NR_key_name:	B93585F4A25D63D2852561C40079DC52
SendTo:	CN=Mary McAuliffe/O=ARRB @ ARRB
CopyTo:	CN=David Marwell/O=ARRB @ ARRB
DisplayBlindCopyTo:	
BlindCopyTo:	CN=R ecord/O=ARRB
From:	CN=Jeremy Gunn/O=ARRB
DisplayFromDomain:	
DisplayDate:	05/22/1995
DisplayDate_Time:	6:15:46 PM
ComposedDate:	05/22/1995
ComposedDate_Time:	6:11:03 PM
Subject:	Re: CIA's response to Board's request
Body:	I am concerned about how the fax went to CIA. Whenever Phil and I want to send something to the FBI, we have always discussed it first , reviewed drafts, and sent it to David for final authorization and for signing. I think that that is a good procedure that we should follow. Let's talk about this.To:David Marwell/ARRB, Jeremy Gunn/ARRBcc: From:Mary McAuliffe/ARRB Date:05/22/95 04:38:01 PMSubject:CIA's response to Board's requestEarlier today I sent a classified fax to Barry calling for further information, as the Board had requested, on redacted items (crypts, names, pseudos, etc.) in those records the Board plans to consider at its next meeting.I made it clear that the more information that CIA makes available about each item, the better, especially in the case of names, pseudos, and agent crypts. Replying to me by phone, Barry said that the problem with this request is that it raises issues that go beyond information readily available in HRG's files and therefore involves tasking the components. This, he said, should come in the form of a formal memo from the Board, which will then be sent to the various focal points within the Agency. Especially anything touching on current status will require additional tasking and research. Agent crypts, too, will have to go back to the holding component for general descriptions (true names are never placed on the same piece of paper with an agent crypt).I plan to talk further with him tomorrow about this, but obviously CIA is not planning to move quickly on the subject.
recstat:	Record
DeliveryPriority:	N
DeliveryReport:	B
ReturnReceipt:	
Categories:	