

NR_key_name: 0E77959047E7DD7F8525648B006607CE

SendTo: CN=Douglas Horne/O=ARRB @ ARRB

CopyTo: CN=Jeremy Gunn/O=ARRB @ ARRB;CN=David Marwell/O=ARRB @ ARRB

DisplayBlindCopyTo:

BlindCopyTo: CN=R ecord/O=ARRB

From: CN=Christopher Barger/O=ARRB

DisplayFromDomain:

DisplayDate: 05/02/1997

DisplayDate_Time: 2:34:42 PM

ComposedDate: 05/02/1997

ComposedDate_Time: 2:34:27 PM

Subject: Questions regarding NSA documents
CALL REPORT DOCUMENT'S AUTHOR: Christopher Barger/ARRB Date Created: 05/02/97 The players who initiated the call? Review Board's representative in the call: Christopher BargerNational Security Agency (NSA)'s representative in the call: [Screened by: NARA RD-F on October 12, 2016 according to the John F. Kennedy Records Collection Act of 1992, 44 U.S.C. 2107, Section 6(1)A] Description of the Call Date: 05/02/97Subject: Questions regarding NSA documentsSummary of the Call:After a protracted gave of phone tag, our NSA p.o.c. and I finally spoke at about 1:45 in the afternoon on Friday May 2. I explained that we had three categories of questions regarding the documents. On the question of the RIFs, they have not been made available to the public, so whatever alterations that need to be made can be done easily. He was of the belief that NARA had the ability to print out restricted RIF. I told him I didn't think that was the case, but that I would check with Steve Tilley and get back to him. I did tell him that under no circumstance would we redo the RIFs; if they needed to be reprinted, he would have to do it. Regarding the documents with inadvertent releases, we have made arrangements to take care of this by telephone on Monday morning (he was leaving for the day as soon as our conversation was over). I will call him and tell him the line number in each document where there is an inadvertent release, and he will take care of it and send us down the new versions after they are done. Regarding instances where sub language needs to be worked out, he believed that Tim and he had gotten some things worked out; it appears that I may just not have been aware of or found evidence of some of these solutions. He has the document numbers and will check his records to be sure, and I will recheck the safe for this evidence (specifically, he was sure that something had been worked out for 10056), and then he and I will have a STU conversation Monday. Where there was something struck already, we'll confirm it; if there are cases where nothing has been agreed on, he and I will work something out at that time. We specifically mentioned two documents, #10127 and #10138. 10127 is the illegible one; he remembered it. He says the original that they have is in the same condition, apparently copied from microfilm; he thinks that the version that we have is about as good as they have for that document. He said that it will be coming up again in the next set of documents in the pipeline, because a second copy was made of it and this one is a little clearer; however, this clearer copy has its own RIF and is a separate document. Options include having the Board vote on the illegible version at the next meeting (seeing that the version of 10127 is the best available), or waiting until the clearer copy is available to us, then comparing them and voting on both at the same time.For 10138, the issue is that we apparently never got a blue highlighted version to present to the Board. This appears to have been accidental, just a "slipped through the cracks" thing, and he thought we had a copy of it. To both his Record

Body:

recstat:

DeliveryPriority: N

DeliveryReport: B

ReturnReceipt:

Categories: