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DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

6 CFR Part 5

[Docket No. DHS–2018–0064]

Privacy Act of 1974: Implementation of Exemptions; Department of Homeland Security (DHS)/U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP)—024 CBP Intelligence Records System (CIRS) System of Records

AGENCY: Department of Homeland Security.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Department of Homeland Security is issuing a final rule to amend its regulations to exempt portions of a newly established system of records titled, “DHS/CBP—024 CBP Intelligence Records System (CIRS) System of Records” from certain provisions of the Privacy Act. Specifically, the Department exempts portions of the “DHS/CBP—024 CBP Intelligence Records System (CIRS) System of Records” from one or more provisions of the Privacy Act because of criminal, civil, and administrative enforcement requirements. DHS issued the “DHS/CBP—024 CBP Intelligence Records System (CIRS) System of Records” in the Federal Register at 82 FR 44198, on September 21, 2017, to provide notice to the public that DHS/CBP collects and maintains records generated, received, or collected by the CBP Office of Intelligence, or other offices within CBP that support the law enforcement intelligence mission, that is analyzed and disseminated to CBP executive management and operational units for law enforcement, intelligence, counterterrorism, and other homeland security purposes. CIRS contains data from a variety of sources within and outside of CBP to support law enforcement activities and investigations of violations of U.S. laws, administration of immigration laws and other laws administered or enforced by CBP, and production of CBP law enforcement intelligence products. CIRS is the exclusive CBP SORN for finished intelligence products and any raw intelligence information, public source information, or other information collected by CBP for an intelligence purpose that is not covered by an existing DHS SORN. CIRS records were previously covered by DHS/CBP—006—Automated Targeting System SORN (77 FR 30297, May 22, 2012) and DHS/CBP—017—Analytical Framework for Intelligence SORN (77 FR 13813, June 7, 2012).

DHS/CBP invited comments on both the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) and System of Records Notice (SORN).

II. Public Comments

DHS received thirty-two comments on the CBP CIRS NPRM and four on the CBP CIRS SORN. Of the thirty-six total comments, thirteen were erroneously filed relating to the republication of the DHS Alien File, Index, and National File Tracking system (A-File). DHS will not respond to comments regarding the publication of the A-File SORN in this Final Rule. Of the remaining substantive comments for CIRS: (1) Seventeen related to transparency; (2) two related to the collection of information not specifically relevant to an investigation; and (3) four were duplicates of two formal briefs submitted for both the SORN and the NPRM. The following is an analysis of the substantive comments and questions submitted by the public.

Comment: DHS should not hide what it is collecting by exempting the information from Privacy Act protections.

Response: DHS published the CIRS SORN in compliance with the notification requirements of the Privacy Act; subsection 552a(e)(4), and thus, is being transparent of its collection activities. The CIRS SORN describes the information that DHS collects and retains in association with this system of records. DHS does not seek to hide this collection or exempt it from the notification requirements of the Privacy Act; rather, it seeks exemptions to ensure that records critical to law enforcement and intelligence activities need not be shared in the event that such sharing might jeopardize the investigation or otherwise compromise DHS operations.

Comment: DHS’s collection of records in CIRS is overly broad because, as stated in the NPRM, DHS may be collecting information that “may not be strictly relevant or necessary to a specific investigation.”

Response: In order to conduct a complete investigation, it is necessary for DHS/CBP to collect and review large amounts of data in order to identify and understand relationships between individuals, entities, threats and events, and to monitor patterns of activity over extended periods of time that may be indicative of criminal, terrorist, or other threat.

Comment: The SORN contains materially false claims concerning the status of the rulemaking for Privacy Act exemptions that are directly
contradicted by the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking for those exemptions.

Response: The Secretary of Homeland Security issued a proper NPRM, pursuant to the Privacy Act, the Federal Register, and Office of Management and Budget (OMB) requirements, received comments from the public as part of the notice and comment procedures of the Administrative Procedure Act, and is issuing this final rule in conformance with those requirements.

Comment: Proposed routine uses would circumvent Privacy Act safeguards and contravene legislative intent.

Response: DHS’s collection of records in CIRS is intended to permit DHS/CBP to review large amounts of data in order to identify and understand relationships between individuals, entities, threats, and events, and to monitor patterns of activity over extended periods of time that may be indicative of criminal, terrorist, or other threat. The SORN is consistent with the legislative intent of the Privacy Act to ensure fair practices, collection, and uses of individuals’ personal information. The routine uses, as written in the CIRS SORN, and disclosures of such records, are compatible with the purpose for which they are originally collected and used by DHS/CBP.

After consideration and review of the public comments, DHS has determined that the exemptions should remain in place, and will implement the rulemaking as proposed.

List of Subjects in 6 CFR Part 5

Freedom of information, Privacy.

For the reasons stated in the preamble, DHS amends Chapter I of Title 6, Code of Federal Regulations, as follows:

PART 5—DISCLOSURE OF RECORDS AND INFORMATION

1. The authority citation for part 5 continues to read as follows:


2. Add paragraph 79 to appendix C to part 5 to read as follows:

Appendix C to Part 5—DHS Systems of Records Exempt From the Privacy Act

79. The DHS/CBP–024 CBP Intelligence Records System (CIRS) System of Records consists of electronic and paper records and will be used by DHS and its components. The CIRS is a repository of information held by DHS in connection with its several and varied missions and functions, including, but not limited to the enforcement of civil and criminal laws; investigations, inquiries, and proceedings there under; and national security and intelligence activities. The CIRS contains information that is collected by, on behalf of, in support of, or in cooperation with DHS and other agencies and may contain personally identifiable information collected by other Federal, state, local, tribal, foreign, or international government agencies. The Secretary of Homeland Security, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(d)(2), has exempted this system from the following provisions of the Privacy Act: 5 U.S.C. 552a(c)(3) and (4); (d); (e)(1), (e)(2), (e)(3), (e)(4)(G), (e)(4)(H), (e)(4)(I); (f)(5), and (e)(8); (f); and (g). Additionally, the Secretary of Homeland Security, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(k)(1) and (k)(2), has exempted this system from the following provisions of the Privacy Act, 5 U.S.C. 552a(c)(3); (d); (e)(1), (e)(4)(G), (e)(4)(H), (e)(4)(I), and (f). When this system receives a record from another system exempted in that source system under 5 U.S.C. 552a(k)(1), (k)(2), or (k)(2), DHS will claim the same exemptions for those records that are claimed for the original primary systems of records from which they originated and claims any additional exemptions set forth here. Exemptions from these particular subsections are justified, a case by case basis to be determined at the time a request is made, for the following reasons:

(a) From subsection (c)(3) and (4) (Accounting for Disclosures) because release of the accounting of disclosures could alert the subject of a record to impede the investigation, to tamper with witnesses or evidence, and to avoid detection and apprehension, which would undermine the entire investigative process. Information on a completed investigation may be withheld and exempt from disclosure if the fact that an investigation occurred remains sensitive after completion.

(b) From subsection (d) (Access and Amendment to Records) because access to the records contained in this system of records could impede the accounting for an investigation of an actual or potential criminal, civil, or regulatory violation to the existence of that investigation and reveal investigative interest on the part of DHS as well as the recipient agency. Disclosure of the accounting would therefore present a serious impediment to law enforcement efforts and/or efforts to preserve national security. Disclosure of the accounting would also permit the individual who is the subject of a record to impede the investigation, to tamper with witnesses or evidence, and to avoid detection and apprehension, which would undermine the entire investigative process. Information on a completed investigation may be withheld and exempt from disclosure if the fact that an investigation occurred remains sensitive after completion.

(c) From subsection (e)(1) (Relevancy and Necessity of Information) because in the course of investigations into potential violations of Federal law, the accuracy of information obtained or introduced occasionally may be unclear, or the information may not be strictly relevant or necessary to a specific investigation. In the interests of effective law enforcement, it is appropriate to retain all information that may aid in establishing patterns of unlawful activity.

(d) From subsection (e)(2) (Collection of Information from Individuals) because requiring that information be collected from the subject of an investigation would alert the subject to the nature or existence of the investigation, thereby interfering with that investigation and related law enforcement activities.

(e) From subsection (e)(3) (Notice to Subjects) because providing such detailed information could impede law enforcement by compromising the existence of a confidential investigation or reveal the identity of witnesses or confidential informants.

(f) From subsections (e)(4)(G), (e)(4)(H), and (e)(4)(I) (Agency Regulations) and (f) (Agency Rules) because portions of this system are exempt from the individual access and amendment provisions of subsection (d) for the reasons noted above, and therefore DHS is not required to establish requirements, rules, or procedures with respect to such access to such records as are part of the system or other system to which individuals may access, amend, and view records pertaining to themselves in the system the would undermine investigative efforts and reveal the identities of witnesses, and potential witnesses, and confidential informants.

(g) From subsection (e)(5) (Collection of Information) because with the collection of information for law enforcement purposes, it is impossible to determine in advance what information is accurate, relevant, timely, and complete. Compliance with subsection (e)(5) would preclude DHS agents from using their investigative training and exercise of good judgment to both conduct and report on investigations.

(h) From subsection (e)(8) (Notice on Individuals) because compliance would interfere with DHS’s ability to obtain, serve, and issue subpoenas, warrants, and other law enforcement mechanisms that may be filed under seal and could result in disclosure of investigative techniques, procedures, and evidence.

(i) From subsection (g) to the extent that the system is exempt from other specific subsections of the Privacy Act relating to individuals’ rights to access and amend their records contained in the system. Therefore, DHS is not required to establish rules or procedures pursuant to which individuals may seek a civil remedy for the agency’s refusal to amend a record, refusal to comply with a request for access to records, failure to maintain accurate, relevant timely and
SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

On December 21, 2000, the Secretary published the National List of Allowed and Prohibited Substances in §§ 205.600 through 205.607 of the USDA organic regulations (7 CFR 205.1–205.690). This National List identifies the synthetic substances that may be used and the nonsynthetic (natural) substances that may not be used in organic production. The National List also identifies synthetic, nonsynthetic nonagricultural, and nonorganic agricultural substances that may be used in organic handling. The Organic Foods Production Act of 1990, as amended (7 U.S.C. 6501–6522) (OFPA), and § 205.105 of the USDA organic regulations specifically prohibit the use of any synthetic substance in organic production and handling unless the synthetic substance is on the National List. Section 205.105 also requires that any nonorganic agricultural and any nonsynthetic nonagricultural substance used in organic handling be on the National List. Under the authority of OFPA, the National List can be amended by the Secretary based on recommendations presented by the NOSB. Since the final rule establishing the National Organic Program (NOP) became effective on December 27, 2019, the National List may be amended by the Secretary on its own initiative.

II. Overview of Amendments

The following provides an overview of the final rule additions and amendments to designated sections of the National List regulations. Application and timeline information on the amendments were addressed in the proposed rule (83 FR 2498) and have not been included in the final rule. In addition, the basis for the NOSB recommendations was presented in the proposed rule. In summary, the NOSB evaluated each substance by applying the OFPA substance evaluation criteria to determine if the substance is compatible with organic production or handling. AMS reviewed each NOSB recommendation and accepted each recommendation for rulemaking. Subsequently, AMS submitted the NOSB recommendations through rulemaking in the proposed rule and this final rule. After considering the received comments, AMS has determined that the additions and amendments described in the proposed rule will be included, with a few minor changes based on comments, in the final rule. Section E of this final rule provides an overview of the comments received and AMS’s response on all additions and amendments.

§ 205.601 Synthetic Substances Allowed for Use in Organic Crop Production

This final rule amends § 205.601 by adding three new substances, hypochlorous acid, magnesium oxide, and squid byproducts, to this section and amends this section by changing the annotation of micronutrients as listed in § 205.601 to include other agricultural practices that may be used in maintaining soil fertility.

Hypochlorous Acid

This final rule adds hypochlorous acid to § 205.601 as a chlorine material allowed for use as an algicide, disinfectant, and sanitizer. Paragraph (a)(2)(iii) reads as follows:

Hypochlorous acid—generated from electrolyzed water. Upon the effective date of this rule hypochlorous acid is allowed as an algicide, disinfectant, and sanitizer, including irrigation cleaning systems in organic crop production. AMS has reviewed and agrees with the NOSB recommendation that hypochlorous acid be allowed for use in organic crop production. AMS received comments on the proposed rule for amending hypochlorous acid onto § 205.601.

Magnesium Oxide

This final rule adds magnesium oxide to the National List in § 205.601(j) for use in controlling the viscosity of a clay suspension agent for humates. Paragraph (j)(5) is added to this section to read as follows: Magnesium oxide (CAS # 1309–48–4)—for use only to control the viscosity of a clay suspension agent for humates. Upon the effective date of this rule, magnesium oxide is allowed in organic crop production as an agent for controlling the viscosity of clay suspension for humates. AMS has reviewed and agrees with the NOSB recommendation that magnesium oxide acid be allowed for use in organic crop production. AMS received comments on the proposed rule for amending magnesium oxide onto § 205.601.