

**NR\_key\_name:** 52E1F05F45F398CA8525661000669556

**SendTo:** CN=Bob Skwirot/O=ARRB @ ARRB

**CopyTo:**

**DisplayBlindCopyTo:**

**BlindCopyTo:** CN=R ecord/O=ARRB

**From:** CN=Laura Denk/O=ARRB

**DisplayFromDomain:**

**DisplayDate:** 05/26/1998

**DisplayDate\_Time:** 2:41:15 PM

**ComposedDate:** 05/26/1998

**ComposedDate\_Time:** 2:40:29 PM

**Subject:** final report  
b. intelligence agents text of section 6(1)(A). . . clear and convincing evidence that the threat to the military defense, intelligence operations, or conduct of foreign relations of the United States posed by the public disclosure of the assassination record is of such gravity that it outweighs the public interest, and such public disclosure would reveal --(A) an intelligence agent whose identity currently requires protection1. CIA Officers  
a. Review Board Guidelines. Names of CIA Officers who are still active or who retired under cover in potentially risky circumstances were generally protected. Names of officers who were deceased or whose connection to the CIA was public knowledge were generally released throughout the collection. CIA Employee was used as substitute language, though when available, useful, and appropriate an alias or pseudonym was substituted. b. Commentary. Review Board members confronted the name issue in the first CIA document they reviewed but did not close the issue until two years later. The drawn out review of CIA employee names points to some of the challenges that existed in the process and to the seriousness with which those involved, both on the Review Board and at the Agency, approached the task at hand. CIA began by defending the protection of employee names as a matter of policy. First, since many employees are under cover, the maintenance of that cover is critical to gathering intelligence. CIA contended that the identification of a name can identify the cover provider and jeopardize operations. Second, although the majority of names are of retired CIA employees, CIA has a confidentiality agreement with them. Many of these former employees objected to release of their former Agency affiliation, suggesting that such release might jeopardize business relationships or threaten personal safety. Initially, CIA wished to argue these as general principles for the protection of all employee names. But the Review Board determined that the merits of these arguments could only be determined on a case-by-case basis. Gradually the CIA began to provide supporting evidence of the postponement of individual names. CIAs initial refusal to provide evidence on individual names was met, not with the wholesale release of names by the Board, but with a firm but patient insistence that the Agency meet the requirements of the Act. Names of a few individuals who were of central importance to the JFK story were released early in the process, but for others the Board gave the Agency a number of additional opportunities to provide specific evidence. For example, December 1995 was the first name day, a Board meeting at which the Agency was to provide evidence for names encountered in records during the previous six to seven months. CIA offered a generalized blanket response. Realizing that the personal safety of individuals could be at issue, Board members gave CIA more time to provide evidence. Other name days were set in May 1996 and May 1997. As deadlines for submission of evidence approached, CIA agreed to release some of the names, but  
**Body:**  
**recstat:** Record  
**DeliveryPriority:** N  
**DeliveryReport:** B  
**ReturnReceipt:**  
**Categories:**