redacted]
Cc: [Redacted]; Greenberg, Randi L.; [Redacted]
Subject: RE: From Dave Venturella: Notification of Organized Events Opposing ICE Police Collaboration-resend

b6
b7c

All,

CJIS is reviewing and preparing comments to the documents but I needed to address one part in particular immediately.

Question # 6 states "**Is IDENT/IAFIS interoperability mandatory for all jurisdictions? Can a jurisdiction choose to "opt out"?**"

The second paragraph of the response is as follows:

"IDENT/IAFIS interoperability is mandated by Congress and in line with the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission. If a jurisdiction does not want fingerprints checked against IDENT, the jurisdiction would need to coordinate with its state so fingerprints are not submitted to IAFIS."

CJIS absolutely does not support this ultimatum as stated. We should NEVER encourage jurisdictions to consider NOT sending fingerprints to IAFIS as a viable alternative. Even the suggestion brings scrutiny to the program and begins to weigh the benefit of SC against law enforcement at large as opposed to in conjunction with it. I understand the genesis of the response in that NGI requirements are to send to IDENT, which gives SC more leverage. But we can not and should not suggest that not sending FP

to IAFIS is an option. We would challenge the APB decision before encouraging states to consider not submitting. The response as written should not go out.

The last sentence of the response should be changed to read "Future requirements call for all criminal submissions to IAFIS to be searched against IDENT".

In the long run we may need to consider alternatives to separate system to system record-linking efforts from jurisdiction concerns on immigration.

[Redacted]
FBI/CJIS
Global Operations
[Redacted]

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, April 28, 2010 2:37 PM
To: [Redacted]
Cc: [Redacted]; 'Greenberg, Randi L'; [Redacted]
Subject: RE: From Dave Venturella: Notification of Organized Events Opposing ICE Police Collaboration-
resend

b2
b6
b7C

I am adding [Redacted] to this email chain.

[Redacted]
FBI CJIS Division
Interoperability Initiatives Unit
[Redacted]

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Friday, April 23, 2010 4:50 PM
To: [Redacted]
Cc: [Redacted]; Vincent E; Greenberg, Randi L
Subject: From Dave Venturella: Notification of Organized Events Opposing ICE Police Collaboration-
resend

Please see below. This is for your information only and does not require any action. If you have any questions, please contact me.

b6
b7C

[Redacted]
Secure Communities
Dest [Redacted]
BB [Redacted]
[Redacted]

Next week, beginning Monday, April 26th, several non-governmental organizations will begin holding media events across the country to express their opposition to ICE and local law enforcement collaboration. The events will focus on ICE's Secure Communities strategy and a FOIA request the organizations have submitted. We are notifying you of these events for your information only; no action is required.

Events are currently scheduled in Arizona, California, Florida, Georgia, New Jersey, New York City, North Carolina, Oregon, Texas and Washington, D.C. For more information about events happening in your area and updates, visit <http://ccrjustice.org/secure-communities>. Please note some of these events will announce additional requests for information from our law enforcement partners.

Should you receive inquiries from media, stakeholders or others, simply follow your standard procedures for addressing their requests. Also, please know the ICE regional public affairs officers are informed of these events. Attached are standard frequently asked questions (internal use only) and talking points about Secure Communities for your reference.

For awareness purposes, we are also notifying our partners within government and external stakeholders. ICE continues to maintain an open and transparent dialogue with organizations and to ensure that our criminal alien enforcement efforts are effective, efficient and fair.

Rachel Canty
Chief of Staff
Secure Communities
Immigration & Customs Enforcement

b6
b7c